

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, February 29, 1972 – Friday, April 14, 1972

Fine Binding

No. 1



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, February 29, 1972, being the first day of the second session of the 29th Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1972

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House and being seated upon the throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly, on this occasion of the opening of the second session of the 29th Parliament of Ontario, I extend warmest greetings to you.

The people of Ontario, having been recently consulted as to their wishes with respect to their representation in this Legislature, have assigned to each of you the most solemn duty and charge which I know you will serve steadfastly and well, whatever your place and part in our democratic process. On behalf of our Sovereign, I convey my best wishes to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and to his ministers in their several new responsibilities, and to all members of the legislative assembly.

Laissez-moi vous exprimer mes voeux les plus chaleureux en ce jour d'ouverture de la deuxième session de la vingt-neuvième Législature de l'Ontario.

La population de notre province ayant été récemment consultée quant au choix de ses représentants au sein de cette Législature, a confié à chacun de vous un mandat et des responsabilités d'une importance on ne peut plus capitale. Je demeure persuadé que, quelles que soient vos positions respectives et votre rôle individuel dans le processus démocratique qui est le nôtre, vous accomplirez tous votre tâche avec constance et efficacité.

Je transmets, au nom de notre Souveraine, mes meilleurs voeux de réussite à notre Premier Ministre et à ses ministres, ainsi qu'à tous les membres de l'assemblée législative, dans les nombreuses et nouvelles responsabilités qui sont les leurs.

My government wishes to outline to the Legislature the various proposals it intends to submit to your scrutiny and consideration during this session. These, and other measures to be placed before you in due course, will be designed to carry forward the major purposes of the government in response to present conditions of our society and its more urgent requirements at this time in our history.

My ministers believe that, as a result of their recent mandate, they have a renewed responsibility to make the growing complexity and scope of government services more efficient and productive while, at the same time, bringing government closer to the people, so that it may be more responsive to the continuing needs for change and reform.

My ministers are aware of the widespread concern over the condition of the national economy of which Ontario's industry and commerce are such a vital part. To maintain public confidence in the basic strength and vigour of our own economy requires the government to use fiscal prudence and restraint in the areas of its responsibility and to encourage individual incentive, endeavour and entrepreneurship in the private sector.

My ministers believe it is their duty to give leadership and provide purposeful means by which our people may continue to enjoy the natural beauty and serenity of our Ontario landscape and a daily life in a healthy and wholesome environment. As well, my ministers believe it is their duty to maintain a standard of life for all citizens, the quality of which will reflect the compassionate and generous spirit of our people. My government will also seek new ways to encourage the achievement of excellence in the many fields of citizen endeavour from which all of Ontario's people may draw inspiration and example.

It is expected that our province will continue to enjoy a substantial expansion of its economy in 1972, with a real growth rate

in excess of six per cent. Such an achievement will represent a significant improvement over the past year. Despite such growth, my government considers the present and projected unemployment levels to be unacceptable. It is therefore the primary objective of my government's economic, social and fiscal policy to attain the highest possible rate of employment.

Budgetary and fiscal strategy will be designed to maintain a rate of expansion in all areas of economic policy in order to effect substantial improvements in the employment rate. While much has been done, and more will be done, to achieve this objective, the speed with which it can be achieved depends in large measure on the improved co-ordination of federal and provincial policies and programmes.

My government will continue to make constructive proposals to the federal government in order to improve intergovernmental co-operation in such specific areas of current concern as fiscal and monetary policy, and in areas relating to competition and foreign trade, including the vital consideration of the auto pact between Canada and the United States.

My government has proposed to the federal government that effective means of dealing with longer-term economic issues be created through regular meetings of Ministers of Finance, which would be constituted as a joint economic committee.

My government is convinced of the need for both federal and provincial action in order to sustain and develop an internationally competitive secondary manufacturing sector, a matter of critical importance to Ontario.

The government is also committed to the pursuit of policies which will encourage more economic activity and greater participation by Canadians in the development of their own resources and in the utilization of their own skills. Further action in this regard will follow the report of the select committee of this Legislature on economic and cultural nationalism.

My ministers will continue to devote their attention to the many important economic, fiscal and trade matters in which Ontario, the government of Canada and our sister provinces have a common interest and responsibility, and in which the co-operation of all is essential. In particular, my government is eager to achieve federal-provincial agreement in the following areas:

1. Tax sharing, so that the basic imbalance in our federal system between revenue sources and expenditure responsibilities can be corrected;

2. Constitutional reform, and particularly the distribution of powers, a matter closely related to tax sharing, so that government responsibilities and institutions are more in accord with the contemporary needs of Canadians; and,

3. Shared-cost reform, so that the provices can assume full financial responsibility for existing shared-cost programmes if they so desire.

In a broader, but no less significant area of inter-governmental affairs, Ontario intends to make strong representations to the federal government, emphasizing the need for full provincial consultation and participation in formulating national policies of vital concern to the provinces, including future considerations of national policy relating to agriculture, communications, energy, foreign investment, international trade and urban affairs, with particular emphasis on urban renewal and housing.

To this end, my government proposes to offer to host a tri-level conference this year in Ontario, in which federal, provincial and municipal governments will be represented. Such a conference will advance the important work begun last year, which my government has supported and helped to sustain.

In the major reorganization which follows the study undertaken by the Committee on Government Productivity, a new Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Inter-Governmental Affairs will be established, with special responsibility for urban and regional planning, provincial-municipal relations and finance, and federal-provincial relations. The implementation of these activities will be integrated in the annual fiscal plan through the provincial budget. The ministry recognizes the need for stronger and more independent local governments and, in preparing future urban and regional plans, my government will be able to avoid a fragmented approach and piecemeal planning by achieving a closer partnership with municipal representatives.

Proposals will be made to the Legislature on many specific urban and regional matters and a series of Design for Development reports will be made available, which will indicate the potential pattern of development in all regions of the province. Plans will be introduced to create regional governments in Sudbury and Kitchener-Waterloo. Action will

be taken to further the implementation of the Toronto-centred region plan and the Design for Development of northwestern Ontario.

As a result of the study by the committee on local election law, the government will introduce a bill designed to reform election procedures, which will include the abolition of property qualifications for voters in municipal elections.

My government, recognizing the significant role of the Ontario Municipal Board and believing it now appropriate to examine relationships of this board with the municipalities, will conduct a review of the functions, responsibilities and practices of the board, including consideration of appeals and petitions from its decisions. Municipalities, municipal organizations and the general public will be invited to participate in this review.

My government will continue in the summer months the employment for youth programme and will increase the scope of this programme by providing additional funds for its activities. The summer employment for youth programme, which provides jobs for students and also funds alternative volunteer activities, is designed to complement the Opportunities for Youth programme of the federal government. The success of the various provincial programmes including the retardation student volunteer programme, project SWEEP, and the summer volunteer programme of the Department of Social and Family Services, all initiated last year, is a tribute to the energy, enthusiasm and diligence of the young people of Ontario who were involved.

New activities will be added to the existing programme, among them a correctional rehabilitation programme involving student participation, as well as the project Youth and the Law, which has been designed to involve young people in an appreciation of law enforcement and the administration of justice.

In the present year, the substantial and practical task of reconstructing the organization and processes of administration will be pressed forward as the government implements the major recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity. My ministers are convinced of the need for such a reorganization in order to improve overall effectiveness and to develop new and better processes by which future policy may be considered and created, and existing policy can be reviewed and reformed.

To this end, new legislation will be introduced in order to provide for the implementation of these farreaching recommendations. This legislation will be incorporated in an omnibus bill and hon. members will have the opportunity to debate its provisions, both in principle and specific detail.

The publication of other reports arising out of the continued work of the Cronyn Committee on Government Productivity will be forthcoming in the near future, including studies and recommendations on automatic data processing, communications and information, and on human resource utilization.

My government will propose to hon. members that a commission be appointed to review the functions and processes of the Legislature and means by which these might be improved to give elected members better opportunities to serve their constituents and to enhance the role of the private member in this Legislature.

My government will introduce legislation to prohibit the holding of more than one elected public office by any individual.

Legislation will be introduced allowing for reforms in the Ontario school record system, and providing greater safeguards to ensure the confidentiality of student records. This will establish the right of students and parents to have access to these records, based on the principle that such information is the private property of the individual concerned.

Legislation will be introduced that will enable school boards and municipal authorities to share in the development of various facilities for both school and community use. Through such arrangements the use of school buildings should be considerably enhanced and the concept of the school as a community resource will come closer to being a reality.

My government intends to extend bilingual services, as required, through the municipal level and in court proceedings. The report of the ministerial commission on French-language secondary education is expected in the near future and the government will consider its recommendations and consult the Legislature as to appropriate action. A senior position will be created in the Department of Education with specific responsibilities for integrating and co-ordinating the various existing programmes and activities which the department provides in support of the French-language instructional programmes in the elementary and secondary schools of Ontario.

As part of a general review of overall economic policy, my government considers

it urgent that there be a re-evaluation of its role and responsibility with regard to the Ontario housing industry, and will seek further means by which housing construction can be encouraged so that more homes are available to more people at the lowest possible cost.

My government will continue to give close attention to the needs of the agricultural industry, with increasing emphasis on the business aspects of farming, particularly farm management. Further initiatives will be taken to increase and diversify the use and sale of Ontario-grown agricultural and food products in domestic and export markets.

The Farm Products Marketing Act and the Ontario Milk Act will be amended to reflect the principles of recommendations contained in the recent report of the royal commission inquiry into civil rights. Amendments to the Edible Oil Products Act to permit the blending of certain dairy products with edible oil products will be proposed.

In the field of health services, the recommendations of the Grange report on hospital privileges will be implemented by legislation which will provide an appeal mechanism for physicians who may be refused courtesy privileges in a hospital.

Legislation will be introduced providing insured services in nursing homes and homes for the aged, allowing the province the necessary authority to expand its health care insurance programme to cover needed medical care in this area.

My government will take steps to improve the availability of essential dental and medical services to people in more isolated parts of the province.

My government, in considering the observations and recommendations of the Willis-ton report, will accelerate its efforts to provide improved treatment and facilities for the mentally ill, and expand the scope and availability of training programmes for the retarded within their home communities.

My government shares fully the concerns of the people of Ontario in respect to the protection and enhancement of our natural environment. The Ontario Water Resources Commission has maintained constant liaison with officials of the federal government, and has been involved in the discussions with the government of the United States on co-operative measures to clean up the Great Lakes. The government of Ontario will continue to press for the signing and implementation of an international agreement with respect to the control of pollution on the Great Lakes system.

My government has completed a study on the many and increasing problems of waste and litter. A proposal to eliminate various unsightly conditions in our environment will be placed before you. A programme will be implemented to remove the blight of abandoned automobile hulks and automobile graveyards from our landscape.

Substantial programme expansion in outdoor recreation is planned over the next five years to include the development of parks and land acquisition for both public open space and for environmental protection.

A select committee of the Legislature will be asked to consider proposals with regard to public safety and convenience in relation to motorized snow vehicles and all-terrain vehicles.

Experiments will be undertaken to test promising new systems and equipment in the field of urban transit, in the anticipation that Ontario may achieve technological leadership which can become the basis for new types of industries.

The government will be proceeding with proposals to develop the lignite deposits at Onakawana in northeastern Ontario, which are capable of supporting a 1,000-megawatt power plant to help meet Ontario's continuing need for increased power. Such a development would create a much-needed focus of industry and employment and provide a stimulus for the whole James Bay area. Further exploration and testing will be carried out as a joint undertaking by the new Minister of Natural Resources, the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, and a Canadian-owned corporation.

It is the intention of my government to extend its programme of annual achievement awards which has existed for some years in the field of sport. The expanded programme will cover other areas of citizen endeavour and recognize the contribution of the individual to our society.

In the field of the rats, such awards will be coupled with scholarships to permit further studies and to encourage further achievement in this important area of our daily lives.

The government believes greater recognition must be given to the fact that many of our cultural organizations are resources to be enjoyed by the whole province, and means will be provided to make them more accessible to people throughout Ontario. To facilitate these and other programmes, the

various forms of provincial government support to individuals and cultural organizations will be reviewed and integrated.

My government proposes to establish a community programmes division within the Department of Correctional Services. This year, regional detention centres are to be completed at Ottawa and Niagara, construction will begin at London, and new centres in the Toronto and Hamilton areas are being planned.

Group homes for juveniles will be established in a number of communities in the coming year, sponsored by community-based organizations, in keeping with the policy of my government to increase its involvement in support of community programmes.

New clinical facilities are being provided to expand on the present treatment programmes for prisoners with drug abuse and other problems. These new facilities will ensure that treatment in a modern clinical setting is available to all such offenders.

My government will continue the mineral exploration assistance programme initiated last year as a means of encouraging mining exploration in northern Ontario.

The government's resources transportation programme in the north of our province will include the construction of major roads in a northwesterly direction from Pickle Crow and Red Lake.

The board of directors of the Ontario Development Corporation and the Northern Ontario Development Corporation will be enlarged and their membership further diversified.

New policies concerning investments and loans, giving preference to Canadian-owned enterprises, will be introduced, and loans under the venture capital fund for businesses employing new technologies and for assistance in the growth of smaller enterprises will be broadened.

My government is aware of the current changes in world trading patterns and their possible effect on Ontario. Particular attention will be given to the changes affecting our exports to Great Britain, the European Common Market and to the United States.

To facilitate the gathering and dissemination of information for our business community, additional trade offices will be opened in new locations, as warranted by our export interests, including the establishment of an office in Washington, D.C.

It is my government's intention to expand its activities in the fields of industrial research and development, metric conversion and international standards and specifications, and to take all effective and practical steps to decrease Ontario's reliance on imported technology.

The Legislature will be asked to consider further amendments to the Ontario Paperback and Periodical Distributors Act, designed to encourage the distribution and sale of our own national or provincial publications.

The government will have ready its proposals for a system of off-track betting facilities to be administered by a provincial government board with representatives from various areas of the racing industry, as soon as the Criminal Code of Canada is amended to permit this. The government's belief is that this province, and any other province that desires to do so, should be given the exclusive jurisdiction, by federal enactment, to control and administer this activity.

My government believes, as do the people of Ontario, that our political system has been well served by municipal representatives, many of whom have accepted public office and responsibility at some personal sacrifice. A few of these elected officials from time to time have found themselves, inadvertently or otherwise, in a conflict-of-interest position between their public responsibilities and their private interests. Due to the wide area of public concern in this matter, studies have been circulated to a number of municipalities and organizations, seeking their reactions. These are presently under consideration and it is my government's intention to introduce legislation during the current session to clarify any ambiguities that presently exist.

The programmes outlined on this occasion have been the object of intensive scrutiny and thought on the part of the government, as being in the best interests of the people of Ontario. We look forward with confidence to a fresh and revitalized approach to many complex problems of our society, and to the purposeful deliberations of the hon. members of this House.

May Divine Providence guide you in this task.

Glod bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I shall now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

CONDOMINIUM ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Condominium Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, just before the motion for adjournment is put, I would like to ask the Premier if he intends to continue with the debate on the reply immediately we undertake it on Thursday? In other words, what other orders of business might we expect?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate the reply from the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) probably on Friday —I thought we might have an opportunity to discuss this tomorrow—rather, on Monday of next week. The mover and seconder would speak Thursday; Friday would be devoted to the setting up of certain committees, and the Leader of the Opposition would have his opportunity to make his contribution starting on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:38 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

(117 members)

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Allan Edward Reuter Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC

Member		Party Constituency	Post Office Address
Allan, James N.	PC	Haldimand-Norfolk	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Apps, Hon. C. J. S.	PC	Kingston and the Islands	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Auld, Hon. James A. C.	PC	Leeds	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bales, Hon. Dalton A.	PC	York Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Beckett, R. B.	PC	Brantford	12 Inwood Dr., Brantford
Belanger, J. Albert	PC	Prescott and Russell	Sarsfield
Bennett, Claude	PC	Ottawa South	35 Avenue Rd., Ottawa
Bernier, Hon. Leo	PC	Kenora	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Birch, Mrs. Margaret	PC	Scarborough East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bounsall, E. J.	NDP	Windsor West	2121 Riverside Dr. W., Windsor
Braithwaite, Leonard A.	L	Etobicoke	50 Pettit Dr., Weston
Breithaupt, James R.	L	Kitchener	90 Church St., Kitchener
Brunelle, Hon. Rene	PC	Cochrane North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Bullbrook, James E.	L	Sarnia	881 Tuder Close, Sarnia
Burr, Fred A.	NDP	Sandwich-Riverside	4005 Howard Ave., Windsor 22
Carruthers, Alex	PC	Durham	RR # 1, Campbellcroft
Carton, Hon. Gordon R.	PC	Armourdale	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Cassidy, Michael	NDP	Ottawa Centre	160 Waverley St., Ottawa
Clement, John T.	PC	Niagara Falls	3397 St. Mark St., Niagara Falls
Davis, Hon. William G.	PC	Peel North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Davison, Norm	NDP	Hamilton Centre	122 Sandford Ave. S., Hamilton
Deacon, Donald M.	L	York Centre	Glenburn Farms, Unionville
Deans, Ian	NDP	Wentworth	38 Beaconsfield Dr., Hamilton
Downer, Rev. A. W.	PC	Dufferin-Simcoe	263 Beech St., Collingwood
Drea, Frank	PC	Scarborough Centre	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Dukszta, Dr. Jan	NDP	Parkdale	40 Park Rd., Apt. 702, Toronto 5
Dymond, Dr. Matthew B.	PC	Ontario	280 Cochrane St., Port Perry
Eaton, Robert G.	PC	Middlesex South	RR #2, Dorchester
Edighoffer, Hugh	L	Perth	147 Nelson St. Mitchell
Evans, D. Arthur	PC	Simcoe Centre	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ewen, Donald Wm.	PC	Wentworth North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Ferrier, Rev. William	NDP	Cochrane South	292 Cedar St. N., Timmins
Foulds, James F.	NDP	Port Arthur	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Gaunt, Murray	L	Huron-Bruce	170 Diagonal Rd., Wingham
Germa, Melville C.	NDP	Sudbury	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Gilbertson, Bernt	PC	Algoma	RR #1, Richards Landing
Gisborn, Reg.	NDP	Hamilton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Givens, Philip G.	L	York-Forest Hill	76 Caribou Rd., Toronto
Good, Edward R.	L	Waterloo North	Box 116, Main Parliament Bldg., Toronto
Grossman, Hon. Allan	PC	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Guindon, Hon. Fern	PC	Stormont	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

Member		Party Constituency	Post Office Address
Haggerty, Ray	L	Welland South	RR #1, Sherkston
Hamilton, Maurice	PC	Renfrew North	RR #5, Pembroke
Handleman, Sidney B.	PC	Carleton	81 Grandview Rd., Ottawa K2H 8B7
Havrot, Edward M.	PC	Timiskaming	148 Tower St., Kirkland Lake
Henderson, Lorne C.	PC	Lambton	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Hodgson, R. Glen	PC	Victoria-Haliburton	Box 240, Haliburton
Hodgson, William	PC	York North	RR #1, Kettleby
Irvine, Donald R.	PC	Grenville-Dundas	River Rd. W., Box 135, Prescott
Jessiman, James H.	PC	Fort William	Vickers Heights, PO, Thunder Bay "F"
Johnston, Robert M.	PC	St. Catharines	10 Canal St., St. Catharines
Kennedy, R. Douglas	PC	Peel South	120 Harborn Rd., Mississauga
Kerr, Hon. George A.	PC	Halton West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lane, John	PC	Algoma-Manitoulin	Box 214, Gore Bay
Laughren, Floyd	NDP	Nickel Belt	RR #1, Copper Cliff
Lawlor, Patrick D.	NDP	Lakeshore	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lawrence, Hon. Allan F.	PC	St. George	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lawrence, Hon. A. Bert R.	PC	Carleton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Leluk, Nicholas G.	PC	Humber	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Lewis, Stephen	NDP	Scarborough West	19 Parkcrest Dr., Scarborough
MacBeth, John P.	PC	York West	9 Palace Arch Dr., Islington
MacDonald, Donald C.	NDP	York South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
MacNaughton, Hon. Charles	PC	Huron	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Maeck, Lorne	PC	Parry Sound	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Martel, Elie W.	NDP	Sudbury East	46 Ferguson Ave., Capreol
McIlveen, Charles E.	PC	Oshawa	100 Alexandra St., Oshawa
McKeough, Hon. W. Darcy	PC	Chatham-Kent	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
McNeil, Ronald K.	PC	Elgin	RR #2, Springfield
McNie, Jack	PC	Hamilton West	Box 250, Hamilton
Meen, Arthur K.	PC	York East	95 Lord Seaton Rd., Willowdale
Miller, Frank S.	PC	Muskoka	RR #1, Bracebridge
Morningstar, Ellis P.	PC	Welland	97 Albert St., Welland
Morrow, Donald H.	PC	Ottawa West	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Newman, Bernard	L	Windsor-Walkerville	1290 Ypres Blvd., Windsor
Newman, William	PC	Ontario South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Nixon, George	PC	Dovercourt	315 Salem Ave., Toronto 4
Nixon, Robert F.	L	Brant	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Nutall, W. J.	PC	Frontenac-Addington	797 Princess Anne Bldg., Suite 206, Kingston
Parrott, Dr. Harry C.	PC	Oxford	22 Wellington St. N., Woodstock
Paterson, Donald A.	L	Essex South	1 Talbot West, Leamington
Potter, Hon. Richard T.	PC	Quinte	Box 42, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reid, T. Patrick	L	Rainy River	Box 187, Fort Frances
Reilly, Leonard M.	PC	Eglinton	639 Yonge St., Toronto 5
Renwick, James A.	NDP	Riverdale	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Reuter, Hon. Allan E.	PC	Waterloo South	45 Main St., Galt
Rhodes, John R.	PC	Sault Ste. Marie	60 Hussey St., Sault Ste. Marie
Rollins, Clarke T.	PC	Hastings	RR #1, Bancroft
Root, John	PC	Wellington-Dufferin	RR #1, Orton
Rowe, Russell D.	PC	Northumberland	546 Lakeshore Rd., Cobourg
Roy, Albert J.	L	Ottawa East	255 Montreal Rd., Vanier
Ruston, Richard F.	L	Essex-Kent	Box 4, South Woodslee

Member	Party	Constituency	Post Office Address
Sargent, Edward	L	Grey-Bruce	Green Gables, Owen Sound
Scrivener, Mrs. Margaret	PC	St. David	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Shulman, Dr. Morton	NDP	High Park	378 Roncesvalles Ave., Toronto 3
Singer, Vernon, M.	L	Downsview	Suite 405, 365 Bay St., Toronto 1
Smith, Gordon E.	PC	Simcoe East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Smith, John R.	PC	Hamilton Mountain	42 Sunninghill Ave., Hamilton
Smith, Richard S.	L	Nipissing	676 McIntyre St. W., North Bay
Snow, Hon. James W.	PC	Halton East	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Spence, John P.	L	Kent	RR #2, Muirkirk
Stewart, Hon. Wm. A.	PC	Middlesex North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Stokes, Jack E.	NDP	Thunder Bay	Box 178, Schreiber
Taylor, James A.	PC	Prince Edward-Lennox	RR #2, Picton (Box 110)
Timbrell, Dennis R.	PC	Don Mills	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Turner, John M.	PC	Peterborough	371 Park St. N., Peterborough
Villeneuve, Osie F.	PC	Glengarry	Box 27, Maxville
Walker, Gordon W.	PC	London North	69 Dundas St., London 12
Wardle, Thomas A.	PC	Beaches-Woodbine	11 Fallingbrook Woods, Scarborough
Welch, Hon. Robert	PC	Lincoln	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wells, Hon. Thomas L.	PC	Scarborough North	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
White, Hon. John	PC	London South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Winkler, Hon. Eric A.	PC	Grey South	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Wiseman, Douglas J.	PC	Lanark	40 Gore St., Perth
Worton, Harry	L	Wellington South	15 Queen St., Guelph
Yakabuski, Paul J.	PC	Renfrew South	PO Box 219, Barry's Bay
Yaremko, Hon. John	PC	Bellwoods	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto
Young, Fred	NDP	Yorkview	Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon. William G. Davis, Q.C.	*Premier and President of the Council*
Hon. Allan F. Lawrence, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary for Justice*
Hon. W. Darcy McKeough	*Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics, Minister of Municipal Affairs*
Hon. Robert Welch, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary for Social Development*
Hon. A. Bert R. Lawrence, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary for Resources Development*
Hon. John Yaremko, Q.C.	*Provincial Secretary and Minister of Citizenship*
Hon. Allan Grossman	*Minister of Revenue*
Hon. William A. Stewart	*Minister of Agriculture and Food*
Hon. Charles MacNaughton	*Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet*
Hon. James A. C. Auld	*Minister of the Environment*
Hon. Rene Brunelle	*Minister of Social and Family Services*
Hon. Dalton A. Bales, Q.C.	*Minister of Justice and Attorney General*
Hon. Thomas L. Wells	*Minister of Education*
Hon. Fern Guindon	*Minister of Labour*
Hon. John White	*Minister of Trade and Development, and of Tourism and Information*
Hon. George A. Kerr, Q.C.	*Minister of Colleges and Universities*
Hon. C. J. S. Apps	*Minister of Correctional Services*
Hon. Gordon Carton, Q.C.	*Minister of Transportation and Communications*
Hon. Leo Bernier	*Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and of Lands and Forests*
Hon. Eric Winkler	*Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs*
Hon. James W. Snow	*Minister of Public Works*
Hon. Richard T. Potter, M.D.	*Minister of Health*

CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 29, 1972

Speech from the Throne, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 3
Condominium Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 8
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Davis, agreed to 8
Appendix: Alphabetical list of the members of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario 9

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 2

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased today to have with us, in the west gallery students from the Canadian Martyrs' Separate School and from the Burlington Central High School.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement concerning a decision taken today to designate additional areas of the Province of Ontario as areas coming within the provisions of the Pits and Quarries Control Act and its regulations.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the government has indicated that it was its intention to apply the provisions of this bill and its regulations as broadly as possible throughout the provinces as circumstances warranted and the capacity of the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs permitted. Until today, 42 townships in southern Ontario were designated as areas of application of this Act. I am happy to announce today that the government has designated 18 additional townships, bringing to 60 the number of townships coming within the provisions of this Act.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Let's get the townships first!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: These townships are Brock, East Whitby, Gloucester, Lobo, London, Markham, Nepean, Osgoode, Pickering, Reach, Toronto, Toronto Gore, Vaughan, Westminster, West Nissouri, Whitby, Whitchurch and Hallowell.

All companies engaged in the extraction of sand and gravel in these townships will now apply for licences to continue their operations and file with the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs rehabilitation site plans in accordance with the terms and the conditions of the Pits and Quarries Control Act.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that one of the townships designated today, Hallowell township, includes an area known as the Sandbanks Provincial Park. As you know, the government has viewed with concern the possible destruction of sand dunes adjacent to this park. It is the government's intention that these dunes shall be protected as a natural resource for the use and the benefit of all the citizens in this province.

For some months now, the government has been engaged in discussions concerning the relocation of certain pit operations in this area. These discussions have now reached a point where in-depth geological analyses are required. I have therefore appointed Dr. Walter M. Tovell, associate director of the Royal Ontario Museum, as an adviser to my department to conduct these studies. Dr. Tovell will also work closely with officials of the Lake Ontario Cement Company in the determination of an alternate site for the company's operations.

Dr. Tovell brings to this undertaking a wealth of geological experience. He is a former president of the Toronto Field Naturalists, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists and chairman of the Canadian Audubon Society. In addition, Dr. Tovell is currently a member of the Metropolitan Toronto and Regional Conservation Authority, a member of the Conservation Council of Ontario, an associate of the Institute of Environmental Studies, Great Lakes section, and a leading authority—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): I certainly hope he rescues the government from that pitfall.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Very nice.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —on the origin of the Great Lakes and their effect on the environment. Mr. Speaker, he will begin his work immediately.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Is he the fellow who is going to decide where we are going to put Toronto's garbage?

Mr. Lewis: He will finish it just as the last dune recedes.

Mr. Renwick: They should never have granted it in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: Order

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I would just like very briefly to introduce to the members of the House the new Sergeant-at-Arms, Major G. R. Soame. Mr. Soame was born and educated in England. He emigrated to our neighbours to the south, came to Canada, and in 1942 joined the Canadian Army. He served in active service from 1942 to 1946, has been a continuing member of the militia, has served as director of the photographic arts department at Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, has been awarded a number of citations for his service in the military, and is a gentleman who brings a great deal of dignity and, I gather, some enthusiasm to his task.

Mr. Speaker, I would welcome him here in his new responsibilities, assure him that I am sure he will enjoy it, and of course I am very satisfied that he will never be called upon to discharge that part of his responsibilities that perhaps are his prerogative, which I haven't seen exercised here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Has he a sharp sword?

Mr. Sargent: Take away his sword!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Maybe he will test it this afternoon.

An hon. member: Eddie will test him!

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Watch your language.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the members, I do welcome Major G. R. Soame as our new Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement really, just an observation. I have asked that all the hon. members and in particular the leaders of the two opposition parties receive the latest updating as to the present placement of government branches, agencies, within the new department—and if they haven't received them they will today or tomorrow—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is for this week? All of this week?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —so that they will be able to more properly ask the appropriate minister.

Mr. Lewis: Like sending a copy to your minister.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Changing names this week again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that we will perhaps go through two or three days of adjustment as to the appropriate minister to ask, but I have given instructions that all of this material will be made available to help expedite the question period.

Mr. Bullbrook: The sign painter is making more money than the Premier's cabinet ministers.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, do you think we should be paid more?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before you call questions. I would point out, sir, that yesterday during the reading of His Honour's speech the custom was not followed whereby the leaders of the opposition parties were sent copies of the speech by the government. This I regret. They were available, I suppose, from the press gallery. Certainly I am glad to see that the Clerk of the House was provided with a copy. And even the chap who was doing the filming up behind the government benches.

Mr. Speaker, I would just express my regrets that this customary courtesy was not extended. It would have been of considerable assistance if it had.

The second matter, sir, on a point of order, is that I would like to ask for your opinion. We were informed by the Premier, at least through the press some days ago, that his parliamentary secretaries would, as part of their responsibility, answer questions in the House. I ask for your direction, sir, as to whether under our rules these estimable gentlemen who are not part of the ministry would, in fact, be able to answer the questions.

Second, it has been the custom—at least under your predecessor's jurisdiction—that questions asked on policy matters were frequently ruled out of order. And since some of the senior members of the cabinet deal only with policy matters, would they then be completely exempt from questions?

Mr. Bullbrook: How would he know? If the government doesn't know, how would he know?

Mr. Speaker: I might respond to the point raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Under our standing orders, of course, the oral question period is provided for the benefit of the members to direct questions to the ministry. I find no provision whatsoever in our present standing orders to direct questions to the ministry. I find no provision whatsoever in our present standing orders to direct questions to any parliamentary assistants and therefore it would be out of order under our standing rules of procedure.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Then on matters of policy you will permit questions to be directed to the so-called policy ministers under those circumstances?

Mr. Speaker: To deal with the second part of the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition—no.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): No?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are you saying that questions cannot be directed to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch)?

Mr. Speaker: If the questions are directed to that particular member as the minister of one of the new ministries, the questions would be in order.

Mr. Singer: He is not a minister, he is a secretary.

Mr. Speaker: If they are questions of policy then, of course, the respective ministers would probably not answer the questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, now, that is a different thing.

Speaking to the point of order if I might, Mr. Speaker, that is a different answer, I say most respectfully, than the first answer you gave to us. Surely we are entitled to ask the appropriate minister a question of policy?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development and Minister of Tourism and Information): The campaign has started.

Mr. Bullbrook. If he does not want to respond that is his prerogative.

Hon. Mr. White: He is off and running.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, another matter just before—

Mr. Bullbrook: I knew it would come from that minister first. I knew it would.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another matter, just before you begin the question period, sir—at least the timing of it. I asked the Premier yesterday about his intention in the ordering of the business. And I ask you if you would assist me in interpreting this answer:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would anticipate the reply from the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party probably on Friday rather than on Monday of next week. The mover and seconder would speak Thursday. Friday would be devoted to certain setting up of committees, and the Leader of the Opposition would have his opportunity to make his contribution starting Monday.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is perfectly clear.

Mr. Lewis: Perfectly clear.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member nodded his head in agreement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition fully understood what was said yesterday when I said it will start on Monday. I saw the head go up and down with enthusiasm.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought I did until I read it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I made it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, in what I said yesterday that his contribution—which, I anticipate, will be very helpful, very constructive, laudatory of the Throne Speech—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Always.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as always—would commence Monday afternoon.

Mr. Singer: The Premier's first answer was wrong.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I can hardly wait to hear what I say.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My first answer did say it would start on Monday, even as I read the rather questionable observation made yesterday.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): I look forward with bated breath to Monday.

Mr. Sargent: The Premier is kind of mixed up.

Mr. Davis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the question period begins, I would like to thank the government for

extending the normal courtesies of the Throne Speech in advancing a copy of the Speech from the Throne prior to its being read.

An hon. member: What happened to my copy?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was right here and no copy came.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition has a poor organization.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did another member get it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think they put it on the wrong seat.

Mr. Lewis: I think it is the pages who have entered into a conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs, Mines, Resources and stuff like that, can he tell the House whether under his new regulations the operation of the removal of sand from the Sandbanks will be stopped as of today, until some further arrangement is made with the alternative sources that evidently have been made available—or at least studied by his department?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition's questions, I can say that the previous minister implemented some very intensive studies as to alternative sites. We have run into some problems because of weather conditions and it is impossible to do very intensive probing and sampling and other such examination that would provide an alternative site. But as far as the closing down of the operation at this time is concerned—no, it will not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So the removal of the Sandbanks will continue?

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker; will the announcement of these regulations bringing these various townships under the ambit of the legislation mean that the operations will continue during the period when the townships are applying for licensing and examining the operations that are presently under way?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they will. We hope to have the matter resolved just as soon as weather conditions permit. We are moving ahead just as quickly as we can, I can assure the member.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Precisely what time limits for reporting has the minister given Dr. Tovell?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have not given any time limits. Just as soon as he can reach an agreement between the company and obtain an alternative site.

Mr. Renwick: What about now? Not later in the middle of the month!

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister set out for the Legislature—would he table in the Legislature—the negotiations which have so far taken place and indicate to the Legislature which alternative site is under scrutiny and what the problems are, since much has been rumoured, privately and publicly, as to the proceedings?

Mr. Renwick: And the cost to the people of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could table that information. I will be glad to.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, am I to gather then from the minister's reply that nothing will be closed down, except that investigation is going to go on into the near future with some form of licensing to come about in due course?

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The member gathers correctly.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are moving ahead as quickly as we can, as I pointed out, because of certain weather conditions—

Mr. MacDonald: So are the sand dunes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think the members will all accept that problem—

Mr. Renwick: So is the sand removal company.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The sands are running out.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —it is facing us right now. I can assure the members we are just as anxious to settle the problem as they are, sir.

Mr. Singer: The minister settled nothing today.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Is he now in a position to inform the House of any decision made with the government of Canada with regard to the location of the airport? Can he comment on recent news stories—last week in the Sun and today in the Globe and Mail—indicating quite specifically the level of negotiation and what the final decision is apparently to be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to comment any further on that particular issue at this moment.

INCREASE IN POWER COSTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another question of the Premier: Did the eight per cent increase in the cost of electric power sold by the power commission to the municipalities, announced by the chairman today or yesterday, get cabinet approval? Second, does the Premier agree, on a matter of policy with the chairman of Ontario Hydro, that we can look forward to an increase every year in the costs of energy?

An hon. member: For the next five years!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on the latter part—the question of the rates for hydro. The government was informed; I have a copy of the chairman's remarks here. They are not subject to approval by the cabinet of this province. I can't comment at this moment as to the suggestion made by the chairman of Hydro that there would be a continuing increase in the rate over a period of time. The only observation I would make is that Task Force Hydro has been asked to look into not only the question of the administration of Hydro, but the questions of rates and of energy supply. I would anticipate that report hopefully some time in the latter part of June or the early part of July, which may give us and Hydro some insight into this particular problem.

As I read the text of the remarks of the chairman of Hydro, the interim rate increase as of July 1 will provide X million dollars of additional revenue. It also means the drawdown, I think, on their rate stabilization fund of some $41 million—I think I'm right in this—over that period of time. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I can't comment as to his suggestion as to whether rates will continue to increase over a period of time. I haven't assessed that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: How does the Premier square his answer with the undertaking made by the administration less than a year ago that rate increases would not come forward during 1972 or as long as the economic and employment problems beset the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think this government gave any undertaking that there wouldn't be rate increases in many fields. What we did say was we discouraged rate increases or we were not anxious to have rate increases. We've tried to maintain it as a matter of government policy, but the question of rate increases of Ontario Hydro, of course, is their ultimate determination.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: Mr. Speaker, wouldn't the Premier agree that he is in a position to more than discourage rate increases in Ontario Hydro, and, in fact, stop them?

Mr. Sargent: Who is running the store?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are many things, I guess, where the ultimate authority to do this rests with this Legislature—no question about that!

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): It is a totally owned and controlled corporation!

ROLE OF ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Premier having to do with a policy matter. Would he explain to the House how the Lieutenant Governor's statement yesterday pertaining to the Ontario Municipal Board could be matched with what apparently is government policy, recently made public when the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) sent a communication to the Municipal Board instructing that it be read at the beginning of the Municipal Board hearing pertaining to Metro Centre, indicating publicly further that the government approved of the Metro Centre programme? Surely the Premier would have some difficulty in co-ordinating this kind of an approach that he himself has enunciated, with the statements and emanations from his Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's anything contradictory here at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, it is direct interference!

Hon. Mr. Davis: There have been suggestions made to the Ontario Municipal Board before. On some issues the Ontario Municipal Board seeks a report from the Department of Municipal Affairs on certain matters before it. There's nothing inconsistent or contradictory in this whatsoever. But it does point out one of the reasons for the part of the Throne Speech yesterday suggesting the reassessment of the role and function of the Ontario Municipal Board, the involvement of the executive council of Ontario with respect to appeals, whether the Ontario Municipal Board should be basically an administrative or financial board, and whether it should get into matters of policy. There's nothing contradictory whatsoever in what has happened with relation to that.

Mr. Lewis: How to curtail its powers? That is the primary object of the inquiry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. Maybe there is a need to increase its powers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One supplementary question! Would the Premier agree that there is a substantial difference in asking for the opinion of the experts in the department and receiving a communication from the minister himself which directed that it be read before the hearings began?

Mr. Singer: Sure!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite proper for this government to have made known, and made known publicly, its attitude on broad matters of policy—we're criticized from time to time. As a matter of policy this government supports the concept of the development of Metro Centre—not in detail; we're not as knowledgeable in some aspects of the details, and obviously this is one of the functions of the board. But on a matter of basic policy on something as significant for this area and this province as Metro Centre, I think it would be an abdication of responsibility if we didn't indicate some—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is interference with an independent board.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not interference with an independent board whatsoever. That is completely and utterly nonsensical.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: In keeping with the approach that the Premier has just indicated, would the government then consider sending an appropriate message to Hydro saying that it is our policy not to increase rates and inflate the economy?

Mr. Breithaupt: Oh, we can't have that. That is interference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is quite possible for us to send some sort of communique, and I've pointed out—

Mr. MacDonald: Why don't they, in keeping with the minister's statement last year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I suggest is that certainly we would look forward to the Task Force Hydro report. I think it's quite obvious that Hydro actually were anticipating a rate increase as of January 1, 1972, and this Legislation does have the capacity—there is no doubt about that. No one's going to debate that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question—

Mr. MacDonald: It is the inconsistency of—

Mr. Bullbrook: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As a lawyer, doesn't the Premier see the obvious inconsistency in his minister eventually sitting as the court of last resort on an appeal from the Ontario Municipal Board, after he's given direction to that court in the first instance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing inconsistent whatsoever. We're talking about matters of broad policy, which, as I say, we have been criticized as a government from time to time for not enunciating.

This we have done, and there is nothing inconsistent in this.

If there were to be an appeal from the Ontario Municipal Board's determination of the application for Metro Centre, there is nothing inconsistent or contradictory to that because they will be dealing, I would assume, with certain matters that are not referred to in any communication to the board —the question of the visual access to the lake and so on.

Mr. Lewis: The chairman of the board is not happy with Mr. McKeough!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the Premier then mean that whatever the minister has said is an absolute direction to the board? And if the matter follows so logically in broad matters of principle, why did the Premier, or his assistant, the hon. member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton), not send a similar communication in this broad matter of principle relating

to the continuation or non-continuation of Spadina, because the member for Huron is the man who signed the contract saying it must be done?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the member for Downsview is going to wish to debate the matter of Spadina ad nauseam here in this House, which is fine.

Mr. Singer: Oh no. No, the Premier will be nauseated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just wish he would consult with his leader as to what the position of that party is with respect to Spadina, because I can never quite understand exactly what it is.

Mr. Singer: That is a good answer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Par for the course.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, certainly it is par for the course—

Mr. Singer: How about answering the question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I think we are entitled to know whose policy it is—the member for Downsview's, or his leader's—as it relates to Spadina?

Mr. Bullbrook: How about answering the question?

Mr. Singer: How about answering the question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it. There is nothing contradictory, there is nothing improper, about indicating a general area of policy to the Municipal Board. There is nothing in the letter that says to the chairman of the board, "You will decide it in such and such a fashion"; but it does put on record that the government, as a matter of policy, accepts the broad principles of the development of Metro Centre. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, what then is the point of the OMB hearing? The government has already decided.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

MEDICARE COVERAGE OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a final question of the Premier, as far as I am concerned: Is it still the policy of the government to implement the extension of Medicare to cover nursing homes and that sort of service by April 1?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this will be dealt with by the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter). It will be stated to the House very, very shortly.

Mr. Cassidy: That is not a very clear answer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe I could pursue this matter slightly further in a different direction and put a question to the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

When the policy as announced in the Throne Speech becomes law, will it cover all of the chronic care cases presently housed in nursing homes and homes for the aged?

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Mr. Speaker, as already indicated in the response of the Premier, this will be covered in the statement of the Minister of Health.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let us hear from the parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Singer: That's not the Minister of Health.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Good try, Stephen!

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A supplementary of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. Has the minister, or his department officials, been in contact with the Ontario Medical Association in regard to their apparent responsibility in determining the eligibility of these persons in these particular homes?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat again that this is the type of question that should be directed to the Minister of Health. The Premier has already indicated this will be covered in the statement; ask the Minister of Health.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: It will take us a while to figure it out.

MINISTERIAL DUTIES

Mr. Lewis: Well, maybe I should ask another question then—not so much of the Min-

ister of Social Development, because he probably feels unduly harassed in the short question period today, but let me direct it to the Provincial Secretary for Justice. What does he do?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And I am here one day a month to collect my cheque.

Mr. Lewis: Does the provincial secretary find it an exhausting activity?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Not as exhausting as it used to be, no.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, in a recent speech the Provincial Secretary for Justice described himself, if I recall, as a "linkage with the people." Can he give us some definition as to the nature of his linkage?

An hon. member: A weak link?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I should say that it was a missing link.

Mr. Lewis: How long has it been missing?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I just wanted to contrast my posiiton, as an elected member, with that of some others which I have known who have been described as the missing linkage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The member has certainly polished his repartee, with all his time to think.

An hon. member: He has an assistant there.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he has got an assistant, right. He will perform with greater and greater flair as the session goes on.

May I ask the provincial Treasurer, and his various other titular appendages, what—

Interjections by hon. members.

TAX CREDIT FOR MACHINERY

Mr. Lewis: I thought that description was pretty definitive on my part in terms of describing the Treasurer's work!

Can I ask the minister whether he intends to continue in the year 1972-1973 his $125 million tax credit for the purchase of machinery and equipment in the corporate sector in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The legislation expires as of March 31, 1973. Any plans to change that legislation would be brought forward, presumably, at the time of the budget.

Mr. Sargent: In his attempt to cover it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the Treasurer implying there is a possibility of changing that programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not want to imply one way or the other, but the answer is no.

Mr. Breithaupt: You can see that he thinks, too.

Mr. Singer: That is why he needs two parliamentary assistants.

Mr. Cassidy: They should give us the staff to do it.

Mr. Lewis: Since the Treasurer is persisting with the programme, could he inform the House, now that virtually a year has elapsed, how many new jobs were created in the Province of Ontario by the $125 million rebate in the last year?

Mr. Renwick: And how many in the United States?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would hesitate just to roll out a precise figure.

Mr. Sargent: Why not say five per cent?

Mr. Deans: The minister could use his hands and feet.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I could, of course, point out that there are something like over 100,000 more people working in Ontario today than there were a year ago.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would like to point out—

An hon. member: Nothing wrong with that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that the proportion—

An hon. member: That disappoints hon. members opposite!

An. hon. member: The labour force has been extended.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The proportion of the unemployed in our work force—the percentage—is less than it was a year ago.

I would like to think that our monetary and fiscal policy is responsible for that very happy turn of events in the last 12 months. On the other hand, I have to think really that more of it was related to the events of October 21 last, when the NDP was laid out.

Mr. Bullbrook: His repartee hasn't improved much.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, if you will permit me to pursue it.

Mr. Singer: Did the Treasurer have his team write some jokes for him?

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps he can evoke yet further thunderous applause in his subsequent reply.

By way of further supplementary, does the minister not have, with a year of the programme, any statistics, any measure, any documentation to provide to the House about the number of jobs created in Ontario through the programme that he described as the single most important boost to the economy?

Mr. Stokes: That is specific progress.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. The answer is no, because we said a year ago that it would be impossible to measure in terms of jobs; it is just not possible.

I can say this—

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer said he would have figures for the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can say this to the members, that the Department of Revenue in the course of its ongoing work is undertaking certain sampling techniques to see what investment there has been and will be in capital investment in the province.

I can also say that there are a number of requests to have the programme continued beyond March 31, 1973. The gear-up time, I think it would be fair to say was somewhat longer in many instances than we thought it would have been.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one final supplementary? Could it be that the request to extend the programme beyond March 31, 1973, is because of how much it has added to corporate profits and not provided a single job—

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: —which is, of course, what they discovered in the United States on the same programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That of course, is great socialist claptrap.

Mr. MacDonald: It isn't.

Hon. Mr. McKeough. If the member would examine corporate profits, he will find that they have declined in the last couple of years.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And we are looking for them to go back up because we believe in profit. You don't; we do.

An hon. member: That's precisely what Nixon said in the US.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Let's get some information on which we can discuss this.

An hon. member: State the facts.

TRANSPORTATION POLICY FOR METRO

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the new Minister of Transport and Communications, again relating to matters earlier in the question period: When exactly will the date be for the initiation of GO Transit through northwestern Metropolitan Toronto, as promised during the course of events last fall; and what use has it been decided to make of the rapid transit line?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, there is an ongoing study with respect to this—

Mr. MacDonald: The ongoing study is going on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I may say that during the course of the events in October I weathered a greal deal of discussion on this particular topic, living in the riding perhaps closest to this particular area. In any event there is a joint technical transportation committee that has been meeting continuously.

We were to have had a report last Friday with the Metro chairman and the chairman of the TTC. Unfortunately that had to be postponed until March 10. There are cer-

tain other aspects in connection with this matter and by April 30 we will have certain reports in connection with the part of that ditch from Lawrence down to Eglinton. We will have reports on the—

Mr. Lewis: That's a nice choice of phrase, "that ditch." Felicitous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —on the traffic and proposals for that area.

I think Mr. Speaker, to sum it all up, the present Minister of Transportation and Communications is very interested in this particular matter.

Mr. Lewis: Oh I see!

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, would the minister say whether it was as a result of the ongoing study that the government decided to oppose the Local Initiatives Programme to provide a three-month trial service from Barrie by cutting off all GO Transit buses? Was that a result of that study?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the member could enlarge on that. I am sorry, I—

Mr. MacDonald: That's not a supplementary question.

Mr. Deacon: The government of Ontario indicated to the government in Ottawa that if the government in Ottawa approved the three-month trial service for GO Transit from Barrie proposed by John Medcof, they would pull off the GO Transit buses and put those people who are operating the GO Transit buses out of work.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, that is not a related question, but I don't mind answering it.

I would say in answer to that, that if the government in Ottawa has money to provide I would hope it would provide it to this government of Ontario in order that we may experiment on this.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there can be no supplementary on a question which was not a proper supplementary in the first place. The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Supplementary: The minister mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that a study is going forward of the GO Transit line that was mentioned in the original question. Does that study include the possibility of GO Transit from Union Station to Woodbridge as well as Union Station to Malton and westward?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not certain, Mr. Speaker, I will check into it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the minister made reference to this so-called group of the three wise men—the chairman of Metro, Mr. Campbell; the chairman of the TTC, Mr. Day; and it used to be the member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton). Is he still one of the three wise men or has the minister replaced him?

Hon. Mr. Carton: He has been replaced by an equally wise man.

Mr. MacDonald: What is his name?

Mr. Lewis: They dipped into the ranks of the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Just two, very brief, Mr. Speaker.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL EMPLOYMENT LOANS PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: A question of the provincial treasurer. I would imagine, about the special development loan programme, federal and provincial. I gather that the funds ran out rather in advance of all the applications being received. Would the provincial government consider expanding the available loan capital, if not the forgivable features, for the purpose of facilitating all the additional projects and work?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): As a supplementary question, Mr Speaker: In the specific example of the city of Windsor, is there absolutely no possibility therefore of the province providing, if not the forgivable loan portion the low-interest loan part of their 10 projects since the city felt, perhaps erroneously, that a letter from the director of municipal subsidies acknowledging their

programme on December 8 was tantamount to acceptance of that programme, with the result that the city didn't hasten to provide the data on the individual forms—

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Question!

Mr. Bounsall: Therefore the forms were received after the moneys had been granted. In this specific instance where that confusion arose, is there no possibility that the province could not provide at least the low-cost loan portions to that city?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker, this is a federal programme with some features which frankly we found were not desirable. The programme was announced, as we all know, unilaterally by the federal government on October 14, without consultation either with the provinces or with the municipalities. Aside from that, we undertook to assist them in the administration of it, and the applications were processed through here on a first-come, first-served basis. Unfortunately, I think something like 20 municipalities came in before the deadline we had established, and when the federal government established a later deadline, the money simply was not available.

I don't think the Management Board of Cabinet or I as Treasurer can particularly suggest that it is appropriate for us to put money into what is essentially a federal programme. My predecessor, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, wrote Mr. Marchand. We have been in touch with Mr. Turner and told him about this problem and suggested that perhaps an additional $10 million should be made available by the federal government; but they have said "no."

I might say that two or three days before they said no to that request, they added $50 million to the Local Initiatives Programme—$50 million cash, not loans. I find some great inconsistency about that, and I imagine the good people of Windsor would too.

Mr. Bounsall: As a further supplementary, was it the province's idea or the federal government's idea that it be on a first-come, first-served basis in terms of approval; and if it was the province's idea, was that a fair way of deciding on the merits of these loans?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, had we been consulted in the first place. We might have suggested some form of allocation. We didn't know of any better way to do it. There were some, I think, reasonable limits; no one was going to apply for the whole $26 million. Basically, that was governed by the amount of work which could be done between now and May 31, which was the key date.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville had a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, I was going to ask the minister if he considered accepting all of the application forms from the municipalities within the given deadline and then allocating the funds on a per capita basis rather than on a first-come, first-served basis?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, because the purpose of the programme was to get people to work and not wait until January 31 to divvy it up. Some of the money was being spent as early as December, as I understand it, which was all to the good.

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister know so much about federal programmes and so little about provincial programmes?

Interjections by hon. members.

SCARBOROUGH HOSPITAL SITUATION

Mr. Lewis: May I, Mr. Speaker, address my last question to the Minister of Health, very briefly.

What is his position on the present controversy in Scarborough about expanding Scarborough Centenary Hospital versus the building of the entirely new complex that Grace Hospital wishes?

Mr. Singer: That is a matter of policy for the other fellow.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the hon. member finally knows where to go for the answers.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member asked me what I did. What does he do?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am inclined to agree and I will take the advice to heart. Why doesn't the minister go back to his office and make a few calls?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Minister of Health had enough trouble getting in there.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member is not just kidding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: Will the minister have as much trouble getting out?

Mr. Stokes: Confession is good for the soul.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, Metropolitan Toronto Hospital Planning Council is presently reviewing the situation—

Mr. MacDonald: An ongoing study.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh no, it is finished; the study is finished. We have more studies than you can shake a stick at.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is right. Some are ongoing and some are stopped.

Hon. Mr. Potter: This is a good one.

Mr. MacDonald: I like the distinction.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And then at the same time members probably read in yesterday's Star or today's Star—I didn't think I would get it that fast; it is today's Star—that the special role study has been done of the teaching hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto. This report now is being submitted to the senior co-ordinating committee and I am waiting its report. I only got the report myself this morning, and I have not had an opportunity to study it. But I think the members will appreciate that we must correlate these two—

Mr. Renwick: Better study the report; it is an ongoing study.

Mr. Potter: Does the member want to answer this?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister's best response was the first sentence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Better keep on; he will get it somehow.

Mr. Lewis: What is the minister trying to say?

Hon. Mr. Potter: What I am trying to say, if they will listen for a minute, is that we now have completed the studies of the needs of hospital beds in the Metropolitan Toronto area, and included in this are the needs for teaching purposes—and there have been recommendations from both of these committees which we must now—

Mr. Singer: Study!

Hon. Mr. Potter: No! I fooled the member! We look at these.

Mr. MacDonald: Reconcile.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And one of the recommendations, of course, as far as Scarborough is concerned, is that the additional beds be added to Scarborough Centenary. The other recommendation by some groups—

Mr. Singer: Is that they shouldn't be.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —was that Grace Hospital locate there.

Mr. Lewis: I think that is what I asked you about.

Hon. Mr. Potter: And now we must—

Mr. Reid: Do another study!

Hon. Mr. Potter: —take into consideration the recommendations of this teaching hospital group to determine whether or not St. Michael's Hospital is going to build in downtown Toronto or in the suburbs where the beds are needed, and it is going to have an effect on the whole thing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Certainly. That clears it all up.

Hon. Mr. Potter: So I hope I will be able to have an answer to this for you within the next week or so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Well by way of a supplementary, doesn't the discussion about building entirely new medical models of the large hospital kind, run counter to the social philosophy of the minister's predecessor, now elevated, and himself, to develop community medical models rather than the traditional kind?

Hon. Mr. Potter: There is no question that we are interested in developing community medical models. And when we are talking about the addition of hospital beds, we have to take into consideration what type of bed we are going to build. When we are talking about extending bed facilities in Scarborough Centenary, for instance, we must determine what types of bed are needed. I don't think for one minute that we are going to continue a programme of building active treatment

beds in areas where we find that beds of a convalescent nature, or beds of a self-care nature are much more efficient. And this is why we have to spend some time in looking into this and decide what we are going to build.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox is next.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests: Does the government intend to acquire the outstanding leasehold interest of the Lake Ontario Cement Company in the Sandbanks area? And if so, when; and if not, why not?

Mr. Breithaupt: Norris wouldn't have asked that!

Mr. Foulds: The member is on the right side of the House.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the proposals that Dr. Tovell will be looking into and when I get his report I will be prepared to make a decision on it, and not until that time.

Mr. Lewis: Is it because he is a member of the Audubon Society that qualifies him to do that?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I am going to address to any one of three, whoever is able to answer me; the hon. member for St. George—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must direct a question to a minister.

Mr. Singer: Well, I do not know which one can answer it because even, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, reading through this document that the Premier sent us yesterday, called Revised Listing of Ministerial Responsibility, it is very hard to ascertain whether questions relating to the administration of justice belong to the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), the hon. member for York Mills (Mr. Bales), or the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko). Well, let's start at the secretary—

Mr. Speaker: Well I say to the hon. member that he must make a choice, and if it is wrong—

CORONER'S COURT REVIEW

Mr. Singer: Perhaps Mr. Speaker will let me ask three if the first one doesn't seem to know. Thank you.

To the hon. member for St. George, the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Could the minister advise us as to whether or not the government is intending to take any action in relation to the compleat report of the Law Reform Commission about the revision of the system of coroner's court, particularly in view of the tragic events that have flowed from the Hayes inquest and from the Murphy inquest?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member struck out on his first time up at bat. That should be asked of the Solicitor General-designate, the hon. member for Bellwoods.

Mr. Bullbrook: It really doesn't do anything!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a new question? I don't see the Solicitor General-designate.

We have no statute that sets out the duties of the Solicitor General-designate. In fact the Solicitor General-designate isn't even in his seat.

Mr. Renwick: It doesn't exist.

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't exist.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask the Premier who he would delegate to answer this question pending the advent of all these three criteria?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to help out the member for Downsview. I know he's anxious. I will answer it for him and say that this matter is under consideration by the government. I expect we will be coming forth with recommendations and perhaps legislation to deal with the matter the member for Downsview has raised.

Mr. Sargent: That is the standard answer.

Mr. MacDonald: We are still running ahead!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South, in keeping with the policy of alternating.

Mr. Lawlor: Which was the right minister to ask?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It was the right question to ask, though I wouldn't try—

TAX REFORM PROGRAMME

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the provincial Treasurer: In view of the announcement of the government proceeding with the tax rebate in preference to residential payments of past years, may I ask the provincial Treasurer why has the sales tax credit been dropped from the so-called tax reform programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think there are two reasons; one monetary. Within certain constraints we proposed to deal with roughly the amount of money which is now available under the existing programme; whether or not we would be prepared to add to it in this year, might be somewhat difficult.

I think the more sound reason—or the other reason—is simply the administrative difficulties of converting the system. I'm not sure that a sales tax credit would be my preference as something to add in future years, as the next preference to add in future years. I think perhaps the field of Medicare premiums might, for example, take priority.

Basically, it's an administrative one. There's an enormous job of education, of publicity, to be done adding these people, in effect, to the tax rolls one step at a time.

Mr. MacDonald: Two brief supplementary questions: In this switch in priorities from sales tax credit to health insurance premium credit, is this not a change from the position taken by the government prior to the election?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I don't think particularly before October 21 we gave any indication, necessarily, of what our preference would be. At the meeting of Ministers of Finance—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Can there be credits for all of those things?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —on November 1 we tabled a document which indicated how both the property tax credit and the sales tax credit would work. We wanted to give a couple of examples—

Mr. MacDonald: Has the change been since then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since then? No; no decision had been made at that point—certainly on the property tax credit but not on the sales tax—

Mr. MacDonald: My final supplementary: Is it correct that the federal government was not willing to include the sales tax credit rebate this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think it would be fair to say that. Certainly after we had tabled that document and the Prime Minister of Canada had indicated their willingness to do their best to do something about it, it is fair to say that they were greatly relieved from the administrative point of view when we said, "Let's just look at the one programme." I don't think they stopped us. No, that would not be a fair answer. Certainly they were relieved when we took it out or made it clear that we didn't want it in.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR SPADINA EXPRESSWAY LANDS

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Has the Premier had an opportunity, since last December when he promised the figure, to tote up the invoices of the Buckminster Fuller report and tell us what it cost? Could he tell us how the ongoing study on that report is coming along, please?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can answer the second part of the question—I don't have the figure as to the first part, I will get it for the hon. member.

What has happened since that time is that the joint technical committee referred to by the Minister of Transportation and Communications has been dealing with the proposed alignment of the rapid-transit portion of what was referred to, prior to that period of time, as the Spadina Expressway.

As I understand it, five alternatives have been suggested. There is to be a determination as to which of the five is to be selected and it will be after that point, I would assume, that Metro would be then considering the development or use of the land that will not be required for the rapid-transit portion.

I will restate my offer to the member for York-Forest Hill again, that, when that time comes this provincial government would be quite prepared to discuss with him either the

conceptual approach that Mr. Buckminster Fuller suggested, or any other approach for the logical utilization of the land that may not be required for the rapid-transit portion of what was the former Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia —supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: No, not supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

INTENDED LAYOFFS BY INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

Have the officials of the minister's department been notified by the International Harvester Co., or has he knowledge otherwise, that they intend to lay off, between April 1 and June 13, 1,800 employees? If so, does he intend to take the usual action of bringing about dialogue to try for reinstatement of the employees, and to bring about an inquiry as to the unstable, irrational functions of that farm implement industry in Hamilton?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, it is always, of course, the purpose of our department to have dialogue with both labour and management in cases such as the one stated by the hon. member.

I have no specific knowledge about this particular case, but I would like, tomorrow perhaps, to give the member more information about this situation. I am not right up-to-date at the present time.

Mr. Gisborn: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Did the minister's department not receive, approximately two weeks ago, correspondence from the Hamilton District Labour Council as per resolutions submitted by the employees of International Harvester in regard to their problem of anticipated lengthy layoffs in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I've been away from my office for a couple of days. I would be glad to look into it tomorrow and report to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

ABSENCE OF JUDGE FROM DUTY.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, in connection with the publication of an item in the London Free Press yesterday saying, "No Official Explanation for Absence of Judge." Could he give some explanation for the absence of Judge G. C. Marshman from his duties in the provincial court at London?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I make no statement on this at the present time, but I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORTS

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. Is it the intention of the minister to introduce legislation implementing the report of the minister's committee on franchise legislation and to implement the report of the select committee on company law relating to credit unions at this session?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, both of these matters are at the moment policy matters and I will make an announcement in due course. I will be dealing with both of them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

SHEAFFER PEN STRIKE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Has the conciliation branch of the minister's department made any progress with respect to bringing together the parties in the Sheaffer Pen strike in Goderich?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I know that they are still working on this matter. They are having discussions at the present time. I understand they are making progress, but that is as much as I can say for today.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: They are meeting currently, are they?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, they are always in touch with it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, a question of you sir, again. I notice that none of the policy ministers today

managed, in fact, to answer any questions which were put.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I thought I gave the member of good answer.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that—apart from the frivolity. The Minister of Public Protection, or whatever the new name is, indicated in reply that that was a policy question. Would it not then be natural in the course of events that the Provincial Secretary for Justice would rise and give the answer to such a matter? I mean, can the Speaker ask that that kind of process take place? No?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that.

In reply to the member's observation, the two matters referred to by the member for Riverdale were specifics and are within the purview of my department. I will deal with them in due course, and part of my presentation to my colleagues will be in the policy field. However, in the meantime they are my responsibility and I will answer.

Mr. Lewis: The minister won't have his portfolio usurped by the member for St. George?

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I might: How do we extricate ourselves from the dilemma in connection with appropriate questions to the Solicitor General-designate? I invite the House leader to help us in this connection. There was one today that was appropriate in the fullness of time to the Solicitor General-designate. What do we do with him now? He is not the Solicitor General.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think I can answer that one too, Mr. Speaker. The Solicitor General-designate will answer. It is maybe unfortunate he was not here, but he will answer those questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has no portfolio responsibility to reply to the questions.

Mr. Sargent: It is incredible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the member for Sarnia and members of the opposition wish to revert and go back to what are the statutory authorities of the ministers of this government, this is fine. This we can do, but we are trying to facilitate matters because the legislation will be before us very shortly.

We thought it would facilitate the questioning in the House if we were to move into those areas where designated responsibilities have been given. We can do it both ways and we are quite prepared to—I have made this very clear to my colleagues—if the opposition wishes.

Mr. Deans: Leave it as it is.

Mr. Lewis: We will do it the government's way. It is more fun.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure it is. Certainly it is more fun. It is more informative and it will work much better in the long run.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It is a heck of a lot easier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All we are trying to do is be helpful during this transition period.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier is not speaking to that point of order. He is not trying to be helpful.

The fact of the matter is that a question was legitimately directed today that was appropriate to the Solicitor General-designate. The policy minister, the Provincial Secretary for Justice, took it upon himself not to answer it. If the government is going to co-operate with us, why didn't he answer it himself today?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: To be perfectly honest, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that the Solicitor General-designate was not in his seat. It is just like the hon. member for Sarnia indicated; some of us are going to find it awkward to be in our seats all of the time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, could there not be an arrangement where, as in Justice, there now are apparently three or four ministers who are sharing the old responsibility, if the question be addressed in its original form to the apparent senior one—if we can work that out—and if it is not his responsibility then it is somebody else's, because the government has distributed all of this responsibility; rather than continue this foolish game of, "No, it is his job; and he is not here; it might be somebody else's." The whole object of the question period is to elicit information, unless the object of the government reorganization is to hide information.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this discussion. If the member for Downsview will read carefully the material that has been provided to his leader—we will get copies for all members on both sides of

the House—I think it will become very evident, as it relates to 95 per cent of the problems, just what minister should be asked.

There may be two or three gray areas for a period of time that need further definition. I am not going to debate this, but I think it is abundantly clear from the material that the member's leader now has.

Mr. Singer: It is not abundantly clear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well it is, Mr. Speaker, it is.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is because the member has not read it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think even the member for Downsview can digest this and find out the appropriate minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The trouble is he can't digest it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We want to tell the members as much as we can.

Mr. Singer: Yes, I noticed that, like Buckminster Fuller's expenses.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I will get that for the member.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it was around $15,000.

Mr. Lewis: That is not bad—$15,000 for Buckminster Fuller?

Mr. Singer: For how many hours?

Mr. Lewis: I will do it for the government for half that.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member is trying to present a report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It would not be half as good.

Mr. Lewis: It would be just as implausible.

Mr. R. D. Rowe (Northumberland): I beg leave to submit the preliminary report of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest that our hearing has engendered, perhaps as chairman of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism I should make a few comments on the committee's preliminary report, which I have the honour to present to the House right on the target date of March 1.

The committee has met continuously since January 11. We have heard presentations from 33 organizations and individuals and, in response to advertisements, received a number of written briefs. Mr. Peter Honey appeared on behalf of Ontario's interdepartmental task force on foreign investment. The Ontario Economic Council made a presentation through its chairman, Dr. James Gillies. The committee also had the benefit of consultation with Senator Maurice Lamontagne, chairman of the Senate special committee on science policy. The committee is most grateful to all those who have contributed to its deliberations.

I would also like to draw the House's attention to the high level of interest and effort that was displayed by all members of the committee. It is I believe to the credit of all members that in the short space of six weeks, the committee was able to achieve a broad consensus. This consensus is reflected in our preliminary report.

I would also like to acknowledge the contribution of our staff. We have been ably served by our counsel, Professor Ivan Feltham of Osgoode Hall Law School; our economic consultant, Professor Stephen Triantis of the University of Toronto; and our research director, Mr. C. K. Marchant—and these three gentlemen are in the Speaker's gallery this afternoon—and also Mr. John Holtby, who is the deputy clerk and was of great service and value to us.

In the short time available to it, the committee has confined itself to a general survey of the current status of opinion and information on economic and cultural nationalism. The committee is not satisfied that the present state of information and analysis is adequate to justify detailed policy recommendation. Accordingly the committee concentrates in its preliminary report on proposals for definitive studies designed to provide a basis for new and specific policies.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to some of the highlights of the preliminary report. The committee recommends that the government increase efforts toward development of an industrial policy for Ontario. Such a policy should focus on the full employment of Canadians and the development of Canadian skills to their full potential. The committee also recommends a systematic programme to gather information necessary to evaluate the performance of both domestically owned and

foreign-owned firms against public-interest criteria.

With respect to economic nationalism, the committee makes the following proposals:

1. A study of capital markets and the availability of capital to finance Canadian enterprises;

2. The committee recommends that government incentives should discriminate in favour of companies with a significant level of Canadian equity participation;

3. The committee recommends that all companies have Canadian representation on their boards of directors;

4. The committee recommends that Ontario set up immediately a register of foreign acquisitions of corporations within its jurisdiction. The committee proposes to study the desirability of having Ontario control foreign acquisitions of firms within its jurisdiction;

5. The committee proposes to study in detail the behaviour, the performance, and the impact of foreign-controlled firms from an Ontario perspective. On the matter of land for recreation, the committee recommends an immediate study of a need for recreational land and its availability to Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the committee's terms of reference also include a review of the current status of opinion and information regarding cultural nationalism. In the short time available to it the committee has not had an opportunity to gather evidence on this subject although some have made representations to the committee.

At this time, the committee makes the following general proposals:

1. That efforts be intensified with a view toward the early development of more and better educational materials for use in Ontario schools and universities;

2. That an examination and airing of the issues relating to university recruitment of foreign nationals would be in the public interest. The committee proposes to carry out this task;

3. The committee proposes a policy-oriented examination of nationalism in relation to the cultural industries.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add the following brief comments on this matter. First of all, I would like to say how pleased I was to be able to have the opportunity to study our provincial responsibilities in the matter of foreign control. Second, although we have some recommendations here, they are recommendations which we feel are in effect proposing that we crawl and that we move rather slowly toward this field of reversing foreign control of enterprises and operations in the province. We will have an opportunity—I hope at an early date—to study very deficient areas of knowledge in this whole matter and propose areas where we can move much more rapidly to regain control over our own destiny.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have just one comment to add to the comments of the two members who have spoken, to say that both my colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) and myself recognize the tentative nature of the report that has been placed before the Legislature. We certainly hope that we will have an opportunity to continue the study and to come to the conclusions that obviously will necessitate some direct government action at some point.

Although during the short period we had at our disposal we did conduct a great deal of investigation and undertake considerably more work than perhaps many of us had expected we would be able to in that period, we do feel that much more has to be done and done as rapidly as possible. We hope the government will see fit to permit the committee to continue to sit during the time the Legislature is in session in order that we can continue with the study and make recommendations prior to the end of this year, if possible.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports of debates and speeches in the amount of 3,000 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province as approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that a select committee of 13 members be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient dispatch a list of members to compose the standing committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed of as follows: Messrs. Henderson, Chairman; Allan, Deans, Gilbertson, Hamilton, Hodgson (Victoria-Halibur-

ton), Leluk, Nuttall, Smith (Nipissing), Smith (Simcoe East), Stokes, Worton and Yakabuski.

Mr. Bullbrook: The hon. member for Lambton gets all the plums.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): What does the hon. member for Sarnia want?

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to: first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: Would the minister explain this magnificent piece of legislation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: To deal with the bill that is before us, Mr. Speaker, the present Act provides for a time limit of five days for the registration of a mortgage or conveyance after execution. This is proving impractical and under this legislation the time limit is set at 30 days.

Mr. Lawlor: The Emancipation from Slavery Act!

CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the Conditional Sales Act provides that a contract must be registered within 10 days of the date of the execution of the contract. Under this bill the time limit has been extended to 30 days.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ECOLOGICAL SANCTUARIES

Mrs. Scrivener moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Establishment of Ecological Sanctuaries in the Province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the establishment in Ontario of areas set apart as sanctuaries for the preservation of plant and wildlife, within which no motor vehicles or motorized snow vehicles may be used for recreation during the winter season.

COMMISSIONER TO INVESTIGATE DECISIONS AND ACTS OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Singer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Appointment of a Commissioner to investigate Administrative Decisions and Acts of Officials of the Government of Ontario and its Agencies and to define the Commissioner's Power and Duties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief explanation. This is, I think, my eighth attempt to try to convince the government that we should have an ombudsman in the Province of Ontario who would protect the citizens of Ontario against what gets to be more and more complex civil servant decisions against which, and in relation to which, the citizen has no ability to contend.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that at this point, now that we have a Provincial Secretary for Justice, who has a lot of time to think, that he could perhaps give some serious thought to this important proposal and perhaps consult with his immediate predecessor, the former member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Wishart), who had a draft bill on his desk for this at the time he went out of office.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:20 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 1, 1972

Designation of additional areas of the province under the provisions of the Pits and Quarries Control Act, statement by Mr. Bernier 17

Introduction of Major G. R. Soame as Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Davis 18

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 20

Location of new airport—news references, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 21

Increase in electric power costs, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 21

Role of Ontario Municipal Board, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bullbrook 21

Medicare coverage of nursing homes, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Welch: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Paterson 23

Ministerial duties, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 23

Tax Credit for purchase of machinery and equipment, continuation of, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 24

Transportation policy for Metro—initiation of GO Transit through northwestern area, question of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Young, Mr. Singer 25

Federal-provincial employment loans programme—expanding available capital, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. B. Newman 26

Scarborough Hospital situation—expansion or new complex, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 27

Removal of sand from Prince Edward dunes and Lake Ontario Cement Co., questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Taylor 29

Coroner's Court review and revision of system, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer 29

Tax reform programme and dropping of sales tax credit, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. MacDonald 30

Conceptual plan for Spadina Expressway lands—Buckminster Fuller report, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Givens 30

Intended layoffs by International Harvester Co., questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Gisborn 31

Absence of judge from duty in provincial court at London, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bullbrook 31

Implementation of reports on franchise legislation and company law re credit unions, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Renwick 31

Sheaffer Pen strike in Goderich, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Gaunt 31

Preliminary report, select committee on economic and cultural nationalism, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Mr. Deacon, Mr. Deans 33

Motion re printing of reports of debates and speeches, Mr. Davis, agreed to 34

Motion to appoint select committee re standing committees, Mr. Davis, agreed to 34

Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 35

Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 35

Establishment of ecological sanctuaries in the province of Ontario, bill to establish, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 35

Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies and to define the commissioner's power and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer, first reading 35

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 35

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 3

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have guests with us today in both galleries: In the east gallery students from the Georgetown High School; and in the west gallery, also from the Georgetown High School.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Economics, and Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to make a statement about a subject which I think is of intense interest to all members of the House and to citizens throughout southern Ontario.

I am today announcing two major steps in the implementation of the Toronto-centred-region plan. First, the governments of Canada and Ontario are at this time making a joint announcement of the site of a new international airport for the Toronto region. Secondly, in order to ensure that the airport is effectively integrated into the proposed community structure east of Toronto, the province will acquire approximately 25,000 acres in the vicinity of the airport—land that is crucial to the development of integrated service, transportation, recreation and community facilities.

Legislation will be introduced this afternoon by my colleague, the Attorney General (Mr. Bales), to permit this development to proceed as a co-operative venture with the federal government for the purposes of the Expropriations Act of Ontario.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, a statement is being made in the House of Commons by the Hon. Donald Jamieson, Minister of Transport, which has been concurred in by the government of Ontario and which shall be considered a joint announcement of the two governments. This announcement is as follows:

The government of Canada and the government of Ontario have agreed that a new major airport will be located in Pickering township just to the northeast of Toronto. The site is roughly between a line just north of Highway 7 in the south, north to the Uxbridge-Pickering township boundary, and between the Little Rouge Creek on the west and East Duffin Creek on the east.

As a cooperative venture, land will be acquired by the federal government for the airport site and by the provincial government for the immediate surroundings.

The choice of a site northeast of Toronto has come after an exhaustive federal-provincial evaluation since 1968 of 59 potential airport sites in the area within a 50-mile radius of Metropolitan Toronto.

It has now been decided that for a number of compelling reasons the Pickering township site is more suitable than any of the other sites studied. In the first place, it is an excellent site, consistent with safety and other aeronautical considerations.

Secondly, it is also the closest site to Toronto of all the proposed sites and, therefore, provides the easiest accessibility.

Thirdly, because it is reasonably close to Lake Ontario and to a number of major transportation arteries leading out of Toronto, investment in water, sewage, and transportation access facilities will be less than at other sites.

Fourthly, even though it is close to Toronto, population in the immediate vicinity of the new airport is small. No major communities will be seriously affected by expropriation or very high noise levels and the environmental impact is minimized.

Finally, and in many respects most important, the location of the airport east of Toronto is the result of joint federal-provincial effort to provide a major stimulus to development east of Metropolitan Toronto, as called for in the Toronto-centred region plan.

The southern part of the airport site lies along the route of a series of proposed urban communities to the east of Toronto, which will be separated from existing lakeshore urban centres by a series of multi-purpose transportation, service and recreation corridors. The government of Ontario has been redesigning the shape and location of some of these proposed communities in order to take account of the airport location and to ensure that areas which could be affected by uncomfortable noise levels are not slated for

residential development. Transportation and service access facilities are also being designed so that the airport will be on a rapid-transit line linking the new communities east of Toronto to Metropolitan Toronto and Malton. The proposed parkway belt and service corridors are also being designed to serve as a separator between the airport and the airport-related community and the existing urban centres along the lakeshore.

The airport site itself is in the neighbourhood of 18,000 acres. The initial role of the airport will be to provide a variety of services, including international, scheduled and charter operations, thus complementing on a rational basis services at Malton and relieving congestion at Malton.

In addition to providing a new national major airport site, it will also be an integral part of an air system for the Toronto region, and will ensure the provision of efficient and adequate air services, minimizing the problems of noise and air pollution. The land acquisition will begin immediately and the opening date for the first airport activities is planned for 1978-1979. Flexibility in the scale and time of expansion is a designed feature of the new airport system.

The governments have agreed that serious consideration will be given to the utilization of the existing Toronto Island Airport for short takeoff and landing—STOL—aircraft as this technology develops.

The federal government is today filing notice of intention to acquire, in accordance with its new Expropriation Act, all the land required for the airport site itself.

The provincial government is introducing legislation today related to the acquisition of land in the vicinity of the airport which will be crucial to the orderly provision of service and transportation access to the airport and the development of the planned community associated with the airport.

The provincial government will ensure by a number of actions that land use in the airport vicinity is compatible with airport operations and with the regional planning concept. Land exposed to aircraft noise and areas being substantially influenced by urban growth pressures generated by the airport will be controlled by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Agreement has been reached in principle between the two governments on the sharing of many of the expenditures associated with the airport development. A portion of the land acquisition by the province will be carried out through funding arrangements under a variety of joint endeavours.

Generally speaking, it has been agreed that the federal government will be responsible for on-site costs of airport projects as well as relocation costs resulting from the displacement of services. The provincial government will assume responsibility for the provision of basic services, such as water and sewage, to the boundaries of the airport. Federal assistance may be provided to a certain extent through existing programmes. The two governments have agreed to study the implications of mass transit and other transportation facilities related to airport development, with a view to working out joint financing arrangements. This is, in fact, a continuation of work now going on in the Toronto area.

To study this and other related co-operative aspects of implementation, the federal government and the government of Ontario have agreed to establish a federal-provincial committee to make recommendations to their respective governments.

The implementation of the airport project will require close collaboration among all three levels of government. Obviously, the federal government will have basic responsibility for the development of the airport site itself. The province has the prime responsibility, in co-operation with the area municipalities, for the implementation of development off the airport site. The municipalities will be informed immediately of the implications for them and discussions will begin on the establishment of machinery to ensure that they are effectively involved in the implementation process.

Mr. Speaker, that completes the joint announcement, but I would like to add some comments that I feel are of particular interest to Ontario, particularly to people living within the Toronto-centred region. The development concept for the Toronto-centred region was unveiled by the government of Ontario in May, 1970. This concept envisaged a structured urban system between Hamilton and Bowmanville, consisting of two tiers of urban communities separated by a series of service and recreational corridors. Within this area a high priority was given to the stimulation of growth to the east of Metropolitan Toronto.

In my budget statement of last April I announced the government's decision to endorse the principles of the Toronto-centred-region concept as a guideline for whatever decisions the province may make that would affect the Toronto-centred-region.

Public reaction to the Toronto-centred-region plan has been overwhelmingly favourable to the general concept. Some 200 briefs and submissions were received from regional development councils, municipalities, associations and private citizens and some 50 public discussions and presentations were held. A number of specific criticisms were received and many of these are being incorporated into the plan as it becomes more refined and comprehensive.

I am happy to say that public reaction obtained through these discussions and submissions has been particularly favourable to the proposals for channelling development east of the highly urbanized core of the region along Lake Ontario; for preserving a large area of low population density north of this urbanized core; and for stimulating growth to specific areas beyond commuting distance from Metropolitan Toronto.

After analysis of the initial public reaction, the government released a status report on the Toronto-centred region in August, 1971. This report announced a number of specific refinements which had been made to the original concept and revealed a number of specific decisions which had been made on individual development proposals. Included in the status report was the following reference to a proposed new international airport for the Toronto region:

> We believe strongly that the location of the second international airport can be a major stimulus to the development of the region, and that its location should not be dependent solely on the current direction of population trends.

Mr. Speaker, such a stimulus to development can have favourable and far-reaching effects not only on the region but on the entire eastern sector of southern Ontario. The airport will encourage growth of urban centres further east, and these in turn will bring welcome prosperity to parts of Ontario that have not shared in the province's overall growth.

With that background in mind, you will recall that the government of Ontario is seeking ways to restructure the municipalities to the east of Metropolitan Toronto. One of the vital decisions to be taken is the delineation of the eastern boundary of Metropolitan Toronto. This government believes that it would be a mistake if there were to be a major annexation to the east of Metropolitan Toronto and therefore no expansion of Metropolitan Toronto is contemplated at this time. The vitality of a new governmental structure, once it is established, will be dependent in part on the dynamically growing areas now within Pickering township. Obviously, the growth of these areas will be greatly stimulated by the airport location.

In the meantime, the province wishes to work very closely with Pickering township in the first place and with all of the other municipal governments in that region which will be involved in planning the provision of services and facilities related to the airport.

Acceptance by the province of prime responsibility for ensuring the implementation of airport-related activities outside the airport site itself requires the establishment of a full-time implementation team. Mr. Larry Forster, who has until now been regional director of the Department of Transportation and Communications for northwestern Ontario, will be the chief of the implementation team.

He will be assisted by a small full-time staff, as well as by staffs seconded for varying periods from the involved departments and agencies of the provincial government. The implementation team will of course work closely with the team refining the Toronto-centred region concept and with the federal and municipal bodies responsible for particular activities. Overall responsibility for co-ordination of provincial activities associated with the implementation of the airport site will rest with my department. Obviously, there are still many questions remaining to be resolved on the planning of the airport development and the specific financial and other responsibilities of the governments involved. We are establishing a joint federal-provincial committee to deal with many of these questions. Meanwhile, I have exchanged letters with Mr. Jamieson, the federal Minister of Transport, containing an agreed annex of understanding. I am tabling these letters, and a copy of the agreed annex, to place on record the agreements made between us concerning the responsibilities to be carried out by our two governments.

This afternoon Mr. Jamieson is making some remarks relating to a further study of airport facilities for southwestern Ontario. As the joint announcement mentioned, the new airport is part of an air transportation system for all southern Ontario. The established airport at Malton, of course, will remain a major component of this system. As a potentially specialized component of the system, the Toronto Island Airport will become the subject of a joint study by the Ontario

and federal governments. This study will pay particular attention to the island airport's potential as a base for STOL—short take-off and landing—aircraft. In any case, the continued use of the island airport will make development of Harbour City impossible.

The implementation team I mentioned earlier will begin its work immediately. No announcement of a project of this magnitude would be complete without reference to some of the more important investigations and studies which have preceded this announcement.

In one of the most important and contentious areas of investigation, our Department of the Environment conducted a study to determine what impact an airport operation would have on the surrounding area. This study encompassed such considerations as air quality, vegetation, wildlife, soil, water, minerals and open space—in short, virtually every natural resource of the area.

As well, the effects of the noise to be generated by the airport were studied in relation to this location. The site proved to be sufficiently removed from existing and proposed urban centres so as to pose no serious problems from the noise to be expected from day-to-day airport operations.

Mr. Speaker, the new airport will have many long lasting effects on the municipalities in the Toronto-centred region area, particularly those in the eastern and northeastern sector.

Apart from the increased opportunity for realizing the growth and urban structure objectives set out in the Toronto-centred region concept many additional advantages will accrue in terms of increased employment opportunities and the tremendous potential for strengthening the economic conditions within the municipalities.

However, it must be realized that the airport and the economic activities generated by it will also create growth pressures which, if not properly handled, can seriously threaten and impair the economic health and the social and physical environment of those municipalities lying close to the new airport. Municipalities that have, to this point, been confronted with relatively slow growth will be subjected to vast pressures on every side to approve more land severance applications, to support urban subdivisions, to amend their bylaws to permit an intensification of development. Such municipalities as Pickering, Markham, Whitby and East Gwillimbury which are already subject to substantial pressure to develop will have these pressures greatly intensified.

Some of the municipalities that will be influenced by the airport's development are already equipped with land-use policies in the form of official plans and zoning bylaws, supported by permanent staffs who will be able to consider the new situation and to recommend suitable alterations in these policies where they are found to be inadequate. Some of the municipalities, however, will have great difficulty in adjusting in sufficient time to accommodate themselves and their policies to the rapidly developing pressures which will be exerted on them.

While the standard of readiness of municipalities within the region varies greatly they all have one thing in common. None contemplated the establishment of the airport in the development of their growth strategies.

To assist municipalities in adjusting to these circumstances, it is the intention of this government to take the following actions in the immediate future.

First, to meet with each of the municipalities to discuss with them the impact of the airport and to consider changes which will be required in their development policies.

In this connection there are representatives of the municipalities in the galleries today. I am now pleased to invite them to come to a joint press conference today at 5 o'clock in Departure Room No. 20 in the main terminal building at Malton Airport, Toronto, where the federal Minister of Transport and the Ontario ministers will be answering questions from the press.

Second, to allocate experienced staff who will be able to work with the municipalities in making the necessary adjustments.

Third, to act under the provisions of Section 32 of the Planning Act, to establish minister's zoning orders on those situations where the growth pressures are greatest and where the capability to react to these pressures is less than required in the circumstances. Special attention will be given to those situations where high noise levels are expected, where land use policies are inadequate or non-existent and in critical areas close to the airport.

Until the full implications of the airport have been considered, this government will exercise its powers as they pertain to official plans and will decline to approve any applications that propose residential development in areas which may be subjected to excessive noise levels from the airport. These policies have been successfully applied in dealing

with new growth around Malton. We intend, of course, to continue to deal with applications within the criteria established by the Urban Development in Rural Areas policy—UDIRA—and the concepts expressed in the Toronto-centred region concept.

The minister's orders referred to earlier may appear unduly restrictive but I indicate that they are short term in nature and will be modified as soon as the full implications of the airport decision have been assessed in conjunction with the municipalities. I am quite prepared to remove the orders as has been done in other parts of the province, as soon as the local bylaws and official plans have been readjusted.

We do not want to create problems for owners of individual parcels which may have been held for some time and we are quite prepared to consider amendments to the orders to relieve exceptional hardships. However, let me reiterate that it shall be our objective to keep residential development to a minimum within the areas of potentially high noise levels and immediately around the airport lands.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the regional municipality of York is preparing an official plan as required by the Act establishing that municipality. The plan is required to be prepared in 1974. Fortunately, the state of the work done on the plan is still at a sufficiently early stage to take the impacts of the airport into consideration. This work being done by the regional municipality will be of tremendous assistance to the individual municipalities and the province in realigning land-use policies in the light of the airport development.

Mr. Speaker, I note—this was in and out but I think it is still out, although it is in the agreement which I have tabled and it is in other documents—the land which will be acquired by the province south of the airport is approximately 25,000 acres.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time, I suppose it is fair to say, no one has been more critical of federal policies than the Treasurer of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): This is the second retreat in a week.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: However, I am happy to acknowledge the results of this form of joint planning.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of clarification?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): No.

Mr. Speaker: I think in view of the importance of the announcement that one or two or three questions of clarification might be permitted.

Mr. W. Hodgson: I would like—

Mr. Speaker: Just a moment!

It seems to me that we have had points of clarification after statements. However, if it is the wish of the House that we handle these during the question period, this is the way it will be.

Mr. Lewis: That is the way it is going to be.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, out of order.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the Treasurer indicate to the House how much provincial money will be involved in the aspect of the responsibility that we have in connection with the airport—not necessarily with the development of the extra 25,000 acres—and what the total cost is projected to be for the whole facility?

Mr. Lewis: I would say about $70 million.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Plus or minus.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Plus a few hundred million after!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I appreciate the question. I don't think that I could give an answer off the top of my head and I suppose it's going to be some months before we can give that answer. Obviously, we're talking of a community which we think it is desirable to build, in the neighbourhood of 150,000 or 200,000 people, who will require services in any case. What the incremental cost is to the airport is something which I imagine the federal government and ourselves are going to be arguing for some time.

I would imagine, for example there has been an agreement between the government and negotiations are going on between water resources—the Department of the Environment—Metropolitan Toronto and the regional municipality of York, to provide trunk services through Pickering, across the top of

Metropolitan Toronto. It may be that those trunk services now—I'm not an engineer—may move slightly farther east and be enlarged to accommodate this community as well.

The cost of that trunk, as I recall, was something in the neighbourhood of $50 million. Whether we assign that to the airport, the airport community or continue to assign it to York is perhaps the choice to be made. Undoubtedly our bargaining position will be that it's all caused by the airport. But I can't answer that question simply.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary on the same line. When the minister talks about a new airport, a cost figure, an approximate one, will be tagged to it. What would the figure be?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The cost of the airport?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the member will have to ask Mr. Jamieson that at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Will the minister ask him for me? I may not get out there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: His figure for acquisition of land, in the estimates, is what, $60 million to $80 million.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker, having to do with serving the large population to the west of the Metro area, which must surely have been the bone of contention, at least according to the news stories that we have been reading. Is the province taking any steps in conjunction with the federal government to improve air transportation from the southwestern part of the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My colleague, now Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton) and the present Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), I think it is fair to say, have been involved in discussions going back over a year to ensure that services all over Ontario, national service and regional service and third lever service—I think that is the correct term—are adequate, and better than adequate hopefully, for the people of northern Ontario and for the people of southern Ontario.

I think it is fair to say that as a result of some of those discussions Mr. Jamieson's announcement, which he is making in the House of Commons pertaining to a study of southwestern Ontario's needs, is very much related to the requests made and indeed positions taken by Ontario in terms of our overall air needs. In that study, we have been asked, and will supply, whatever assistance we can.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is there a compensation programme for those landowners who will be affected by noise and other disturbances associated with the decison to locate it at a specific place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The federal government is acquiring those lands required for the airport and where noise levels are excessively high. We have agreed, as the member will see in the agreement, to take whatever steps we can, as we have done at Malton by a variety of methods, to ensure that no new development takes place in the other noise-affected lands—which I may say are enormous according to the map. They have not yet been refined and undoubtedly will be narrowed. At the tip of the noise line, I suppose it is fair to say that there is less noise there than there is perhaps in Queen's Park with planes flying overhead. I am serious about that.

The lines look much larger than they are and they are not as critical as perhaps they might appear to be on some of the maps. They are a long way from being finally refined.

In those areas we have indicated that if there is to be any compensation, that is the responsibility of the government of Canada and not of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They accept that, do they?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Is it a supplementary?

Mr. Deans: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York North has a supplementary.

Mr. W. Hodgson: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister with regard to his announcement, since he has pretty well clarified where the eastern boundary of Metro is going to go, is he in a position to clarify the northern boundaries between Metro and the region of York?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am pleased to clarify that it is the decision of the govern-

ment that the northern boundary of Metro will remain at Steeles Avenue.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the minister be able to clear up what provisions might have been made by the government to compensate the municipalities for what would obviously be a decrease in their growth during the interim period when the airport is being developed, as a result of zoning and the stopping of development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think one has to remember that the growth in the township of Pickering has been severely limited over the last few years, and for financial reasons mainly.

Mr. Deans: Another supplementary question: Can the minister indicate what has become of the plans to develop the airport in the Hamilton area—the Mount Hope Airport—as the result of this particular decision by the two levels of government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Jamieson's statement in the House of Commons includes this sentence: The initial step in developing an aviation system for Toronto and southwestern Ontario will be the extensive improvement of facilities in Hamilton, London and Windsor airports.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of supplementary questions.

The minister referred to Pickering, Markham, East Gwillimbury and one other municipality. I note that he is going to make certain government staff available to them from time to time, some on a permanent, some on a temporary basis. Is there any planning for those municipalities insofar as aid for services that they are going to be required to supply, because these municipalities are, by and large, low in assessment and small in potential revenue and it would seem to me that the scope of this development is going to put great burdens on those municipalities to provide services? Is that part of the thinking in this plan?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those municipalities and the regional municipality of York, of course, are being assisted—I can't name the figure off the top of my head—by quite large grants made available to the regional government to assist in the preparation of their regional plan by 1974.

Mr. Singer: No, I don't know that the minister properly understood me; not just aid in the planning but in the implementation and in the provision of services, which is most important. In other words, if the government is going to ask Pickering to indulge in building a very large trunk sewer line or trunk watermain while their growth is very limited, it is going to be an intolerable burden on Pickering, Markham, East Gwillimbury and the others.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The trunk services, of course, which are going through Pickering to serve Pickering, the airport, the airport community, and undoubtedly the regional municipality of York and possibly at some point in the future parts of Metropolitan Toronto, will be a provincial undertaking.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario South, a supplementary?

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): A supplementary: In staying to the true point of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister who will be responsible for the fringe areas not included in the purchase or acquisition, either by the province or federal government? Whose responsibility will it be to pay compensation for noise and nuisance to those people in the area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government of Canada.

Mr. W. Newman: That is all I want to know.

Mr. Lewis: The member is a parliamentary assistant for goodness sake.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The member does not listen very well.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister for what reason he is planning a brand new city of 150,000 to 200,000 on a 15,000-acre site which lies within the high-noise area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It does not lie within the high-noise area.

Mr. Deacon: Looking at the map it appears to.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Lewis: As a further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: On that point, Mr. Speaker, what proposals does the minister have for the development of what I gather he is going to call Cedarwood, in terms of the degree of government participation, the degree of private participation and how he intends to develop the plan, put out tenders, whom he is going to involve? Has the minister something that he can tell the Legislature now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The government has no fixed position on this. We are obviously a day or so away from breaking ground at that area. My own view is, and I think it is shared by my colleagues, that it has become necessary because of the high cost of land, for the government to take action to acquire that land.

If one compares this with the English new towns for example, the English new towns are a development corporation financed either by the city of London or by the government of the UK and they plan every bit of it and they finance every bit of it and they own great chunks of it when it is all over. We would hope that having acquired the land we could adopt some broad principles as to where the core was going to be, the composition of the community, how much high rise, how much low rise, how much single family and so on; and then we would be able to turn segments of that over as it became available to the private sector to finance and develop.

Mr. Lewis: Holding onto the land?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not necessarily! That's an option, as to whether we would lease the land for 99 years or 50 years. That might be appropriate for the commercial core for example. I don't think it's as appropriate for the Ontario citizens, most of whom want to own their own land and don't want a 99-year lease.

We would of course control, through some device or another, the selling price of that land in the first instance; so that having achieved by the large purchase and the early purchase the economy of purchasing that land, we would not see it siphoned off as we have seen in so many other instances.

Mr. Lewis: Great opportunity for a little socialistic economic planning.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well there are some Tories who perhaps would turn over in their graves; but there will be a lot of private sector involvement in this, believe me.

Mr. Lewis: Well I am glad the minister is reassuring them now.

Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: I would like to ask him if he could tell me why the government of Canada is buying such high-priced highly-productive agricultural land when they could move 10 miles further north and buy low-priced land and low-agricultural-productive land?

An hon. member: That is a fair question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The Premier just lost his job. He is fired.

An hon. member: His farm is north.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, there were 59 sites studied at one point or another. Each one of those sites had a number of variations depending on the location of the runways for example, and it has a tremendous implication, and in effect almost changes the site even though the terminal may be in the same place. I don't think it is appropriate that we get into a discussion this afternoon of the relative merits of one site or another.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, supplementary: The minister made reference to planning for STOL aircraft; are there any definite plans that will involve either the province or the federal government in the purchase of STOL aircraft and assistance to de Havilland, which is the only manufacturer in Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: He might try to solve the strike first.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are discussions going on between my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Tourism, and between the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the federal government. We of course took the initial steps last fall with STOL aircraft in northern Ontario on a two-year basis, which I am told is a great success.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I think there have perhaps been a reasonable number of supplementary questions. The entire period should not be devoted to the one matter. I don't want to be too rigid on this; if the hon. members feel that we should continue with supplementaries, fine, but I point out to you the standing orders call for a reasonable number of supplementaries. The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): What is to be the name of the new airport?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Givens International.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Or Givens Memorial.

Mr. Givens: Let us call it the Spadina airport! You may decide to abort that, too!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That will be a decision of the government of Canada, not of the government of Ontario.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): He is not on speaking terms with them on that!

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Will the former Century City property be involved in this and will this in any way clean up some of the problems that have resulted there from land which has been sold and the farms having gone into ruin?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sure that the member would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that those of us on these benches who have been involved in this have done our utmost to ensure that we didn't know whose property was involved and whose property wasn't involved. It runs through my mind that one of the federal officials indicated to us that certain parts of the land formerly known or known now as Century City would be acquired for airport purposes, and certain other parts would lie in the noise zones, but not high noise zones.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It may or may not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Since the operational date for the new airport is 1978 or 1979, is the minister able to comment on what the traffic situation might be in Malton in this interim period? In effect, what would the long-term effect be in Malton? Does he see that as staying even or being scaled down? He mentioned in the report the government is going to relieve the pressure. Can he enlarge on that a bit?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I wouldn't want to comment on that. Mr. Jamieson is coming to the joint press conference this afternoon at 5 o'clock. I think he and his officials will be fully prepared to answer those questions.

Mr. Kennedy: A supplementary: Has Mississauga council been invited?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, but the member has got two hours to invite them.

Mr. Kennedy: They will be. Two minutes is adequate.

Mr. Deans: Can't you guys pass notes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister how long does he anticipate the joint study involving the Toronto Island Airport will take?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think we can answer that. The viability of the economics of STOL is not yet a sure thing. That technology is being developed elsewhere, mainly by the manufacturers themselves. What we are really saying is that the island airport should be retained, hoping that at some point, and I think with a certain degree of expectation, it can be used as a STOL port. How soon, I wouldn't like to venture a guess.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Mr. Speaker, the minister in his remarks referred to serving the new airport site with rapid transit. What I am interested in knowing is whether or not he might anticipate that the same service might also serve central and northeastern Metropolitan Toronto—if so, whether he might anticipate that service beginning prior to 1978 or 1979?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the government going to do about northeastern Toronto?

Mr. Lewis: Where is the northeast expressway going?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the answer to the question is yes, but timetables are a thing of the future.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries? If not, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the new northeastern expressway proposed to go? I gather that the government committed itself to 407 now, several miles north of the 401, and a connecting expressway in the northeast as well. Surely that is now planned?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that is a question, Mr. Speaker, more appropriately asked of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Lewis: May I redirect it with enthusiasm, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, who can obviously answer it.

An hon. member: Is that another study?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I knew I would get into this eventually.

Insofar as the particular route is concerned, this has not been decided. It is being studied but there will be—at least it is in the study stage—a freeway somewhere around Highway 48, I would say, and this will connect with Highway 407 in the Highway 7 area.

Mr. Singer: For cars or for people?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the rapid transit line is concerned, is the government of Ontario going to build it or are the municipalities going to build it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Which?

Mr. Singer: The rapid transit line.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The study is going on now jointly between the joint committee established by my predecessor—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Which one?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —by Mr. McNaughton—now chaired by the present minister of the Department of Transportation and Communications, looking at all aspects of rapid transit in the Metropolitan Toronto area. In this particular instance, of course, it extends outside Metropolitan Toronto. But how it is to be funded is a subject which will be dealt with in that context.

Mr. Singer: That certainly clears that up.

Mr. Givens: In your announcement today—

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary, sir?

Mr. Givens: Yes sir, I may not have understood. Does the minister's announcement today seal the fate of Harbour City or is that to be an outcome of the study on the use of the island airport? It was not clear.

Mr. Singer: That study is finished. Stan is gone and so is Harbour City.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, there was handwaving on that side, but I did not get an answer.

Mr. Lewis: Just read Stanley Randall's original statement in the record.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Stanley Randall has said a lot of great things and we are still very proud of him on this side.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister spends most of his time repudiating them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the member does one-tenth of what Stanley Randall did for this province, he will have something to be proud about when he retires.

Mr. Martel: The minister is so sanctimonious standing there!

Mr. Deans: However, Stanley's project is gone.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: However, he was not always right!

No, I would say this; let me say this: We believe at this moment that a high priority should be given to a study of the existing Toronto Island Airport. As we see it now, that Toronto Island Airport should be continued to be used as an airport, hopefully for STOL purposes that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Very handy for the lands and forests types too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —precludes a Harbour City; finishes it. Strikes it dead, I think the hon. member for York-Forest Hill said. That could change, as a result of our study, but I doubt it.

Mr. Reid: The minister is pretty confident.

Mr. Martel: I am glad the minister qualified that.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

TRADE TOUR OF CHINA

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It just occurred to me I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Development, Tourism and Information, if he is going to accompany the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) on his trade tour to China?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): One way.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development): No, I am not!

LIGNITE DEVELOPMENT BY ONTARIO HYDRO

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Can he explain to the House some reference in His Honour's speech the other day about the involvement of a private corporation in the projected development of the lignite deposits by Ontario Hydro? Is there, in fact, any unwillingness on the part of Ontario Hydro to undertake the technology to remove and use the lignite?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The concept, Mr. Speaker, has been discussed for a period of time and has been studied jointly now by Ontario Hydro, by the government and what was formerly known as Alberta Coal—and I can't tell the House the name of the corporation that has taken over Alberta Coal, other than that it is a Canadian-owned corporation which owns the mineral rights in that area. The company had made a proposal to Hydro that they would provide, through private sources, the financing and development on the project; Hydro would buy on site at certain rates that would be determined—if the burning process proved to be successful, transmission problems resolved, etc. But that is the involvement of the private corporation. They are the people who presently have the rights there, who have been doing the research up until this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Did they purchase the rights or were they granted some time ago?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker I would have to check this out. They have had them—whatever it is, by purchase or by way of lease—for a period of time. And they have been the ones who have, up until this point, done most of the research as to the burning capacity of the lignite in that area.

TRADE TOUR OF CHINA

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Revenue. Did he ask the Minister of Trade and Development to go with him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman. Yes, but I found out that the Minister of Trade could not speak mandarin Chinese; and it is very important.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): But this minister can.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

HOUSING SITUATION IN ONTARIO

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: How is the housing portfolio to be handled in the House hereafter? I gather in the draft outline that it seems to fall into more than one area.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes Mr. Speaker, there is a reference in the Throne Speech to an assessment of housing policy and some of our problems in the housing field. I think in this assessment there would probably be some determination as to the proper administrative functions. For this period of time, though, the Minister of Revenue will be responsible for the Ontario Housing Corp. and to answer for the corporation here in the Legislature.

CONCEPTUAL PLAN FOR SPADINA EXPRESSWAY LANDS

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question from the member for York-Forest Hill as to the cost of the conceptual project on his favourite roadway. The fee was $15,000 plus $886.75 in expenses.

And while I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, because I would not want the Leader of the Opposition to feel that he had been neglected on Tuesday, as was customary a copy of the Throne Speech was delivered to his office approximately 14 minutes before 3 o'clock. At the same time a copy of the speech was

delivered to the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I can't tell him what happened to it after that, but it was delivered.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well since the Premier raised it, might I suggest that next year, if he is in his place, he consider just giving the copy to a page so that my successor would have a convenient way of following the words of His Honour on such an important occasion.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Who is the member's successor?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary to the Premier –

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The Premier will recall that in the December session I asked the same question as the hon. member for York-Forest Hill, but in addition–

An hon. member: It might be the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Singer: –I asked him to provide information as to how many hours of work were involved by Buckminster Fuller and/or his associates, and he undertook at that time to get that information.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I did undertake to get that, but I will try to get it. We don't keep track of the number of hours. We pay the cost of the conceptual material and, as I say, the bill for it was $15,000–

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Conservative Party should pay that bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: –and there is an item for $886.75 in expenses.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary, could the Premier advise us the basis on which the bill was submitted? Was it a fee bargained for in advance or did he just pay whatever was asked? On what basis was it prepared and paid?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I shall endeavour to find out.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is nice!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

INCO EMPLOYMENT POLICY

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker:

Can the Minister of Labour report to the House on his undertaking to the Sudbury and District Labour Council and to members of this Legislature to have discussions with International Nickel Co. of Canada Ltd. on its present policy on layoffs; and what may be imminent and what security there is for the work force in the Sudbury basin?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party, as he knows I did meet on February 17 with the leaders of the Sudbury and District Labour Council and I have a letter on the way now to Mr. Brown, the president of the Sudbury and District Labour Council, in connection with our meeting with the management of Inco. They had, of course, asked a number of questions of Inco. For instance, they wanted to know if the company could give them a long-range forecast insofar as employment or layoffs with Inco are concerned. We were not able to obtain any definite commitment from Inco because as we realize–and members opposite will too, of course–this layoff was because of market conditions.

Mr. Deans: It was due to bad market planning.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: That may be the member's opinion but it is not mine at the present time, and I have not seen–

Mr. Deans: Inco admitted that!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: –any evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Deans: They admitted it was bad planning on their part!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Anyone connected with the nickel and copper industry will realize that since 1965 the market had been exceptionally buoyant and by 1971, particularly in the first few months of 1971, there was a decline in market conditions and it became apparent in December 1971 that there was a very sharp decline in the industry. That is the main reason, in fact, for the layoffs.

I am very happy to report to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that both the union and the company have done exceptionally well in trying to mitigate the effects of this layoff.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker,–

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary question?

Mr. Martel: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the minister: Has he been able to ascertain specifically how much nickel the International Nickel Co. was able to stockpile in the preceding year, based on the number of excess overtime hours they forced the men to work?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't have this figure now and I doubt if the company could give it to us. The reason for stockpiling, as I said earlier, is simply because the forecasts were fairly good, the market was good and all of a sudden there was a very serious decline. That's one of the reasons why the company did stockpile, not knowing what would happen.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Minister, is the minister aware that International Nickel Co. admitted to having excess production over sales from January 1 of 1971 on and that during the entire period they continued to hire employees, bringing them from all over Canada? In not one month were their sales equivalent to their production.

Mr. Speaker: I believe that although the hon. member made a statement, there was a question in it. Perhaps the hon. minister wishes to reply before we call another member. Is there a reply to that, or was it purely a statement?

Mr. Martel: No. I wanted to know if the minister is aware that the production was greater than the sales from January 1, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Production might have been in excess of sales, but that was because of the forecast of the company. They just couldn't forecast–that was the reason they gave us. They just couldn't.

As a matter of fact, you will find that even in governments. You may have all kinds of computers and experts, and their forecasts are sometimes way off the beam.

Mr. Lewis: It was a bad market analysis.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Is the minister prepared to table in the House the results of the inquiries carried out by the Department of Labour prior to the granting of the certificates to work overtime?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be prepared to give the member full details of our communications with both labour and management anytime.

Mr. Deans: I was referring to the certificates that are necessary for permission to work overtime during the year 1971.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be glad to consider this, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. members please indicate if they have any supplementaries, so we can keep the question period orderly. Does the hon. member for Rainy River have a supplementary?

Mr. Reid: No sir.

Mr. Speaker: Well then he should wait until I determine that the hon. member for Scarborough West, as leader of the New Democratic Party, has no more questions.

Mr. Lewis: There is a supplementary behind me.

Mr. Speaker: Right! Supplementary from the hon. member for Parkdale?

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Sudbury, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry.

Mr. Germa: Taking into consideration the minister's statement about the soft position of the nickel market, will he consider lifting all overtime permits for the International Nickel Co., both in their production sector and in their development and construction sector?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: This may not always be in accordance with the desire of labour or of management, but I would be glad to consider it.

NOTICE OF LAYOFFS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, which is, I think, not a supplementary.

Will the minister consider plugging those holes in the Employment Standards Act which he knows exist, to prevent a company from neglecting to give appropriate notice by laying off less than 10 per cent of the work force, which in a case like Inco can be an enormous number of men?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is a very sensitive area; one which I'm looking at very seriously at the present time. It

is premature, of course, to come up with any decision but, I think, in the case of Inco, the notices were within the law.

I'm looking at the whole spectrum, because I think this is an area where our department can play a very important role.

TELEGRAM PUBLISHING CO. LTD.

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

Can the Minister of Labour report to the House on the investigation, which his predecessor I'm sure launched, into the behaviour of the Toronto Telegram in its dealing with its employees at the point of its shutdown?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position today to tell the member offhand what has taken place so far. But if it is the wish of the hon. member, I will be glad to give him a report as to where the matter stands now.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the House was assured that before the end of January an investigation would begin into the behaviour of the Telegram, a matter which clearly concerned the manpower branch and the employment standards branch of the minister's department. Has the investigation begun, and is the minister then saying that if it has he will give us a report on its proceedings and how this House intends to deal with the Telegram?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Our officials in the manpower services branch have been active. They have been working very closely in the case of the Telegram with both labour and management. I will get up-to-date reports from them for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

GREAT LAKES CLEANUP

Mr. Reid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Can he indicate whether the Ontario government has made known its feelings with regard to the statement that was in the paper last week to the effect that the United States was not going to proceed rapidly with the cleanup of the Great Lakes? What representation did this government make to Ottawa and to Washington in this regard?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, first, let me remind the hon. member that the negotiations between Canada and the United States are under the Department of External Affairs of Canada. We have two members on the committee—the technical committee—that is doing the negotiations.

As far as the original negotiations are concerned, I am informed that they are proceeding. It is hoped that there will be a suitable agreement ready for signature between Canada and the United States some time later on this year.

The report that was in the paper about a week or so ago had to do, as I understand it, with the refusal, or the turn down, of the office of the budget of the United States to agree to the US environmental protection agency's request to accelerate the programme which is being negotiated. The original programme negotiations are still continuing.

As far as our position is concerned, we are disappointed, of course, but we are still confident that the original negotiations will be concluded.

Mr. Reid: May I ask, by way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, what effect this "deacceleration," if that is the way to put it, of the American programme is going to have on Canada's and Ontario's cleaning up of the Great Lakes? Is it going to mean that our efforts are useless in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't know that I can answer that in a few words. We are still continuing our work with the government of Canada, with which we have our agreement, and we propose to continue on schedule. What the effect of no acceleration on the US side will be I don't know, because I don't know how rapidly they will be able to proceed with the original agreement.

ROBARTS LIBRARY

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Does the minister support access to the Robarts library stacks by undergraduates and the public?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, this is something that, of course, is being looked into by the board of governors of the university and also by the library council.

I understand that there has been a new proposal made to the student council, made by a committee that was appointed by the library council which had student representation. It means that students will have more access than was originally indicated, but I understand that it does not provide for free public access as far as browsing is concerned.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary may I ask the minister if he supported the open access?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I support the recommendation of the committee. I am not in the—

Mr. Deans: The minister learned his lesson in the environmental portfolio.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am not in a position to disagree with its findings at all. I think there are good reasons for this latest solution.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, then the library which stands in the name of the former Premier is to become an exclusive preserve of certain doctorals, other students and people who can afford a sum of money—a fairly substantial sum of money—to enter? Is that what the minister would wish?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, that is not the case at all. The public will be able to use the library, it just won't have the same privileges that the students at the university will have.

Mr. Lewis: Not even all the students will have all those privileges.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I think the important thing at this point is to at least give this latest solution a trial. There are certain unknown factors involved in the operation of a library of this size, particularly in the type of material and books and other things that will be included in that facility. So at least in view of the concern for loss of certain original material in the existing library, I think the decision of the committee is right.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary.

Mr. Laughren: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Has the minister in his deliberations considered that his position is contrary to the recommendations of the Wright commission report?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well, I think the Wright commission report didn't specifically deal with the Robarts library, as the hon. member well knows.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but they dealt with all other libraries.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The report did recommend, certainly in a very general way, that access should be given to the public to institutional or university libraries where possible. I think that is being followed here. The terms of that access, of course, may vary from institution to institution, but I don't really think there is a serious conflict between those two opinions.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister, as a matter of principle does his government define the word access as public use of the books, or does he define access as simply being able to go in one door and out the other?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Really Mr. Speaker, I can't see much difference in the two illustrations given by the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: No, apparently the minister can't.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Public use would include going in and ordering—

Mr. Deans: The public have access to the legislative chamber, but they can't sit there.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —a particular text or a particular book from that facility. Now if there is going to be some management, some control, some regulation as far as the use and tenure of that particular book, I think the plan is reasonable; and I still think it provides public use and access to that library at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville has been attempting to place a supplementary previously. I will permit it right now.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): No, I will bypass. I have a supplementary to another question.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries on this one? If not, the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

HAM RADIO OPERATORS

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communication, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister

plan on taking any action concerning the requests of ham operators for a special licence plate?

Hon. Mr. Carton: This is under study presently, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: May we expect an answer within the next month or so, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the following reports:

The Ontario Department of Health 46th annual report, 1970; the 25th annual report of the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario, March 31, 1971; The University of Toronto financial statements for the year ended June 30, 1971; the report of the Ontario Telephone Service Commission, 1970; the report of the Crop Insurance Commission of Ontario, 1970-1971; the report of the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1971; the annual report of the Ontario Energy Board for the year ended December 31, 1971; the 1970 annual report of the Ontario Housing Corporation, Ontario Student Housing Corporation and Housing Corporation Limited; the Provincial Auditor's report of 1970-1971; and the Public Accounts of the Province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1971.

An hon. member: What a busy day.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

EXPROPRIATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend the Expropriations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, with the advent of large joint undertakings such as the federal-provincial project like the airport, it is desirable that our expropriation laws recognize these joint ventures and be made to apply to them.

This bill provides for two amendments to the Expropriations Act. The first amendment clarifies an existing provision that prevents enhancement of market value of lands expropriated for the project itself and the resultant compensation to be paid.

The second amendment ensures the protection of the public by applying that provision to joint ventures such as the airport development.

The principles and procedures recognized in the Expropriations Act are preserved and compensation provisions can be made to apply to joint ventures.

ETHICS OF ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Ethics of Elected Representatives.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

DANCING SCHOOLS

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Dancing Schools.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is to limit the amount of the registration fee at the dancing school or social club. In the past there has been a tendency to enrol or dupe people into long-term agreements and they had very little opportunity to get back any funds.

An hon. member: Has the member ever been taken?

Mr. Drea: No, I have never been taken, but I have got a lot of people out of it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, consideration of the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. Eaton, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. MacBeth moves, seconded by Mr. Eaton, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable W. Ross Macdonald, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario.

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a great privilege for me to be called upon to move this address to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor. I am certain all members of this Legislature will join me in thanking His Honour for his words of confidence and inspiration that will surely guide us well in our deliberations in the days ahead —deliberations which will indeed have a decided effect on all of us in this province in future years.

I am certain, too, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this Legislature will agree with me when I say that the years ahead will, without doubt, be the most challenging we have ever known.

It is my privilege, sir, to be among the first in this session of the Legislature to offer most sincere congratulations on your election to the post of Speaker of this assembly. I and all the hon. members are fully aware of your wealth of experience, your years as chairman of the committee of the whole House. We are all confident that you will not only serve with distinction in your new role but with fairness to all.

I am confident of that, sir, and I am confident that the restructuring of our government and the civil service will ultimately lead to the provision of the finest service for our people and our province. I am a great believer in change where and when change is necessary, and it was necessary to update the structure of our government to keep in step with the needs of our people. I take this opportunity of congratulating this government on its effort and foresight in implementing this new structure.

Although I do not intend to elaborate, I congratulate all those members of cabinet who have been appointed to new positions within government. I am confident that each and every one of them will carry out their new assignments to the fullest degree. In particular my congratulations go to the newly established posts of provincial secretariats which have been assumed by the Hon. Robert Welch, the Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence and the Hon. A. F. Lawrence.

I also congratulate the Hon. Darcy McKeough, provincial Treasurer, who has been named to head up the very important new post of Financial and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Hon. Charles MacNaughton, who has assumed new responsibilities as Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet. I wish them every success in their new assignments.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. members for York East (Mr. Meen), Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett), Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman), and Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes), who have been appointed parliamentary assistants. I am confident that they will be a great asset and that they will contribute much toward the functions of this government as they carry out their various responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not make mention of the last Ontario election in which our people gave this government a rather respectable mandate. I was delighted, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the Conservative team which was so ably led by our Prime Minister (Mr. Davis). It was indeed an easy task to conduct a campaign on the platform which he and his ministers provided. There was no false or impractical promises—there were no "pie in the sky" offers which could not be delivered when this government was re-elected.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That got a smile.

Mr. MacBeth: Warming up a little? The response of the electorate was an excellent indication of the strong support of our people who were undoubtedly confident of our party's and government's ability to carry out our promises. Now we all look forward to participating in the implementation, under

the capable leadership of our Prime Minister, the legislative programme outlined for us by His Honour, the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Ruston: Now the bad news.

Mr. MacBeth: Now the good news. As a private member and as the new member for York West I welcome the opportunity provided by this traditional motion to express some personal thoughts on fields of legislation referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

While recognizing democracy is the best form of government yet devised, I believe most will agree that by its very nature it is not the most efficient. The government's expressed intent to become "more efficient and productive while at the same time bringing government closer to the people," presents somewhat of a paradox.

Both are admirable goals, but I hope in our attempt to achieve the latter we will not sacrifice the former. The people of Ontario have given this government a strong mandate to govern and the majority of the people of this province expect it to do just that, listening to the dissidents and extremists but not being unduly influenced or delayed by them. The greatest common weal generally lies in the middle course of moderation and tolerance.

All will welcome the expressed intent to preserve the natural beauty and serenity of our Ontario landscape. I would hope that this intent will lead to expansion of our provincial parks system and to continued strong measures to improve the environment.

No problem has had greater interest to our youth and their concern came through clearly and loudly during the October election campaign. Even now, I have on my desk a number of letters from a class of grade 8 pupils of Lambton-Kingsway school. All express concern over this problem and inquire as to what I and the government are doing about it.

Most of our generation, raised with a different philosophy, are not yet prepared to make the personal sacrifices required to preserve our ecology best. We want our instant television sets, with their constantly burning tubes, not content to wait 30 seconds to preserve the energy that is required. Mr. Speaker, our hope lies with the education and concern of our youth who may be prepared to make some of these sacrifices that our generation is loath to do.

The Throne Speech, hopefully, holds an open door for federal-provincial fiscal reform. For the economic welfare of our entire country, no reform is more urgent. The economic problems of the Thirties, the depressions of those years and the subsequent war years, led public opinion to favour a strong and well-financed central government.

During those war years, provincial concessions were willingly made which the federal authorities, regardless of party—and indeed with public approval—have not seen fit to relinquish. Developments of recent years are leading to re-examining the divergent aspirations and needs of the people of our 10 provinces in such fields as education and social programmes. These show that the Fathers of Confederation were wise in their intent to make the provinces strong in their own fields of responsibility.

The good of our country depends upon recognizing our differences and providing each province the financial means and independence to control its own destiny within the bounds of constitutional responsibility. Ottawa's largesse for frivolous programmes on its terms and without concern for provincial priorities, must be replaced by unconditional grants or the surrendering of some share of its present taxation. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our government will work to that end.

I note with interest the proposal to create regional governments in Sudbury and the Kitchener-Waterloo areas. I would remind the government of some outstanding matters in regional government legislation yet required for the Niagara region and the York region, that is, having to do with the responsibilities of hydro-electric commissions in those municipalities. I hope that these responsibilities of the commissions will be defined early this session and the outstanding matters finally determined.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the proposed review of the role of the Ontario Municipal Board. As a former municipal council member, I have had my differences with that board. I appreciate its functions and the purpose for its existence, but I have often questioned its zeal in supplanting its wisdom for that of the elected representatives and the costly and protracted procedure it itself has evolved. As a quasi-judicial body, it should not change policy made by an elected body. Examination and reform is welcome.

Of personal interest to me is the short paragraph on legislation to prohibit the holding of more than one elected public

office. If this is an offence, I personally am an offender. If any conflict does in fact exist, it is a public and open one.

I suggest that good often comes from such dual capacities. The wisdom of placing senior officials ex officio on various public bodies is a well-accepted practice, even though in certain dealings between the bodies conflicting interests may arise. The liaison and understanding gained is valuable. The important factor, Mr. Speaker, is that the public knows of the two positions and has full knowledge of any conflict that may exist.

As far as I am concerned, I have no intention of seeking re-election to the hydro commission of the borough of Etobicoke. Presently, however, the time demands of both offices—that is, as a commissioner and a member of this House—are not in conflict, and I believe that to resign now would be a disservice to my municipality and place council in the unenvious position of appointing a short-term successor.

Would the cost in conducting a general election over the entire borough of Etobicoke be warranted at this time? Perhaps those who have undertaken the job and have been elected to do it should be allowed to complete it. In this matter, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to proceed with caution.

Earlier I spoke of the concern of the young people of York West for their environment. York West, now consisting of the central portion of the borough of Etobicoke, is generally regarded as a pleasant residential community. Surprisingly, one of our major problems is that of pollution—pollution from the transportation industry by way of motor traffic throughways slicing through the community and aircraft noise and exhaust.

The Toronto International Airport has brought both good and bad to my riding—good in terms of employment and growth, bad in terms of environment and zoning problems. The federal government controls the airport but leaves to the local municipality the cost of acquiring the buffer land areas that are required, of soundproofing schools and hospitals and of safely zoning the flight paths.

I hope that relief will soon be provided from some of the ills Etobicoke is suffering from the international airport by the early development of the Pickering airport which was announced in this House this afternoon.

I do, however, urge the government to ensure sufficient land will be acquired by the federal authority in Pickering so that the local municipal taxpayer will not have to pay for federal shortcomings and that the local council will not have insoluble zoning problems. That, Mr. Speaker, is the condition we found in Etobicoke, where the federal government supposedly financed the airport but left many of the surrounding problems to the municipality—and they are very costly and difficult to overcome. I again urge the government in this new location that they make sure to have a broad-sighted policy to acquire all the land that may be necessary.

In closing, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to H. Leslie Rowntree, QC, my predecessor for York West. He has served his province well in many capacities and his recent retirement as chairman of the board of the Ontario Science Centre is noted with regret.

Mr. Speaker, in his closing remarks, His Honour the Lieutenant Governor advised us that the programmes he had outlined—

> . . . have been the object of intensive scrutiny and thought on the part of the government, as being in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

He stated:

> We look forward with confidence to a fresh and revitalized approach to many complex problems of our society, and to the purposeful deliberations of the hon. members of this House.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this Legislature, and this new government of Ontario, have every intention of carrying out the wishes of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

As a result, our province shall continue to grow and develop as never before and we shall continue to maintain our leadership as the most progressive jurisdiction in the continent.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Middlesex South.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to have the opportunity to second the motion of the hon. member for York West for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne presented by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The Speech from the Throne has laid down the foundation for deliberation and action over the months ahead. It is a foundation of concern for people, combined with good common sense which the people of

this province so readily and overwhelmingly endorsed last October.

I am sure that this government will deal with the great many complex issues which it faces, with confidence and decisiveness reflected by its leader, the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province, and with the skill and dedication shown by those selected to serve in the cabinet. I would like to congratulate them on their appointments and assure them of the responsible and enthusiastic support of the members. As we who were chosen by the people of this province to govern proceed to do so, we will, with the best interests of the people of this province in mind.

I was most pleased with the reference in the Speech from the Throne to expanded policies concerning investments and loans, giving preference to Canadian-owned enterprises, and in particular, for assistance in the growth of smaller enterprises. I am sure the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. White), my neighbour in the riding of London South, is a man of vision with that touch of practicality that will inspire confidence by the small businessman. I know I have many small businessmen in my riding who will be looking forward to the developments in this programme.

Speaking of my riding—the one which we proved in the last election was a great Tory riding—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eaton: —I feel I must restore it to its just position in the eyes of the public. The recently disposed-of member seemed to have a habit of referring to it in derogatory terms; such as a poor and underprivileged place. Well, it is not. It is a riding which exemplifies the cross-section of the very foundations of this province.

It contains the basic rural life of Ontario, with a backbone of numerous family farms which produce practically every agricultural product grown in this province; from the dairy farms close to the city of London to the beef areas of Ekford and Mosa, hog operations, orchards—all the field cash crops grown in Ontario. It supports two canning factories with a third being built close to the border in the riding of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott), to which I am sure some of our produce will flow.

It is a riding of many small communities which foster the small independent businessman. It contains a portion of the city of London, which is labour intensive, providing the very lifeblood of our developing industrial complex—people; proud, hard-working, industrious people. There are also native Canadians in my riding who don't want the charitable type of talk provided by the past member, but government co-operation with their own ambitions, such as is exemplified by the recently approved day care centre for Muncey, and government co-operation which I am sure will be forthcoming when the appropriate time comes on the recently started project to raise funds for a community centre in Oneida.

I think the last member thought that the people of Middlesex South were his flock. He found they couldn't be led. They didn't want the socialistic philosophy of being told how they will live.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They were lucky; he made speeches.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The member is in the right place.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He got 9,000 votes.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): It wasn't enough, though.

Mr. Eaton: They want the opportunity which we will give them to achieve their own personal goals.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eaton: I was most pleased to see the indication of expanded programmes in park development in the Speech from the Throne. The Sydenham Valley Conservation Authority in my riding has just recently taken an option on Melwood Park. I urge our government to give the necessary assistance which the authority will be looking for in developing the park.

There are several other projects in the riding to which I urge our government to give immediate consideration: the development of water supplies in the village of Melbourne and Campbellville, the Head St. bridge project in the town of Strathroy and the rebuilding of Highway 81 from Highway 2 to Strathroy.

I was also most pleased to see the commitment in the Speech from the Throne to construct the new regional detention centre in London. It has been long needed. I would urge the government to establish the name as the Elgin-Middlesex area detention centre.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Call it the Bolton Memorial Detention Centre.

Mr. Eaton: I was also pleased to see the commitment in the Speech from the Throne on the development of facilities for community and school use. I remember distinctly making a commitment in my nomination speech to work toward that end.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Eaton: It is of utmost importance to the life of the people of a community and will be most welcomed by the many communities in my riding.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member is reading his predecessor's speeches.

Mr. Eaton: I note with interest the reference to agriculture in the Speech from the Throne. Having worked all of my business life for the agricultural producers of this province, I shall have a continued interest in the happenings of that industry. I would make particular reference to the statement that further initiatives will be taken to increase and diversify the use and sale of Ontario-grown agricultural and food products in domestic and export markets. Having been associated with the sale of a farm product for the past number of years, of which more than 50 per cent of our crop was exported, I am well aware of the need of a continuous aggressive programme of market promotion abroad.

The programme of assistance in contacting these markets, carried on by the Ontario Food Council under our Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), is most appreciated. In fact, three of my former colleagues in the Ontario Bean Producers Marketing Board leave tomorrow for the United Kingdom and Europe. Some people are pessimistic about the United Kingdom market because of its entry into the Common Market. However, the attitude should be one of optimism, that the United Kingdom can become our doorway to the new markets on the continent.

I urge our government to take steps to give the necessary encouragement and incentives. An aggressive approach to export markets by the Department of Agriculture and Food, for which our minister, my neighbour in Middlesex North, is to be commended, has seen the export of agriculture products expanded by nearly $500 million since 1968.

I also viewed with interest in the Speech from the Throne that the Farm Products Marketing Act and the Ontario Milk Act will be amended to reflect the principle contained in the report of the royal commission inquiry into civil rights. I feel some of these should be implemented forthwith. However, some of the recommendations reflect a lack of understanding of the foundations of farm marketing in Ontario. I will not stand by and see recommendations shoved through, just because they are in the report, which could very well undermine the many years of work of producers in this province in farm marketing.

Agriculture in Ontario has increased its productivity per man more rapidly than any other segment of the economy. Agriculture is the most dramatic success story of our time. We take for granted the abundance of food in our supermarkets; yet our miracle of food production is the envy of nations around the world and has the respect of all the world. This is the result of the capabilities of the farmers in this province; yet they are not repaid in proportion to the skill and effort which they put into their business.

In Ontario, approximately 18 per cent of personal disposable income goes to food. Elsewhere in the world, it is lower only in the United States. It is comparable to 25 per cent to 30 per cent in Europe and over 40 per cent in Russia. No person in Ontario should object to paying more for his food and marketing boards should be the tool of the producers to obtain that return. My aim is to see that these marketing powers are maintained and extended as producers need them.

When speaking of the agricultural industry, I must express my concern, and the concern I know that many of my colleagues have expressed, for the current egg situation. Much hinges on the waited inquiry report. Although many of us feel that immediate action is necessary, it would certainly undermine the inquiry to move without the report. One realizes that one action alone is not enough. To implement quotas in Ontario tomorrow without corresponding action in other provinces would be useless. There is a need for the use of federal legislation under Bill C-176, but as yet the federal government has not appointed a national marketing council.

The proposed loan programme suggested by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture has some merit. However, unless the necessary action is taken to ensure profitable returns, then the loans do little more than put the producers further in debt. I do hope the report is forthcoming shortly. Then I urge our government to move immediately in co-operation with the producers of Ontario,

other provinces and the federal government to ensure the egg producers the opportunity to receive a fair return for their product.

One issue which has resulted from the proposed egg vote last year, to which I think particular attention must be paid under the Farms Products Marketing Act, is that of voting privileges. It is wrong that individuals with five or six hens can control the industry. I feel something must be done to ensure that those voting on a marketing plan have some reasonable proportion of their income at stake.

Another need that I see resulting from the egg situation is a more available and single source of fixed and working capital, so that the producers need not get tied up with feed companies to finance not only their feed but their poultry and livestock. I would urge a study of the situation to see what could best serve the producers of this province.

I must make mention of the capital grants programme, which, due to the good judgement of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, was expanded this past year. The amount of dollars going into the capital grants programme has increased from $4.2 million last year to $16.2 million until the end of February this year, and from 5,000 applications to more than 25,000 applications this year. Some delay was experienced in processing these grants due to the popularity of the programme. However, they are now caught up with, which we are most pleased to see.

The capital grants programme applied to drainage, and this leads me to another problem. An increase has been brought about by the capital grants programme initiated by this government, which in turn has brought about other needs. First, there is a need to bring the Municipal Drainage Act into the proper ministry, and I believe that to be the ministry of Agriculture and Food. The drainage work being performed in this province is directly concerned with agriculture and the increased productivity of agricultural lands.

Secondly, with the amount of drainage being performed by individual drainage contractors, there is a need for legislation to give the contractors a self-governing control in their field. With the importance of the drainage to the agricultural industry, I would urge action on these matters.

Also worthy of note is Ontario's crop insurance programme. Further expansion of this programme has made it by far the most extensive and comprehensive crop insurance programme in Canada presently being considered by other provinces. The Minister of Agriculture and Food can be justly proud of his actions. I know, from appearing before the Crop Insurance Commission with producers, that they have found a spirit of co-operation when making their suggestions to improve plans, and I urge this continued co-operation. The Crop Insurance Commission this year will offer 13 plans covering 19 crops and bare ground coverage. This has been a most important programme developed for Ontario agriculture.

As I view the overall Speech from the Throne, I am confident that the deliberations of this House will produce actions of importance to this province and will be of major benefit to the people of this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House leader will tell us what he is contemplating for tomorrow morning.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes. We will proceed tomorrow morning with the ordinary business as it appears in the rules, and we will be introducing a motion tomorrow morning with regard to the establishment of the committees. That will constitute the business for tomorrow.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Might I further ask if the motion will just establish the committees, or is the House going to have the report of the striking committee at the same time?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I cannot answer that at this moment, but I would hope that would be the case.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:45 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 2, 1972

Toronto-centred region plan development of new international airport and area community structure, statement by Mr. McKeough 39

Location of new airport and other transportation facilities, questions of Mr. McKeough and Mr. Carton, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. W. Hodgson, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer, Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Givens, Mr. Good, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Trimbrell 43

Trade tour of China, questions of Mr. White, Mr. R. F. Nixon 49

Lignite development by Ontario Hydro and involvement of private corporation, questions of Mr. Davis, Mr. R. F. Nixon 49

Trade tour of China, questions of Mr. Grossman, Mr. R. F. Nixon 49

Housing situation in Ontario—breakdown of administrative functions, questions of Mr. Davis, Mr. Lewis 49

Conceptual plan for Spadina Expressway lands and Buckminster Fuller's fee, questions of Mr. Davis, Mr. Givens, Mr. Singer 49

INCO employment policy, questions of Mr. Guindon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel, Mr. Deans, Mr. Germa 50

Notice of layoffs re Employment Standards Act, questions of Mr. Guindon, Mr. Lewis 51

Telegram Publishing Company report on employee relations, questions of Mr. Guindon, Mr. Lewis 52

Great Lakes cleanup and Canada-U.S. negotiations, questions of Mr. Auld, Mr. Reid 52

Robarts Library and access by students, questions of Mr. Kerr, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds 52

Ham radio operators and special licence plate, questions of Mr. Carton, Mr. B. Newman 53

Presenting annual reports, Mr. Yaremko 54

Expropriations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 54

Ethics of elected representatives, bill respecting, Mr. Shulman, first reading 54

Dancing schools, bill respecting, Mr. Drea, first reading 54

Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacBeth, Mr. Eaton 54

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. R. F. Nixon, agreed to 60

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 60

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 4



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 3, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome our guests this morning. In the west gallery we have students from Bennington Heights Public School, from Jarvis Collegiate Institute and from Burlington Central High School. In the east gallery we have students from Westmount Secondary School. A little later on in the morning we will also have students from Madonna High School and from Oliver Stephens Senior Public School.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): There are not many over there.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): We've got quality over here.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): At least we are over here.

Mr. Ruston: Slim pickings though!

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): There are not too many over there.

OHC FINANCIAL RECORDS

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development who, I believe, according to the latest book, has something to say about the Ontario Housing Corp.

Could he tell us why adequate financial records for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1971, have not been made available to the Provincial Auditor to enable him to deal with these, particularly in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Auditor made similar complaints about the operation of Ontario Housing Corp. in at least his last two reports of 1969-1970 and of 1968-1969?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Trade and Development is no longer responsible for housing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could I redirect that question? If necessary I will repeat it to whoever looks after Ontario Housing.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Don't all jump up at once!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is really too complicated for the ministers isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the Provincial Auditor's report. I think it was tabled yesterday if I recall. Am I correct; was it tabled yesterday?

I haven't seen the report. I saw the report in this morning's paper. I have an idea, though, that the term to which the Provincial Auditor is referring doesn't refer to the period ending December—at least the fiscal year of 1971. I have an idea that it refers to a previous year. I have an idea, too, that these things have been straightened out since.

The auditorial notice, if the news report is accurate, has pointed out that the Ontario Housing Corp., being the fastest growing and the best operated housing corporation in North America, has been growing at a rapid pace and because of the very complex operations of building so many housing units in such a short period of time has understandably had some problems in relation to keeping up with the requirements, one of which is what the auditor refers to. Certainly if there are any shortcomings which don't satisfy the Provincial Auditor we will see to it that they are corrected in short order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Even though the minister may not have had the opportunity of reading the report that was tabled yesterday, could he tell us why no action has been taken in Ontario Housing or by the responsible minister in relation to the reports that the Auditor made in 1968-1969 when he said:

> The audit and the report thereon of Ontario Housing Corp. for the year ended December 31, 1968, was not completed until September 12, 1969. Although this date is an improvement over the previous year I am still concerned about the delay in closing the books and the submission of statements for audit.

And the year 1969-1970, which the minister has had available to him for 15 months or more:

> In my report of November 28, 1969, I expressed my concern about the existing accounting problem in Ontario Housing and the delay in its closing of the books and the submission of statements for audit.

An hon. member: Poor management!

Mr. Singer: And he goes on.

How many times, Mr. Speaker, does the Provincial Auditor have to complain to the inhabitants of the front benches that everything is not being done in accordance with the way that would allow him to report properly to the House about the financial affairs of Ontario Housing? Why is the government not able to so order its affairs in this very large spending appendage of the government so that the auditor can properly report to the people of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out, I haven't read the Provincial Auditor's report. I intend to read it thoroughly. I intend to have a discussion with the Provincial Auditor and my officials and find out if the condition to which he refers still exists. If it does still exist, Mr. Speaker, I assure this House that these matters will be cleared up.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: No, I am not quite through.

By way of supplementary: Has the minister or anyone concerned with public housing read the Auditor's report for the year 1969-1970 or for the year 1968-1969? If so, why didn't they take action before this current report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned at the outset that I recalled last year having a discussion on some of these matters which came up in the previous Auditor's report. It was my understanding that, for the period which is referred to in the news report, these matters had been cleared up to the satisfaction of the auditor.

Mr. MacDonald: Obviously not!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is not as obvious to me as it may be to the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: That is our problem with the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For example, the news report states that in his report for the financial year ending March 31, 1971, Mr. Spence says he has again had difficulty in getting financial statements and so on. For instance—

Mr. Singer: He says "problems continue." Those were the first two words.

Mr. MacDonald: Why didn't the minister move then? Don't be so dense.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For instance, it is not clear to me from the report that the Auditor is referring to the financial year ended March 31 in respect of—

Mr. Singer: Instead of reading the newspaper report why doesn't the minister read the official document?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because I haven't had it yet.

Mr. Singer: Oh come on!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was tabled yesterday. I just haven't had a chance to read the Auditor's report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: They have it months before.

Mr. Grossman: No, we don't have it months before. The Provincial Auditor's report is not available to the ministers one minute before it is tabled in this House.

Mr. Singer: Well, the minister had it for 12 hours!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I never had it for 12 hours. In fact, I still haven't seen it. And even if I had had it yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I would not have had the opportunity to be in a position to discuss it.

Mr. Lewis: The minister doesn't have to be defiant about it. One day he will read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Even if I had had it yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have come to the quick conclusions that the hon. member opposite may have come to; I would have then asked to meet with the Provincial Auditor and with my staff and gone over this thoroughly before I came to the kind of quick conclusions the hon. member has come to.

Mr. Singer: Every year for three years it has been the same thing!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I don't recall ever discussing this in the House before or being asked this in the House. I don't know what else the hon. member would like except an assurance that anything in the report which does not satisfy the Provincial Auditor will be thoroughly investigated and will be straightened out in accordance with the wishes of the Provincial Auditor.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, without pursuing it too far, if the minister can find approximately 30 seconds to direct himself to pages 14 and 37 of the report, he will see that it does extend to March 31, 1971—it is entirely within his purview as minister—and that it is rather more serious than simply bringing things into line. The auditior says, "I am also concerned about the—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question you are going to ask?

Mr. Lewis: I am asking a question based on this sentence of the report, "I am also concerned about the number of errors in the accounting entries and the weakness in the controls over equipment and appliances, etc."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not asking a question, he is making a statement.

Mr. Lewis: How is that allowed to happen in what is essentially a Crown corporation over which the minister has had purview for some considerable time. Apart from the actual procedures of auditing, how was it managed that there are weaknesses in accounting procedures and questions about purchases and equipment? How is it that the corporation can run in a manner quite so inefficient?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I don't agree, of course, that the management of OHC is inefficient. All I can say to the hon. member again is that there is no use me prejudging what has happened and why it has happened, having regard for the fact that I have just stated I am going to discuss these matters with the Provincial Auditor and with the staff, and if in fact there have been what the hon. member refers to as inefficiencies, they will be straightened out.

Mr. Singer: But the Auditor refers to inefficiencies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right then, I will discuss it with the Auditor and whatever is required by the Auditor, I can assure the hon. members will be carried out.

Mr. Singer: He has asked for it for three years and he still can't get it.

Mr. Speaker, despite the galaxy of titles and new jobs and so on. It is very difficult—oh, here comes the Minister of Public Works; I have a question for him.

Interjections by hon. members.

LAND PURCHASE IN TORONTO

Mr. Singer: Could the Minister of Public Works advise us what use was served the people of Ontario when the Department of Public Works purchased for $800,000 a parcel of land on Bloor Street, having 100 feet frontage and which, according to the Auditor and insofar as he has been able to ascertain, has a right-of-way on it in favour of the University of Toronto which allows a parking facility to that institution for 31 cars; and as far as the Auditor can ascertain is to be used by the city of Toronto and by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education for recreation purposes?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, this parcel of land was purchased by my department as land for future expansion of the building next door. The land was appraised by outside appraisers; the easement to the University of Toronto was taken into consideration in the setting of the appraised price.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain to us, by way of supplementary, why the government would purchase a piece of land to supplement holdings next door, when the government doesn't even own the holdings but in fact leases them.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): That is all.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I understand under the terms of the lease that that building will be owned by the government at the expiration of the lease and this—

Mr. Lewis: Long range planning—lease for 99 years!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —and this lot is available for expansion of that building at any time in the meantime.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us why it was bought at the present time, and if there are in fact any plans for such expansion; and what possible use the present investment of $800,000 is going to be except to provide a continued parking space for 31 cars for the University of Toronto?

Mr. B. Newman: That is over $20,000 a car.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, of course the land was bought when the land was available to protect it for future expansion. The easement for the parking of 31 cars can be accommodated within a much larger parking area that would probably be built in the new structure, when it is built. As I have stated before, in the appraisals of this property it was taken into consideration that there was this easement for the parking of 31 cars.

Mr. Singer: From whom was the land purchased?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the member that. I can get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Who did the appraisal?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't have the name immediately but I can get the name of the appraiser.

Mr. Singer: Could the minister advise us as to the earliest date on which it is likely the province will make any other use of the land than for parking and recreation purposes and why it was necessary to be done now?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I will investigate, Mr. Speaker, as to whether there is any date set as to when the land will be built upon.

I think I did say that the land was bought at the time it was bought because it was available and to have it in government hands for future use rather than to have it bought by a private developer, and not have it available in the future.

Mr. Singer: By way of final supplementary on that point: Could the minister advise us why the Auditor had to say in his report "as far as I am able to determine"? Did the minister not make available to the Auditor the information that the Auditor asked for? And why was the Auditor forced to use as vague a phrase as "as far as I am able to determine," when one would have imagined that the minister's officials would have given a complete statement to the Auditor of the intended use for this land?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, of course, I can't answer that question as to why the Auditor made that remark. I am sure the information that he asked for from my officials was made available to him—the appraisal and so on. I will investigate this—

Mr. Ruston: Sounds like a shady deal!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —to see whether the Auditor asked for any information—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Sounded like Eddie; but it wasn't.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have questions for the Premier (Mr. Davis) and for the member for Chatham (Mr. McKeough) and for a couple of other ministers who aren't here for the moment. We'll let them go.

Hon. Mr. White: Well it is just as well, because—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Singer: The hon. minister has no responsibility so nobody bothers with him anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

PROPOSED GAS PRICE INCREASE

Mr. Lewis: I'll bother with him before the question period is over, and make him feel a little better! Can I ask a question first of the Minister of Natural Resources?

What right has Consumers' Gas to announce an intention to increase rates at a level of four per cent before the end of this year, based on the National Energy Board increase granted to TransCanada PipeLines, without a hearing before the Ontario Energy Board? When is that hearing to take place, and what will the position of the government be?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and Lands and Forests): Well, Mr. Speaker, I know of no announcement that has been made by Consumers' Gas in regard to an increase. I think that the member is fully aware that such an increase has to be heard before the Ontario Energy Board. I have no knowledge of when that hearing would be at this point in time, but I would be glad to check into it and let the hon. member know.

Mr. Lewis: Rather recently a spokesman for Consumers' Gas indicated that we would pay four per cent more by the end of the year as a result of the TransCanada return increase. But the minister is guaranteeing a hearing before the Ontario Energy Board?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly. This has to be because any increase that is granted at the federal level for an increase at the provincial level has to be approved by the Ontario Energy Board.

Mr. Lewis: What gives Consumers' Gas, then, the right to say that residential natural gas consumers in Toronto are likely to pay about four per cent more by the end of this year as a result? What right do they have to make that kind of statement before coming before the Board?

Mr. MacDonald: Is the Energy Board in their pocket?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I certainly can't speak for Consumers' Gas. They can make all kinds of statements. I am sure they do. This is up to them. But from where we stand it has to come before the Ontario Energy Board.

Mr. Lewis: Has the government of Ontario thought of making submissions to the government of Alberta in its present hearings over the price at the wellhead, which will ultimately determine the price to the consumer in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think we have representation at those hearings. Maybe the Minister of Justice (Mr. Bales) would be better qualified to answer that than I would.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry. Minister of what?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Minister of Justice.

Mr. Lewis: Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It would go through him.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister know whether the government of Ontario has made an actual intervention before the hearings in Alberta?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am not certain. I think if the member directed that question to the Minister of Justice he would be glad to answer it.

PROVINCIAL PARK IN BRUCE PENINSULA

Mr. Lewis: It is difficult under the circumstances. I hope the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) returns to the House, Mr. Speaker. I am hoping he hears me wherever he is. I have some questions for him.

In the interim I have a question, of the Minister of Environment first, I think. How far have plans proceeded in the government to purchase the acreage—I believe as much as 90,000 acres—in the Bruce Peninsula for the use of a provincial parkland?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): I think that the hon. member should direct that question to the Minister of Natural Resources. We are not in the parks business.

Mr. Lewis: Fair enough! He will then direct me to Public Works that does the actual purchase. I leave it with them.

Mr. Singer: Here comes the Minister of Health.

Mr. Lewis: Let me ask the Minister of Public Works at what stage are the plans for the acquisition of 90,000 acres for parkland on the escarpment in the Bruce Peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the particular land in the Bruce Peninsula I believe that the hon. member is inquiring about, I do not know the exact details at this moment. We are, of course, purchasing land continuously on the Niagara Escarpment at different locations.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister saying that it has not come to his attention that the government wants to purchase a large acreage for the purpose of a park in the Bruce Peninsula?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am not aware of any request for us to purchase that specific parcel of land, but we are continuously purchasing land in the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Singer: Yes, like on Bloor Street—$800,000.

Mr. Lewis: Excuse me. A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Is it the intention of the government to purchase that large acreage, of which much has been spoken, in the Bruce Peninsula for the purposes of a provincial park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that and assist my colleague, the Minister of Public Works, in this particular matter; it is the intention eventually to acquire for public recreational use approximately 90,000 acres of land in four townships in the Bruce Peninsula; but not totally a provincial park. We have two provincial parks in that particular area. I think members are aware of that beautiful underwater park that was recently declared at the tip of the Bruce Peninsula. There is a small national park on the very tip of the Bruce Peninsula—an island. Just off the point—or inside the point—we have a provincial park which may be increased in size. But it's not the intention to put the whole 90,000 acres into provincial parks when it is purchased.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Has the minister frozen land costs in the area, since it will be a matter of public acquisition now announced?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No. I don't think there is any freeze on the land at all. I think the member is aware that we will be purchasing land up and down the escarpment and all over various areas. To my knowledge there is no freeze.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is aware of what has happened?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: We are aware of the land inflation as well.

Can the minister give us a timetable on the purchase of this land?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No. I have no timetable right at this time, Mr. Speaker. This will be, of course, on a priority basis.

Mr. Singer: The minister is making another examination?

Mr. Lewis: By way of a question to the Minister of Public Works. What purchase—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce had a supplementary, unless the member has asked the question.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, was taken by the other member.

Mr. Speaker: Very good; the hon. member for Scarborough West.

LAND PURCHASES ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Mr. Lewis: One question of the Minister of Public Works: What purchases that he is aware of have recently been made of parcels of the Niagara Escarpment?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the government has purchased a total of 19,819 acres of land on the escarpment totally.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I—

Hon. Mr. Snow: There have been 2,950 acres purchased in this fiscal year to date.

Mr. Lewis: The minister means the fiscal year that ends March 31, 1972?

Hon. Mr. Snow: That is right.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Can he indicate to us where that acreage has been purchased and when it was purchased?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact dates of the purchases but they are in about 10 or 12 different townships. As I say, the total purchases in this fiscal year are 2,950 acres.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister table that information?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I can make this available.

REPORT ON MENTAL HEALTH OF ADOLESCENTS

Mr. Lewis: Thank you.

A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: Is the Minister of Health aware that there has been circulating in his department for almost 20 months a report from the children's special services branch, entitled **"Treating the Untreatable Adolescent,"** chronicling a crisis without precedent in the area of mental health for adolescents in this province?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): That must be one I haven't seen yet. I'll look into it for the member.

Mr. Lewis: Right. May I ask the minister whether he has been informed that of the 10 programmes submitted from the children's services branch, mental health division, the Department of Health, to Treasury Board for expansion or new projects in this last fiscal year, all 10 were turned down?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, Mr. Speaker. I haven't been informed of that at all.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister aware that in the body of the report of the document I refer to—he probably isn't—might he make himself aware that the mental health legislation for children which this House has passed has forced the Children's Aid Societies into an even more invidious position than existed before the legislation? In fact the backlog, the waiting lists and the facilities, are greater in one instance and fewer in the other than prior to the change in legislation.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that I am not aware, because I'm not aware of the report that's been mentioned. Perhaps I could tell the hon. member that the whole mental health programme is being reviewed by myself and by the director of the mental health services in the province.

It is our intention to treat mental health the same as any other health problem is treated in the province. I don't think that it should be segregated as a different entity at all. It is our intention to see that this becomes much more community-oriented to get away from our large institutions as we've known them in the past, and try to get the care and treatment of mental health into the community the same as the treatment of physical illnesses.

Mr. Lewis: One last supplementary: When the minister has seen the report, read it and informed himself of it, would he explain to the House why all the recommendations in the report to cope with this extraordinary problem in Ontario have not been implemented, have gone unheeded by his department—all those recommendations paralleling what the minister allegedly wishes to pursue?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of course, Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible for me to explain what went on in the past and why it was turned down in the past. All I can do is assure the member that I will read it. I will be prepared to discuss it with him when I have.

Mr. MacDonald: We look forward to that with great anticipation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

ONTARIO PLACE DEFICIT

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Trade and Development. Can the minister inform the Legislature how much of the multi-million-dollar deficit he had on Ontario Place he expects to make up by increasing the price of admission to Ontario Place?

An hon. member: Hot dogs at 25 cents.

Hon. Mr. White: I will have to take that question as notice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has taken that question as notice. The hon. member for High Park.

ALLEGED DISTURBANCE AT MILLBROOK

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services. I'd like to ask the minister about the recent reported riot at Millbrook. What was the cause of the riot? What is being done to prevent future riots? How many of the rioters were shipped out to other prisons?

And, most important, would the minister not agree with me that by shipping out his hard-core prisoners from Millbrook, which is supposed to hold hard-core prisoners, to other jails, he is just spreading the dissension?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of a riot in Millbrook.

Mr. Shulman: On January 24.

Hon. Mr. Apps: I don't think the member could consider that as a riot. There may be some disturbances in Millbrook and if it comes to our attention that there may be some problems, what we normally do is to try to make sure that those who may be fomenting the unrest are sent out to various other institutions in the province to try to prevent what might turn out to be a riot.

Mr. Shulman: Then as a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: In the case of this non-riot, why was it necessary to send so many prisoners out in an emergency and so quickly; and would the minister not agree with me that if these troublemakers are sent to other prisons he is just spreading the trouble?

Hon. Mr. Apps: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that is so, because they are spread out in different areas and they are not able to get together. As the member will realize, we try to prevent anything that might develop into a riot and we found this to be a very effective way of doing it.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary, if I may: Would the minister call the situation where 75 per cent of the working force refuses to go to work a minor disturbance?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I wouldn't call it a riot, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ruston: Call it a strike!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A sit-down strike.

Hon. Mr. Apps: There might have been some unrest, but I don't think it developed into a riot.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

CONTROL OF TAX CONSULTANTS

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. In view of the increased number of organizations and individuals dealing with the filing of income tax forms and so forth, is the government considering any type of legislation, regulation or control to protect the public?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, income tax being a federal responsibility, we have not seen fit to control this group of people; but I appreciate the thought expressed in the question and I will look into the matter for the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: All sugar this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR NORTHERN AFFAIRS

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Natural Reresources. Can he explain why the responsibility for northern affairs has been removed from the north-based Minister of Natural Resources and placed with the Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs when the Premier clearly indicated or promised that particular responsibility would remain with the northern minister?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased that the member for Thunder Bay has asked this question because I know he appreciates how much the northern affairs officers are doing in northern Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What a lot of nonsense! That's one of 29 cases—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'm just concerned for the north.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member is quite right. The Committee on Government Productivity did suggest that it should go to another department of government, but I can reassure the member for Thunder Bay that this decision has not been firmed as yet and the organization known as the northern affairs branch in my department will remain in my department until the government makes a decision. There is no decision made as yet.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary, I would like to refer to the report that was just put on our desks yesterday afternoon and signed by this very minister saying: "It is expected that the northern affairs branch will become part of the new Ministry of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs"—and the minister signed it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: Now, that's pretty firm.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That has changed.

Mr. Stokes: It's changed, too, for the report.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: If it didn't change with the report, it changed this morning as a result of the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River with a supplementary.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary question of the minister, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister realize that we in the north consider this a downgrading of the department rather than an improvement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh, I don't think it is, Mr. Speaker—not at all. The northern affairs branch will get stronger instead of weaker.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

Mr. J. F. Goulds (Port Arthur): A supplementary: I would like to ask the minister why the northern affairs branch was assigned to a northern minister such a relatively short time before the events of October, 1971, and why so soon after the events of October,

1971, it was assigned to a minister whose main concern is not the north?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that question. The decision by the government that this branch should be moved is not firm. It is that plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

ESSEX COUNTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Education. When does the minister plan to announce a decision on the request of the Essex county board of education to approve or disapprove of their action with regard to the director of education in the county of Essex?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would be ready to offer a decision very soon in this matter were it not for the fact that there is a case before the courts.

As the hon. member is aware, the director who has been suspended presently has a suit in the courts against the board and the legal advice I have at this time is that we should say nothing in regard to this case.

Mr. Ruston: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In what status does the present director of education stand then, after the county passed a resolution dismissing him? Who now pays his salary or is he on salary?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to get that information for the hon. member. I asked this very question myself and I am not sure at this point in time.

I think the Act is rather unsure in this particular matter. I would like to have it checked out and I will get the answer for both the hon. member and the Essex county board.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East, if there are no further supplementaries.

ELIGIBILITY FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Revenue: In view of the fact that the board of the Sudbury Housing Authority has issued instructions to its staff that no one outside the limits of the city of Sudbury is to be considered for either senior citizen housing or otherwise, would the minister look into this matter? Would he bring to the Sudbury board's attention that, first, I think it is discriminatory and, second, because the province and the federal government pay the bill for this, all residents in that area should be entitled to a house based on needs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to look into this matter and provide the hon. member with the information as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

COST OF ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary of the Minister of Trade and Development but I see he is on the verge of leaving the chamber. Has he gone? May I have the attention of the Minister of Trade and Development, please? He will want to take notice of this question, I am sure.

Could the minister tell the House what the final cost of Ontario Place is and why there is a considerable discrepancy now between the original forecast and expenditures already made?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister catches up with his homework quickly because some of these answers are very urgent.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: He can't give a supplementary.

Mr. Givens: In January, there was a report—

Mr. Speaker: Order! There can be no supplementary when a question is taken as notice; and the hon. member is making a statement.

The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. W. Hodgson: No wonder the member didn't get along in Ottawa if this is the way he carries on.

DE HAVILLAND LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon), I would like to direct a question

to the Premier. In view of the fact that the industrial dispute at the de Havilland plant in North York has now entered its seventh week without serious bargaining, would the Premier initiate action to bring the two parties together around the bargaining table?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will discuss this matter with the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Lewis: It will help to build the STOL aircraft for the Premier's airport if he has the plant working.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is not in my riding.

COST OF WELFARE PAYMENTS

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Has the minister's department done any studies as to the costs undertaken by the province in respect to welfare payments to people whose unemployment insurance payments have been delayed? Have there been any studies?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I am sure this question of delays in unemployment insurance has caused a lot of problems to all the members. It has caused severe financial problems to the municipalities and to the province. Our department has been working with the federal Department of Manpower to establish an arrangement whereby moneys that have been paid by municipalities and by this government could be recovered for welfare payments that have been made.

This is a problem, of course, that is Canada-wide. Every province is experiencing this same problem. This is due, I believe, to the new Unemployment Insurance Act that was introduced last year. But we are making progress and we hope to be able to have an agreement soon, whereby we and the municipalities will be able to recover these sums of money.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate the recovery attempt, but I am wondering, does the minister have any idea what the cost is up until this point—the added cost?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We in the department know that it is a substantial amount of money. It is in the neighbourhood of $2 million or $3 million, if not more.

Mr. Gaunt: Is it $3 million, $4 million?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes, it is about that, in that neighbourhood. As I said we are in the process with the federal government of trying to recover these advanced sums of money.

Mr. Gaunt: If the negotiations with the federal government work out, what percentage of that money does the minister anticipate recovering?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be rather difficult to answer this question at this time.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker no, it is a new question.

Mr. Speaker: Further supplementaries?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member from Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: May I ask the hon. minister if directives have gone to the welfare departments in municipalities that they should give priorities or pay attention to those who are having difficulty collecting unemployment insurance payments, because I know in my own community a lot of them, did not know that they could go to the local Department of Social and Family Services.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Why doesn't the member get after Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I am just speaking from my own experience in my own riding, Mr. Speaker. This has been done there, so I am sure this must be general throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

HAMILTON HARBOUR PRESERVATION

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Prime Minister: Can the Prime Minister indicate why his government has refused to involve itself in the dispute over the preservation of the Hamilton harbour, since it is vital to all of the tertiary treatment plants for both industrial and municipal purposes in that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that really should be raised with the Minister of the Environment. As I recall, the

minister made some observations as to the constitutional position of the province, whether in fact we could do anything in this regard. I certainly will discuss it with him. Perhaps the hon. member would like to direct the question to him on Monday. But my recollection is there is a constitutional problem.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

LAKE ERIE COTTAGERS LAND RIGHTS RULING

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the government leader: Will the minister inform the House as to whether or not the government will appeal a decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal of February 3, 1972, pertaining to certain cottage owners on Lake Erie, ruling that they possess and control the lands right to the water's edge?

Mr. Singer: Nobody knows who is responsible for that.

An hon. member: That's the way the question is.

Mr. Haggerty: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, when I said the government leader, I thought there would be about five or six of them jump up. But perhaps I should direct it directly to the Prime Minister, or the Premier of the province—I should phrase it that way.

Would the Prime Minister inform the House as to whether or not the government will appeal the decision of Ontario Court of Appeal of February 3, 1972, pertaining to certain cottage owners on Lake Erie, ruling that they possess and control the lands right to the water's edge?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter is being discussed by the government. I hope to be in a position to inform the House some time very soon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) I believe has been trying to gain the floor. If not, the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

GOVERNMENT TREATMENT OF CERTAIN RIDINGS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: When a city or a riding does not elect a government supporter in a provincial election, it is—

An hon. member: They have made a mistake.

Mr. Burr: That is the point of my question. Is it the government's policy to punish that area by withholding loans, grants and other favours?

Mr. Singer: It certainly is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this government treats all ridings and all people in this province in equitable and similar fashion.

An hon. member: Amen!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Amen!

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Would the Premier please notify the Progressive Conservative candidates in Essex county of this policy so that they will not imply that he has a different policy?

Mr. MacDonald: Reply; repeat the traditional attitude.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if an individual in Essex county or in the city of Windsor who was, or may be in the future, a candidate for the party that I lead, indicates that his or her participation here at Queen's Park might be to the general benefit of that community as their ability might dictate, far be it from me to discourage that kind of discussion.

Mr. MacDonald: Tra la! It is only a frustration of the democratic process duly recorded at election time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

IMPROPER PROMOTION

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: Have steps been taken by the Ontario Securities Commission to recover, for the victims, the profits made by R. G. Johnston, through improper promotion of shares of the United Investment Life Insurance Company, for which his former employer was recently reprimanded by the commission?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have not been informed of this particular incident. I shall inquire from my officials and reply to the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Doesn't the minister read the newspapers?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

QUEEN'S PRINTER

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Provincial Secretary or whoever can answer for the Queen's Printer, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister ensure, under the same arrangement by which the Queen's Printer sends out all government documents printed by him to the full depository libraries in Ontario, that sufficient numbers of other government publications not printed by the Queen's Printer can be received by him for the same and similar distribution?

Mr. Deans: Not all at one time now, fellows. The member better tell him who it is.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Queen's Printer falls under the jurisdiction of my department. I don't know exactly what publications the hon. member is referring to, but I do know that we do have a distribution of publications, such as annual reports of departments, to the libraries. If the member would like to give me more detailed information as to what publications he is referring to, I will certainly get the answer for him.

Mr. Bounsall: A further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. Singer, that Mr. Rowe, member for the electoral district of Northumberland, and Mr. W. Hodgson, member for the electoral district of York North, be appointed chairman and deputy chairman, respectively, of the committees of the whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that the standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed as follows:

1. Procedural affairs committee.
2. Administration of justice committee.

Committees 1 and 2, combined under the chairmanship of the chairman of the administration of justice committee, will function as the private bills committee.

3. Social development committee.
4. Resources development committee.
5. Estimates committee.
6. Public accounts committee.
7. Regulations committee.

Which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, provided that all boards and commissions are hereby referred to committees numbers 1 to 4 in accordance with the policy areas indicated by the titles of the said committees.

Public accounts for the last fiscal year are hereby referred to the public accounts committee and all regulations to the regulations committee.

All standing committees shall report from time to time their observations and opinions on the matters referred to them, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has put forward the same short motion that governed committee proceedings in the last session of the last Parliament. This was tried as a bold new experiment, but I don't think it was any improvement at all over what had existed before. What we came to in fact, and what the Premier suggests again, is a stylized and formalized committee system that is completely and absolutely in control of the government, is used only for casual examination of statutes and has no ability to generally examine the performance of government departments.

The putting of this motion today—and the motion will carry, Mr. Speaker—continues the denigration of the role of the private member in this Legislature. We have no ability really to inquire, when the House is in session, into the functioning of various departments. An example of this today is the apparent ignorance—and I accept it; the minister said so—of the minister responsible for the Ontario Housing Corp. of what has gone on in relation to the reporting of its financial affairs.

We can't get at it in the question period. We are not going to be able to get at it, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that might be allocated by the particular committee to which is allotted the affairs of Ontario Housing.

We have a myriad of government agencies and it has become almost like the ritual

rain dance. They come in every year and the minister has a fixed statetment which he reads about the wonders that he and his agency perform. He is surrounded by his PR men and by the people with glib answers.

Under our committee system, we never really have the ability to examine what goes on in these various government agencies, and we are not able to get it in the House any longer because, by this game of tick-tack-toe or shuffleboard, whatever it is called, we can't get any consistency in responsibility in the Treasury benches. We can't get anyone who feels that he has a duty and a responsibility to answer. And something brand new has been added: The Premier every now and then in the last day or two has become sufficiently embarrassed to stand up and say, "Let me answer that, because I am not sure which one of my 22 ministers or five parliamentary assistants is in fact going to be able to do it."

This is the best the Premier can come to. He has got a brand-new bright, management-conceived, supposedly efficient system of runnning, not the Legislature but of running government, and he wants to leave out the private member. This just isn't good enough.

We don't have research facilities attached to these committees. We don't have people to advise the private members, and the private members have no ability at all to get at what government is supposed to be doing.

Mr. Speaker, the motion is really meaningless. It allows the government to continue to process matters through. It allows no new inquiry, no real inquiry, and one must wonder how long the Premier and his colleagues are going to continue to fool, or believe they are fooling, the people, who believe that this Legislature is supposed to be a meaningful place where debate and inquiry can be conducted. It isn't, and the introduction of this motion today adds to the continuing disregard of the Legislature by the government.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more. I don't think there is any point in continuing this debate. We have had it year after year. The government religiously resists the kind of suggestions that have come forward. I am putting them forward again, but I know they are falling on deaf ears, and with that I will let this motion move.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am of equally faint heart, but for a moment or two I want to deal with the motion.

I have some small reason to hope that the commission, which is referred to in the Throne Speech, may treat seriously of the dilemma of the private member in this Legislature and may treat seriously of the need to entirely overhaul and remodel the committee system; and without prejudging that commission I assume that in the very near future it will emerge and something will come of its proposals and recommendations.

In the interim, I am sorry that the Premier has seen necessary to reconfirm a pattern which is clearly in disrepute in the Legislature. With great respect to him, Mr. Speaker, the committee system to which we have been subjected in the last year or so has not worked effectively, has spawned enormous frustration among the members and simply patterning it again on precisely the same principle will do the same for this session, which is unnecessary and a little demeaning.

I want to suggest the four areas where we should obviously alter that committee system and move an amendment to that effect, because I think these things should be put:

1. It is wrong that the committee should work only at the direction of the House. The committee should be seen to have enough integrity of their own and capacity of their own to direct their own affairs at those times when the House does not do so. It is an absurd slur on the capacity of a committee, made up as it is dominantly by government members, to suggest that it cannot explore matters of its own choosing. It is an unduly arbitrary exercise of executive authority to keep those committees knuckled under government, and to deny the committee the right to investigate things which may cause embarrassment to government, although in fact all they would do would be to bring more information before the public.

2. The committee must have the right to engage counsel, must have the right to engage expert staff, and to pay them.

3. It is obvious that we must have unlimited substitution of members on those committees. I do not know what it is about the government which refuses to allow members of this Legislature to substitute freely on committees with advance notice. The principle of continuity which the government argues is, of course, destroyed if the member isn't there.

When we have committees sitting jointly and severally, as has happened last session—it was a real shambles—at least it should be possible for members of the same party to

substitute, so that the same philosophic point of view can continue to be made and the things which parties have shared in caucus can continue to be put. The government is stubborn and obstinate in a way which is really infantile in refusing to allow the simple substitution of members on these committees so that we can always have a particular viewpoint represented.

4. Finally, of course, to make them relevant, they should be reported in Hansard. That would not be an undue procedure; it would make sense, because the standing committees make sense.

I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following clauses:

1. Which said committees shall severally be empowered on their own initiative when not otherwise engaged on matters and things referred to them by the House, to examine and inquire into such further and other matters and things related to, or in any way touching upon, matters and things within their competence as they in their discretion may determine.

2. Which said committees shall severally be empowered to engage counsel and from time to time such other expert staff as may be necessary to enable the committees to discharge their responsibilities.

3. That unlimited substitution of the said committees be permitted with notice to the chairman to be given prior to or at the beginning of each meeting.

4. That the proceedings of the committees be reported by Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just to reply very briefly to the observations. As the member for Downsview has observed, we have discussed this issue really for the past several years. I think it is fair to state that from my observations in the past two years the committee structure, while still not achieving perfection—and I am the first to recognize this—has been a distinct improvement over the procedures of former years. I think we have made progress, but I am the first to admit there is work yet to be done.

Of course, this was one of the reasons for the statement in the Throne Speech related to the commission. There is no doubt that this will be one of the areas they will be assessing and reviewing with the advice and assistance of those who will be participating. I would be hopeful that certain constructive recommendations may emerge at that time.

I would make this personal observation, as it relates to the question of substitution. I would think this is something that the commission might very properly assess. I have mixed feelings on it. I really am not unalterably opposed to that particular concept, but I think it would be appropriate for the proposed commission, when we get into a discussion of this in the House some time very soon, that this perhaps could be part of the assessment they would make.

I would just make this further observation to the hon. member for Downsview. While I appreciate his frustrations from time to time, I would only say this to him, through you Mr. Speaker, that it appears to us on this side of this House that while the committee system may not represent perfection and while he may not always get the answers that he likes in this Legislature—usually because they don't agree with his own personal point of view—it sounds to me that he has somewhat abdicated his interest and responsibility in some of the observations that he has made.

Mr. Singer: I guess we are getting to the Premier!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not at all.

Mr. Singer: The Premier's temper is getting short.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I intended to rise before the Premier did. I would just like to make one observation—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It sometimes hurts, doesn't it?

Mr. Reid: —in relation to—I believe it was the third point made by the leader of the New Democratic Party. If I may have the Premier's attention?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am listening very carefully—more carefully than the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Reid: That point is simply this, that in going over the new governmental responsibilities and the switching around of those responsibilities, it is impossible for a member of the opposition who is given a particular task to be put on one committee and to fulfil his complete responsibilities for that particular department that he was perhaps responsible for before. Because of the diffusion of these responsibilities one almost has to sit on two or three committees.

As well, there are some of us over here who are interested in more than one field of government and the present system does not give us the opportunity to take part in those other fields. Now if, as the Premier has indicated in his remarks of a few seconds ago, he is not tied to this non-substitution and he feels that it is perhaps a matter that this government commission can look into, perhaps he would realize the feeling of this party, the feeling of the NDP and perhaps of his own members, and he would be willing to change and allow this free substitution, and let the government commission look into that aspect rather than waiting until this government commission comes in, because it is going to be a period of complete frustration for us. Does the Premier understand my point?

Mr. Lewis: It is a valid point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just going to make this observation so we all understand one another. The Throne Speech did not say it would be a government commission. I think it is rather important that we perhaps recognize that it could very easily be a legislative commission, not a government commission.

Mr. B. Newman: A select committee?

Mr. Reid: Is the Premier willing to accept that change of free substitution or not? That is the main point.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I said that I am not unalterably opposed to that whatsoever. It is something that I believe the commission should assess. If we find during the discussions in the House the functioning of the system—to me it would be relatively easy to change if this were one of the initial recommendations. I am not prepared to do it until this assessment is made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I want to make an observation in respect to the regulations committee. For some years past a movement spearheaded by the then-member for Woodbine moved back and forth in the opposition benches of this House asking that before regulations are laid down the members of the Legislature have some participation in what those regulations are to be. And so it was advocated at that time that the regulations committee should be set up so that proposed regulations could be examined by that committee of the House and then amended, changed, and finally brought before the House and presented. When the committee was set up last year, those of us who were on that committee found to our consternation that we had absolutely no power as a committee. That is not unusual, perhaps, in many of the committees, because of the government preponderance on them, but in this case what we were presented with was the Gazetted regulations after they had been Gazetted, so that it was, Mr. Speaker, a nice little exercise in education.

The committee was told what the civil service had done and what the minister had agreed to, but we had absolutely no chance to participate in the formation of the regulations. Now it seems to me that is an exercise in sheer futility, and if we are to take time for this committee then we should have those regulations before they go to the Ontario Gazette. We should have some chance to discuss them before they are finalized, and I bring to the Prime Minister's attention this facet of this committee's work which seems to me must be changed to make the committee meaningful.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Lewis moves that the resolution be amended by adding thereto the following clauses:

> Which said committees shall severally be empowered on their own initiative when not otherwise engaged in matters and things referred to them by the House,
>
> To examine and inquire into such further and other matters and things related to or in any way touching upon matters and things within their competence as they in their discussion may determine;
>
> Which said committees shall severally be empowered to engage counsel and from time to time such other staff as may be necessary to enable the committees to discharge their responsibilities;
>
> That unlimited substitution of the said committees be permitted with notice to the chairman to be given prior to or at the beginning of each meeting;
>
> That the proceedings of the committees be reported by Hansard.

Those in favour of Mr. Lewis' motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Mr. Lewis: We will suffer your opinion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Downsview was so hot about this and he was not here to vote.

Mr. Speaker: Those in favour of Hon. Mr. Davis' motion will please say "aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves that commencing on Wednesday, March 8, and until further ordered, each Wednesday will be reserved for the committees of standing and or select committees and the House will therefore not meet in the legislative chamber.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills. The hon. member for St. David.

TORONTO URBAN FOUNDATION

Mrs. Scrivener moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Toronto Urban Foundation.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, the Toronto Urban Foundation Act 1972: The purpose of this bill is to establish a foundation to study the sociological and psychological affects of urban living upon residents in Metropolitan Toronto, and to assist in the long-range planning of urban areas in Ontario.

CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill introduces the concept of strict liability for the manufacturing, selling or leasing of defective and/or dangerous consumer products.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I beg leave to present the annual review of the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs for the calendar year 1971. You have kindly allowed me to place a copy of this report on each of the members' desks and I would urge all members to go through it with complete care. I know that they will find it a real source of information and, of course, for reference in the period ahead.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, this annual publication has earned recognition, not only in the mining industry but throughout the schools of Ontario, and all educational areas, for the tremendous amount of valuable information and references in this particular booklet

I also want at this time to compliment the staff of my department for producing such a comprehensive report in such a short period of time. I did a quick examination across Canada, I might say, and I can say to you that no other department in any government in Canada has produced so consistently a report so comprehensive in such a short period of time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment of the House, I wonder if the House leader could tell us exactly what Monday holds for us?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, on Monday, we will proceed with the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Deans: And the private members' hour?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Hon. W. A. Davis (Premier): We cannot tell the hon. member exactly what it will hold, but we can tell him that it is going to go on.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:15 o'clock, a.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 3, 1972

OHC financial records re Provincial Auditor's report, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 65

Land purchase in Toronto adjoining U of T, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 67

Proposed gas price increase re Ontario Energy Board hearing, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 68

Provincial park in Bruce Peninsula re land acquisition, questions of Mr. Snow and Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 69

Land purchases on the Niagara Escarpment, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Lewis 70

Report on mental health of adolescents, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 70

Ontario Place deficit, question of Mr. White: Mr. Givens 71

Alleged disturbance at Millbrook, questions of Mr. Apps: Mr. Shulman 71

Control of tax consultants, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. B. Newman 72

Ministerial responsibility for northern affairs, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes, Mr. Reid, Mr. Foulds 72

Essex County director of education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Ruston 73

Eligibility for housing assistance to residents outside Sudbury, question of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Martel 73

Cost of Ontario Place, question of Mr. White: Mr. Givens 73

De Havilland labour dispute, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Young 73

Cost of welfare payments to unemployed with delayed insurance payments, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. B. Newman 74

Hamilton Harbour preservation dispute, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 74

Lake Erie cottagers land rights ruling, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Haggerty 75

Government treatment of certain ridings which do not elect government supporters, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Burr 75

Ontario Securities Commission and improper promotion of shares, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Deacon 75

Queen's Printer re distribution of publications, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bounsall 76

Motion to appoint Mr. Rowe and Mr. W. Hodgson as chairman and deputy chairman of the whole House, Mr. Davis, agreed to 76

Motion to appoint standing committees of the House, Mr. Davis, agreed to 76

Toronto Urban Foundation, bill to establish, Mrs. Scrivener, first reading 80

Consumer Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 80

Report, annual, Mines and Northern Affairs, Mr. Bernier 80

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 80

No. 5

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 6, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: In the west gallery are students from St. Thomas More School in Mississauga, and from the Woodland Centennial Senior Public School of Pickering; in the east gallery Oak Park Junior High School, Toronto, and Saint Jane Francis School of Downsview.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What ministry?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there must be something on this afternoon that is keeping the government benches otherwise occupied.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Trips to China!

PLEA BARGAINING IN ONTARIO COURTS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: However, the Provincial Secretary for Justice has arrived—

Mr. Singer: Buying land.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —I would like to ask him, as he takes his seat, if he is now prepared to give the House a statement on plea bargaining which he promised some weeks ago?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): I believe the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) is the one to ask.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We have got the wrong one again!

Mr. Singer: Here we go again!

Mr. Stokes: The Alphonse and Gaston act.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I believe the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, will be indicating the nature of the directives that will be sent out to the Crown attorneys within a few days.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is that not a matter of policy?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary. The member for Sarnia makes a good point. Surely that is a matter for policy and why wouldn't the policy minister have something to say about it?

How is the decision made, Mr. Speaker, as to which minister will actually develop the stance and deliver it to the Legislature?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I shall be glad to indicate some of the matters that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should have read about before this. The jobs—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Doesn't the minister think a statement such as this is a policy statement?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think that a statement such as this falls directly within the purview of an operating ministry or department of this government—

Mr. Bullbrook: What does that—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —and therefore statements respecting those matters in the House are better directed to those individual ministers who have the day-to-day problems; this is the proper procedure.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a further supplementary, does the minister recall giving an undertaking to me in December that he would make a statement to the House in this connection?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, why don't we—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: And I did that in my function as the Attorney General of the Province of Ontario; and I am indicating to the Leader of the Opposition now that I believe that statement is about ready to be made by the Attorney General.

Mr. Bullbrook: I rise on a point of order.

I think we should clarify this as quickly as possible. I suggest to you most respectfully, Mr. Speaker, that in this Parliament we

will not get one issue that is more blatantly involved in policy than the statement my leader has asked for. Now as I understand the response, speaking to this point of order, of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, it is that the transference of that policy will ultimately require administrative details and, therefore, the response should come from the Attorney General. I suggest to you then, within the ambit of that response, Mr. Speaker, when are we ever going to get replies to questions from secretaries responsible for policy in that government?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Never! We will never get any answers. They don't do anything. How can they answer?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker I—do you want to comment on that point, sir.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Could I ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker? Could the Provincial Secretary for Justice delineate to us one or two headings which he believes are policies so that we might be able to direct a few questions to them?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Or tell us what he does.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the question once again is to tell members what I do, that is a different question completely than attempting to put me on the griddle to make answers during the question period in this House for administrative or even policy matters relating to a single department.

As far as the job of policy ministers goes, as I say if the hon. members had taken the time to do a little bit of their homework and read some of the material that has been available to them, as it has been to everybody else, generally speaking the job of the policy ministers, as I understand it, is to communicate, to co-ordinate and to initiate policy within the government.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister is not communicating.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How about a little co-ordinating in the Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Is he now prepared to make a statement to the House on plea bargaining, which was promised by his predecessor in December?

Mr. Deans: Who has since been elevated to the position of communicator.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, this is a matter that came to my attention when I came into the department. It is of great concern to me as it was to my predecessor, the Provincial Secretary of Justice.

Mr. Lewis: And to his predecessor. It was part of the predecessor's chat.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The Crown Attorneys' Association was consulted in reference to this matter and has made certain submissions to me, since I came to the department. I wanted to talk to the people in the Ontario Law Reform Commission, the chairman particularly, and this I have done. As soon as my consideration of the plea bargaining situation is completed, I will communicate it to the Crown attorneys throughout the province. At that time, I will be pleased to present the material to the members of this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can I ask the Attorney General if he feels that among those that he would consult would be the policy minister for Justice?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Certainly!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Has he so consulted him, because the policy minister indicated that the statement was in preparation and would be available shortly.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The policy minister and I have very close liaison on these matters.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What has he said that is different from what I said?

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Nothing!

ORGANIZED CRIME IN ONTARIO

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Can he give the House some further information to the comment that he made publicly about a week ago, which led him to warn that organized crime was becoming a stronger threat in this province?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the hon. member had been on his feet during the estimates he would have learned that those were my views in my job as Attorney General last year. I have been reiterating this off and on in various public statements, both within this Legislature and without this Legislature, since March 1 of last year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary question then—really for a matter of clarification—does the minister feel it is his duty publicly to point out the dangers and the responsibility of his colleague, the Attorney General or the public protector sitting over there, or the Solicitor General, who may or may not be here, to take the action that is needed from the warnings that the policy minister is speaking about?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I would be glad to speak to that. We have in the works, as part of the function of my job as Provincial Secretary for Justice, some new policies which will be detailed during the course, I hope, of this session of the Legislature, and also as part of some of those new policies which will be enunciated by the departmental minister in due course. I feel it is part of my chore to, in effect, prepare not only the members of the public but the members of this Legislature in advance with some of the reasons for some of the new policies and some of the new structures and format and organization as far as combatting crime in this province is concerned; and this is part of it.

Mr. Lewis: What does that mean? What does all that mean?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: You just keep your shirt on and you will find out!

Mr. Lewis: I am very comfortable, thank you.

Mr. Singer: Is that one of the minister's preparations?

GOVERNMENT ACTION AGAINST DOW CHEMICAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further question of the Attorney General, I guess. Could he give a status report to the House on the suit against Dow Chemical that was entered into about a year ago?

Mr. Singer: That is a good question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By his predecessor!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the action against Dow Chemical commenced last spring. The defendants were Dow Chemical of Canada Ltd. and Dow Chemical Incorporated, the American Company, and the inclusion of the American company as a defendant was challenged. It went before the court and that matter is still before the court. I anticipate that it will be before the Master shortly. I think it was the Master who was dealing with it because of the challenge by the American Company to being a defendant. Certain law officers in the Attorney General's department were called before the court to testify and I anticipate that it will be before the court again this month.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: It will be before the courts this month?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is right.

Mr. Singer: The trial?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, not the trial. It has to go on—

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean it has taken him a year to find out who he is suing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, it has not taken us a year to find out who we are suing.

Mr. Lewis: Of course it has.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We know very well who we are suing. One of the defendants does not like it, that is all.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, would the Attorney General care to guess when the trial would likely commence—1973, 1974, 1975?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in guessing. I have some very definite ideas when that may take place.

Mr. Singer: Tell us!

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Tell us; or is that policy?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General has a definite idea could he take the House into his confidence and tell us what that idea is?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The hon. member, being a member of the legal profession, knows perfectly well the steps that must take place; there must be examinations for discovery. They will take place in the next months and then following that the trial will take place.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It has been a year since the announcement.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, it hasn't.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Hon. Mr. Kerr) said it was going to go to trial this spring.

Mr. Reid: He was never right anyway.

Mr. Lewis: Then they put him in universities!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

One of the hon. ministers has indicated to me he should like to revert to ministerial statements. Do I have the permission of the House in order that questions may be asked?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): No.

Mr. Lewis: It depends on which minister.

Mr. Bullbrook: Which minister? We like some of them.

Mr. Speaker: We have not received unanimous consent in any case.

Mr. D. C. Macdonald (York South): That means the minister will get here on time for a change.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DETOXICATION CENTRES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General, and this may have to be redirected. Can he give us a status report on the expenditure of the $4 million that was to be used to improve and establish detoxication centres? I think this has importance since the death of someone in the drunk tank at one of the Toronto jails occurred in January this year.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I think that question really should go to the Minister of Health because the expenditure of the money comes under that department rather than under the ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me I will redirect the question. As the Minister of Health is here, I trust he heard the question?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The detoxication centres are in the process of being planned now for several areas of the province. We will have several of them in operation very, very shortly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: What about the situation in Metropolitan Toronto? There is the problem elsewhere, I understand, but it is here where we have had the substantial problems culminating in some deaths; the most recent one in January.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Metropolitan Toronto will be included in the programme, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, what does that mean? Which detoxication centres have been established? Which are pending; for which places and on which dates?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am sorry, I cannot give that information. I haven't got it all at my fingertips, but I will certainly have it available for the member tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: I won't push the minister. Just give us one or two examples—perhaps two or three.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. Lewis: Just a couple of examples.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have two operating now in Toronto, as the member knows—one in the west end and one in the east end—and we have, I think, six in the process of being organized. I can give all the details and when we hope to have them in operation to the member tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, okay!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

TELEGRAM PUBLISHING CO. LTD.

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour. Can he now give us the status report on his department's investigation into the termination of The Toronto Telegram?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very pleased to inform the hon. member that just about one hour ago I authorized the director of the employment standards branch to appoint a one-man committee to investigate in connection with the Telegram Publishing Co.

Mr. Lewis: I am not sure I can absorb all of that so quickly. The minister has authorized the director of the employment standards branch to appoint someone to look into it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Exactly, Mr. Speaker, under section 10 of the Employment Standards Act.

Mr. MacDonald: It took the minister five months to do that?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, I have only been minister for a month, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister and his predecessor!

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, now that the minister has authorized the investigation which he undertook to make a number of months ago, who is the commissioner going to be to investigate it?

Mr. MacDonald: Not John Bassett, I hope!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker. The appointee is Mr. Carter, a professor at Queen's University who obtained a Bachelor of Law degree from Queen's in 1966.

Mr. Lewis: I take it, by way of supplementary, that Mr. Carter is one of those on the list of the labour-management arbitration group acceptable to all?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I couldn't answer that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, will Mr. Carter have the right to procure documents and require that evidence be presented to him by the owners of The Telegram as well as by its former employees?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I have in front of me the terms of reference—

Mr. Lewis: Could the minister read them?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, they are quite long. I think they have to do mostly with the ground rules—to see if their ground rules have been changed as far as notices of termination are concerned and with reference to the status of certain employees. These are included within the terms of reference, but I would be glad to show the balance to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: I shan't pursue it except to say I take it that included in the terms of reference is an examination of whether or not the Telegram Publishing Company violated the Employment Standards Act in the nature of its termination and the treatment of its employees?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Exactly.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker: But we would also assume under these circumstances that the other areas of interest and concern about the closing of the Telegram would be excluded and that this appointed person—would the minister call him a commissioner?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, we don't call him a commissioner. It is a one-man inquiry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That the person conducting the inquiry would be restricted only to matters pertaining to the Employment Standards Act. Or would he have broader terms?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be glad to make a statement tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, on the full terms of reference.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources in a similar vein.

Is he now prepared to table, or has he tabled—perhaps I missed it—the full material on the Sandbanks sand dunes negotiations thus far and the various properties that are being looked at?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): By the way, how is the minister's eyesight?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and Lands and Forests): My eyesight? Great. I would like to show the member the pictures of the sand dunes and maybe take him down there and show him a few things.

Mr. Lawlor: Look what the Globe and Mail says about the minister's eyesight.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't really know what the member is talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, the information is not completely prepared yet.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is obviously too touchy.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Well, the minister is on the receiving end of the Globe and Mail editorials.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That was an asinine report if you ask me.

Mr. Singer: Is that parliamentary?

Mr. MacDonald: Globe and Mail report asinine? Get that on the record!

Mr. Singer: Almost as bad as they say in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I might make a statement along that line. It would take eight years to level the ground at the rate they are taking sand out now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: It will take years to level the ground?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Eight years—and we will have the matter cleaned up long before then.

Mr. Lewis: I don't know whether the minister will have it cleaned up long before that; but what about the documents he promised to the House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we're working on those and we hope to table them very soon.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that under the terms of the lease with the Lake Ontario Cement Company, article 8 states that trees may not be removed without prior permission of the district forester. I'm given to understand that there's considerable devastation of trees now, as well. Has that the permission of the minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am not aware of this matter, Mr. Speaker, but I'd certainly be glad to look into that aspect of the lease.

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps the minister should go out and view the site.

Mr. Deans: Maybe he would know more about it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'll take the member with me.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Take them both.

Mr. Lewis: Well, take the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Okay.

Mr. Lewis: He'll speak for the caucus on this. May I ask a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

Mr. Lewis: Now that the Minister of Health, I'm sure, is familiar with the document, internal to his special services branch, the mental health division, can he indicate to the House what action the government intends to take?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I sure can, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Yes—we heard that last time.

Mr. Stokes: Has the minister read it yet?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I didn't; the member for Downsview didn't ask me before.

We have two assessment centres which will be constructed this year; and there'll be one long-term closed unit, for long-term patients, which will be in the mill for this year. In the proposal that was recommended for consideration there were two assessment centres, three long-term closed units and a rural community programme. We are starting, as some of the member's confreres will tell him, with some pilot projects, some community projects. In addition to that, the two assessment centres will be on their way very shortly; and one long-term closed unit will be on its way very shortly.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the Minister satisfied in his own mind that this will answer the crisis as outlined in the document prepared by his staff?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I'm satisfied that they can get this on the road; and we're going to continue along the lines as recommended to provide the facilities that are needed. I think I told the member last week that we are anxious to get community involved as much as possible and to develop community centres. We are interested in one or two projects that have already been recommended to us in the city of Toronto and we hope to get these started this year. That's in addition to this.

Mr. Lewis: It was indicated in a newspaper story that the minister was meeting with his officials today. Did that meeting take place today? Has there been an alteration in programme based on that meeting?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know anything about that meeting. I read in the paper Saturday that Dr. Rae-Grant—and incidentally Dr. Rae-Grant was misquoted. I think I should bring to the attention of the hon. members of the Legislature that most of that article was

taken from the report; that Dr. Rae-Grant was badly misquoted and that she didn't make the statements she was quoted as making. In that article it said that Rae-Grant had arranged to meet with me this morning. Well of course she didn't say that, because no meeting had been set up with me this morning. She did contact me over the weekend because she was very concerned about the statements that were made in the press and I arranged to see her this morning.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister see her this morning?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I saw her, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Then that particular in the Globe and Mail story was correct?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, it wasn't correct.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister did see her this morning.

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, that wasn't what the member asked. He asked me if I saw her as arranged. It was not arranged previously.

Mr. Lewis: Until the weekend! Well, perhaps it facilitated the arrangement then.

I would be interested to know precisely which parts of that story are alleged to be inaccurate; because, without compromising Dr. Naomi Rae-Grant, I also had a discussion with her and did not find such inaccuracy.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well Dr. Naomi Rae-Grant, when she met with me this morning, stated emphatically that she did say she wasn't surprised that no action had been taken on the report, because, quite frankly, you don't very often get action with the report without it having been reviewed to decide what part of the recommendations you're going to accept; and as I understood her to say, this was what she meant when she said that, but it was interpreted differently.

She also said, and she was quoted quite rightly, that she wasn't surprised that this type of illness wasn't a very high priority. I think we'll agree that over the years mental health as such has been very low priority, so there wasn't anything unusual in that statement. But unfortunately whoever wrote the article —John Zaritsky—made a point of emphasizing these two statements. And the rest of the quotations in here, I would suggest, came from the report itself, and did not come from Dr. Rae-Grant.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I thought that was very clearly identified in the story; but perhaps we will leave it at that. I might deal with it tomorrow.

One last question of the Minister of—oh, he is not here. I will end my questions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Fort William.

NATIONAL PARK IN THUNDER BAY DISTRICT

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Could the minister enlighten the House on the state of negotiations between his department and the federal government on the placing of a national park, as proposed, in the Thunder Bay district?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the hon. member for Fort William that I do think the Hon. Mr. Andras goofed, and he goofed badly. I would like to explain.

About a week ago a front page story came out in Thunder Bay which stated that the federal government and the provincial government were involved in some very deep discussions and negotiations concerning the establishment of a national park at the Black Bay peninsula. I want to make it very, very clear that there are no discussions and no negotiations going on with the Province of Ontario in connection with such a national park.

I do feel there has been an error made on the federal minister's part, because we are engaged right now in some negotiations concerning the establishment of a national park in the Pukaskwa area. It is our desire to proceed with these negotiations and we are most thankful for the federal government's participation so far, but I want to make it very, very clear, that there have been no discussions—there may have been some informal comments, there have been informal comments regarding a number of areas, because I think the federal government is most anxious to make some national parks out of the beautiful areas of northern Ontario—but at this point in time I can tell the member for Fort William that there are no discussions and no negotiations going on with regard to a national park in the Black Bay peninsula.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: To what does the minister attribute the statement by the Hon. Robert Andras if there is no basis in fact and there is no active discussion going on between the federal and the provincial authorities?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Election fever, what else?

Mr. Singer: That is what it is? Good, the minister found out!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think—well, the hon. member will have to surmise himself.

There may be an event coming up which would be of interest to him but I notice he attributed a portion of the announcement to his colleague, the federal member for Thunder Bay, Mr. Keith Penner. I am not aware whether he was involved in that announcement or not.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What does the hon. member for Thunder Bay attribute it to?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has the reply to a previous question.

IMPROPER PROMOTION OF SHARES

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have an answer to a question given to me by the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon).

I am advised by the Ontario Securities Commission that it has no power to institute civil action on behalf of members of the public, excepting in connection with insider trading liability, and then only in accordance with section 114 of the Securities Act and the equivalent section of the Business Corporations Act.

Individuals who feel aggrieved must seek their remedies in the civil courts.

I am, however, informed that Mr. James Prendergast, the chairman of the board of United Investment Services Ltd., has stated that the company is interested in learning of the details of any purchases of either United Fund Management Ltd. or United Life Insurance Co. Ltd., shares made available by clients of UIS during February, March and early April of 1971, on the basis of representations made to them by UIS salesmen. In accordance with the requirements of the securities commission, UIS is bonded and insured as protection for itself and its clients against the misconduct of any of its salesmen.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, does the minister feel that it is the responsibility, or any responsibility or should be the responsibility, of the commission to assist action by shareholders who are aggrieved by or suffer losses by insider trading of this sort, or of improper promotion—to assist them in civil action to recover their losses?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In regard to that supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, the reference I made in my general reply was to section 114 of the Act. I would say that the duty of the commission is to supply as much information as is possible in regard to insider trading. I would add that both of these companies are incorporated under federal charter, and therefore action in this regard must be taken by that authority.

Mr. Deacon: A further supplementary: Would the commission therefore undertake to get the details of all the trading that took place in this particular situation? For example, regarding details of insider trading that took place in the Slater Steel action that is now being taken by aggrieved shareholders of Slater Steel, would the commission undertake to get the facts for the shareholders?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will comment further on that particular aspect of the question when I have the information.

Mr. Shulman: A further supplementary: In the minister's reply he suggested that these people should contact the company. Has the suggestion been made that the company will reimburse shareholders who lost money as a result of these improper representations?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In reply to that particular question, I think it was inherent in the last sentence of the answer: "In accordance with the requirements of the securities commission, UIS is bonded and insured as protection for itself and its clients against the misconduct of any of its salesmen." Now part of the action that has been taken, I understand, is that the salesmen involved have lost their registration and have been dismissed by the company, and the company, in fact, is inquiring into those matters.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Singer: No, a new question.

Mr. Lawlor: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In KRL Investments Ltd. it was disclosed that the minister's department has not brought any prosecutions forward for a considerable period of time, five years or more. When does the minister intend to enforce the regulations and act with respect to insider trading?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In that particular regard I don't know the reference that the hon.

member is making but, as I said, I am informed again by the authority of the commission that if they are incorporated under provincial law then that responsibility would be ours. If it is a federal incorporation, then it is a federal authority to prosecute.

Mr. Lawlor: They have never done it; they just don't trust him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has a reply also to a previous question asked by the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young).

DE HAVILLAND LABOUR DISPUTE

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. During my absence on Friday, the hon. member for Yorkview directed a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) concerning de Havilland Aircraft and UAW Local 112 at Downsview, I would like to report the following to the hon. member:

The strike, as he knows, started on January 21, 1972, and there are approximately 900 production employees involved. We have been reviewing this situation with the principals of the parties each week. My latest information is that the company is now negotiating with the UAW for the office workers who are not on strike; this involves 300 employees. Both the company and the union feel that following the staff negotiations would be an appropriate time to resume negotiations with the plant workers.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate a timetable of the reopening of negotiations with Local 112? It seems incredible that they have to wait until the office workers' contract is settled.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, it looks as if this is an agreement between the company and the union. They want to settle the negotiations with the 300 office workers first and then would be prepared to resume negotiations for the production employees.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Speaker, this almost looks like blackmail, telling the office workers they must settle before negotiations can open with Local 112. Surely the minister can look into this aspect of the situation and perhaps bring some pressure to bear to get these parties around the bargaining table.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the last thing the Minister of Labour would like to see is any blackmail. I will be glad to look into it tomorrow and hopefully get the two parties concerned working on it as soon as possible.

Mr. Young: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works also has the answer to a previous question.

LAND PURCHASE IN TORONTO

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, on Friday there were several questions I answered and some that I said I would get information thereon.

The member for Downsview asked for the name of the appraiser on a property on Bloor Street. The name of the appraiser is Mr. Arnot Parrett, FRI, MAI, AAICI, SRA, 514 St. Clair Avenue East, Toronto.

Mr. Deans: Is that a position or a name?

Hon. Mr. Snow: He has got a lot of initials. The property was purchased from a company known as 246 Bloor Street West Ltd.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's a catchy name.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The director my department dealt with was Mr. T. L. Twigg.

It was also observed by one member regarding the lease on the building at 252 Bloor Street West that this was a 30-year lease with 27 years yet to run.

Regarding the appraisal, I stated that there was an adjustment for the easement for the parking of cars. The appraiser stated that the market value of the site was $851,000; the value was reduced to $804,000 due to the easement—

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on! They can't use it at all so the government takes off $40,000.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, that is not right, Mr. Speaker. I explained that on Friday if the member would look at Hansard. The purchase price was agreed at $800,000. The member asked if the Auditor requested information from my department—

Mr. Bullbrook: Let us have a copy of the search of title. I want to have a look at that—$40,000! It is incredible!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —The answer is yes. He was advised by the officials of my department that the land would be used for probable extension to the Department of Education property at 252 Bloor Street and was referred to the Department of Education for any

additional information regarding the use of the property. Our department was requested to purchase the property by Treasury Board on May 27, 1970.

Mr. Bullbrook: For what department?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The Department of Education.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Department of Education? I should not have asked the question—

Mr. Singer: I have a few supplementaries.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Right!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise us as to whether or not this 246 Bloor Street West Ltd. shares any offices with the lessors to the government of the OISE building?

Secondly, could the minister advise us whether under the city of Toronto zoning bylaws and under the city of Toronto official plan, anything could have possibly been erected on this lot?

Thirdly, would the minister advise us whether or not the easement to the University of Toronto was a perpetual easement? If, in fact, it was a perpetual easement, what sense is there in deducting nearly $40,000 from an overall price of $840,000 if, in fact, the land cannot be used?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, would the minister table for us the appraiser's report and the documents relating to the search of title?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I do not have all the information the member is asking for—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I, by way of supplementary, or on a point of order—

Hon. Mr. Snow: —I will take the question as notice. Mr. Speaker, also on Friday—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I, by way of supplementary, or on a point of order—why does the minister have to take as notice the final question? Will he table the appraiser's report and the search of title in this House so that the members may look at it?

Mr. Speaker: I think there is no point of order; there may be a supplementary question.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then by supplementary: Why does the minister have to consider taking as notice a simple request to table the appraiser's report and the search of title?

An hon. member: The member is out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes or no? Will the minister do it for us?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, there is so much in that question that will require research, I will reply to the whole question at a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Which is quite in accord with the standing orders. The hon. member was out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: I did not say I wasn't.

LAND PURCHASE ON NIAGARA ESCARPMENT

Hon. M. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the member for Scarborough West asked me to table information regarding land purchases for the Niagara Escarpment assembly. I have this information which I will table at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York East.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOLF COURSE ASSESSMENT

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if he is in a position yet to table in this House the report of the committee on golf course assessment and taxation?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Economics and Municipal Affairs): It is being tabled this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview. He was on his feet earlier.

BLOOR STREET PROPERTY USE

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education. Could the Minister of Education advise us, since it was apparently at the request of his department that this $800,000 purchase price be paid to the firm, 246 Bloor St. West Ltd., what plans he has for the use of this land and how he is going to get rid of the easement to park cars on it?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member has got the minister on the run again. He does it every year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He hasn't got me on any run.

POLAR BEAR CUBS ON INDIAN RESERVE

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. By what authority have employees of his department entered the Attawapiskat reserve and demanded that band members give up two polar bear cubs to the Toronto zoo?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the report on that particular incident. The member is quite right in saying that the conservation officer did go to the Attawapiskat Reserve and asked that the two cubs in question be turned over.

Mr. Stokes: Not "asked"—"demanded".

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have "asked."

He was told by the chief he had no authority there; so the officer was obliged to contact the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which he did.

It has been our practice, of course, to permit Indians to kill a certain number of bears for dog food and in defence of their own property, but we do try through a process of education to reduce the number of killings, because we certainly don't want to have this particular species become extinct.

It is unfortunate that extreme steps were taken in this particular case. We always want to have the co-operation of the Indian people, but I would point out that in this particular case the two cubs in question would have brought about $30 to $50 on the bootleg market. Had they been handled through the proper channels, the Indians could have received as much as $300. So they were actually giving them away when they could have received 10 times more. This is where we try to help.

Mr. Stokes: Is it not true that the Department of Lands and Forests officials agreed to pay $300 to the Indian in question for the pelt of the mother, if they would turn over the two cubs to the Toronto zoo? Inherent in that, isn't it a foregone conclusion that the department came to the conclusion that the band couldn't look after the cubs in the same manner as the Toronto zoo? Is this not an abrogation of the aboriginal rights of Indians in demanding the release of such wildlife for the purposes mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't know all those specific details, but I would tell the member for Thunder Bay that under Treaty 9, which exists in this particular area, the Indians do not have any special privilege to take wildlife.

But this is not the point. I can assure the member that co-operation with the Indians will improve, and I have so instructed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

DAYCARE CENTRES

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. How many daycare centres were approved by his department; and also how many Indian reserves did not qualify for a daycare centre under winter works?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, I believe 66 daycare centres have been approved by our department, and out of that number 10 were to Indian bands.

Mr. Lewis: How many?

Mr. Spence: May I ask how many qualified?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How many qualified?

Mr. Spence: Yes.

Mr. Reid: How many applications?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How many applications?

Mr. Spence: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: As I just mentioned, there were 10 nurseries approved to Indian bands, so I would assume that the—

Mr. Reid: How many applications were there?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: How many applications? I could find that out. I don't know offhand, Mr. Speaker, but I would be glad to get that information.

Mr. Spence: A supplementary: How many Indian reserves did not qualify, but had an application in?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I shall find that information.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask the minister if, to qualify, the Indians had to make a formal application in the first place?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian band or the administrator could make the formal application.

Mr. Reid: May I ask the minister if he really knows what is going on in his department? Is he aware that in one of the Indian reserves in my riding the band administrator wrote and asked for details on the programme, and within a week of his asking for details, the band received a letter from the minister's department under the minister's signature telling them that they had received approval for a daycare centre without any application?

Can the minister explain: (a) How this can possibly happen; and (b) If all one has to do is write for details to get approval for the expenditure of public funds before even the people involved are asking for a certain project of this type?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Election fever!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear that just an inquiry has brought a grant and I will look into it. Would the hon. member tell me the name of the Indian band?

Mr. Reid: It was the Couchiching band, the Couchiching reserve.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary: All right.

Mr. Bounsall: Could the minister tell us, regarding the funds allotted in the winter works programme for the construction of daycare centres, have all the funds been allocated?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, there was $10 million allocated and I would say very close to that amount has been allotted.

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, the oral question period has now expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. McKeough presented the report of the committee on golf course assessment and taxation.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CORONERS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Coroners Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to allow any person whose conduct is relevant to an inquest or who might be affected by the verdict of an inquest to cross-examine witnesses either in person or through counsel.

LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, before going into the intent, I would like to point out that the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) spent some time with me on the introduction of this bill and unfortunately he is away from the House on business for the province.

The intent of this bill is that by eliminating economic sanctions or any form of control from foreign influences, Ontario working men and women will have the opportunity to work for their long-established goal of total independence for their labour movement.

Mr. Shulman: How about the same thing for corporations?

Mr. Drea: I'll take it under advisement.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had, sir, to extend my congratulations to you since your election to this

important and high office. I had the honour of seconding your nomination, which I did with enthusiasm.

I have had, in the past, every reason to feel confidence in your impartiality and fairness. But I must say that I have some misgivings about extending compliments to you, sir, because I am told that the last time I did so that they were extracted from Hansard and used for a nefarious purpose; to wit, the election propaganda of the Conservative candidate in Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter).

As a matter of fact, I think that under the circumstances—since this speech has the earmarks of my last hurrah as leader of the party—I should, sir, be frank with you and say it was my intention, if the Liberal Party had formed a government and if you, sir, had been successful in re-election, to ask you to be the Speaker even in a Legislature that was controlled by a party other than one to which you had political allegiance.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why not even if he had been defeated?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There has never been a feeling on my part that your judgements were anything but your own best judgement, and I think that is the measure of you as a man; and certainly a measure of you in your abilities as Speaker.

I did feel, however, that I should say something about that old chestnut which recurs in this House and elsewhere as to the advisability of having a permanent Speaker; one who would perform this office as election campaigns come and go and as, according to theory at least, governments come and go.

My own feeling is that this would be a mistake. I think that the man who presides over this chamber must have the continuing confidence of members on all sides; that this confidence should be expressed openly, as I have done sir on this occasion, and also, when it is necessary, that the confidence be removed so that Mr. Speaker is the servant of the House in the best and democratic sense.

I also want to extend my best wishes, and to some extent, my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. MacBeth), while I have not known him personally, certainly has a substantial representation in the Metropolitan area. I was interested that his main advice to the government was that it not proceed with the statement in the Throne Speech which would, in fact, make it illegal to hold some other position of emolument in government service as well as being a member of this House.

I should, I suppose, plead a conflict of interests. Since I only hold one job, I feel that the government's position in that connection is the correct one. I know that it may work a hardship on some members of this House. The hon. member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett), I am told, has in addition to his indemnity here, as a controller in Ottawa an additional indemnity, considerably more than is paid at least to a private member at this level.

In my view the government should proceed forthwith to make it illegal to hold more than one position. I think to be fair, however, Mr. Speaker, that we should recall that one of the former adherents and supporters of the Liberal Party, the former member for Essex North, Mr. Arthur Reaume, whom many of you recall, for many years sat as a private member of this House and also acted as mayor of Windsor. So there has been this tradition. But I, for one, intend to support the bill when it comes before the House, which would make a change.

The hon. member for York West, I thought, removed some of the efficacy of his remarks when he fell prey to that usual series of statements in the motion to send a humble address to His Honour which usually —and much I think to the discredit of a private member—begins, ends, and in the middle simply adds adulation and a kind of sycophantic support for the leader of the government that I don't think adds much to the government or the person who phrases it. So, it appears that the hon. member for York West is adding his name to the list of humble servants and handmaidens of Tory power.

The hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Eaton) is a representative of the farm community, I would say. I appreciated his remarks. I sense a very close connection between the member for Middlesex South and the member for Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart) in agriculture. Our present Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has occupied that post for more than 10 years. Perhaps the new member is thinking that there may be some changes in this regard in the next two or three years. Well, I suppose we could do better for a short-term appointment.

I remember very well the member for Middlesex South's involvement in the bean board situation some years ago now, and I listened to his comments with a great deal

of interest. I'm sure that people did on all sides, particularly those 28 new members of the House in support of the Conservative Party. I think it's a shame that not one of them has been elevated to any rank in the administration, although one or two have been designated as parliamentary assistants. I'll have more to say about that, actually, a little later in my remarks.

Surely if any administration was ever in want of some new blood and some new ideas —perhaps, Mr. Speaker, a bit of a push in the progressive spirit of modern government —it is this government. I feel that within the ranks of the new members—and I've come to know a good many of them, if not all—I think that such ability does exist.

The feeling in the present leader of the government is that they've got to be backbenched for a while. I understand the Premier (Mr. Davis) is now using that as a verb, sort of like ageing meat or smoking hams—backbenching a member. These people have to mark time and talk about the great leadership of the Conservative Party and the clear views of the future. I would suggest that they should throw the Treasurer's name (Mr. McKeough) in from time to time too if they know what's good for them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think, Mr. Speaker, that that approach to democracy is an archaic one and certainly not one in the best interests of the people of this province. So I regret the timidity that the Premier has shown in his cabinet changes. Certainly there were changes; but rejuvenation, unfortunately no.

I, of course, have been very interested in the steps leading to cabinet changes and administration reform. As you know, sir, it was our party that discussed this on the hustings on many occasions. We were critical of the size of the government. We felt that the lines of responsibility had become blurred over the years and that the taxpayers, the citizens, the Legislature, were not well served by a continuation of the status quo that had simply been added to since the days of George Drew.

As you know, sir, we called for the reduction in size of the cabinet, but we had no intention of having two levels of responsibility. I think it is generally accepted that people of cabinet rank should all have policy responsibility and that if you want administrators, you hire them.

This government opposite has 70,000 in their employ, some of them paid more than they are. I understand that quite a group now in the senior levels of the administration have larger emoluments than the cabinet ministers. Of course, they probably work a good deal harder.

But my point, sir, is this. Policy must be a shared responsibility, according to our understanding of responsible government, and that those people who have, on the other hand, responsibility for administration, are hired—and I should say fired if necessary—by those who have the confidence of this House, and therefore the confidence of the province.

So I would say, sir, that we have grave reservations and misgivings on the basis of the reforms that are presently being enacted by fiat of the government and, we are told, by an omnibus piece of legislation which may be put before us sometime in the next few weeks. I particularly am doubtful as to whether one particular minister, the one who is sitting opposite me at the present time—the Treasurer I'll call him for convenience sake—should have rolled under his aegis so many farreaching and decisive responsibilities at this time and in this province. I think, actually, the member for Chatham-Kent (Mr. McKeough) has a tremendous amount of ability in this House and out of it, but he has got a couple of weaknesses. He is a great fighter, you know, when he chooses to be, but when you look, sir, at the fact that not only is he the Treasurer, but he is the Minister of Economics with all of the planning decisions that accompany that great ministry. He also is the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs—so that he deals with his favourite politicians, those in the seats of the mighty at Ottawa, whom he doesn't frighten at all; and on the other side, those at the municipal level whom he scares witless from time to time—I just think, really, that the service of the province calls for either division of those responsibilities or else—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A division of the minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A division of the minister, yes, an excellent suggestion! It used to be called drawing and quartering; perhaps we ought to return to that.

However, Mr. Speaker, the change among the cabinet ministers themselves—where almost every one of them, with the exception of Agriculture and perhaps one or two others, has had new responsibilities in the last few months—is difficult to understand. One might also think that the leader of the government

wants his ministers to be as much off balance as he himself is. There is a tendency we would expect, I suppose, for the Premier to establish the kind of authority which perhaps was missing following the convention that selected him as leader of the party and elevated him to this supreme position in the business of the Province of Ontario, the government of the Province of Ontario. Some of the changes were substantially regrettable.

Certainly I for one regret the change in the Department of the Environment. I would think that the former incumbent (Mr. Kerr) must have been somewhat surprised when he wasn't elevated to the capacity of a thinking minister and left in a situation where he administers. But surely the most unkind cut was when he woke up one—Friday morning, was it, George?—Wednesday morning, and found that he wasn't even in the environment any more; that he was well above that, in the esoteric air of universities and colleges, where obviously you don't need a thinking minister.

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not that particular cabinet change mightn't have been dictated by the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Snow), who is also the chief Conservative arm twister and bag man, I am told; if not the chief, let us say the man who represented the government in some of these more delicate dealings, because I have read from statements on the part of industry which has been affected by the decisions of government over recent years, where there was some question as to the fairness of the positions taken by the former Minister of the Environment.

In my view, the Minister of the Environment should not be seen to be fair by the industrial moguls whose decisions, in fact, have polluted our environment in the past. I think probably that change was a political one. We now have the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), representing Leeds, who perhaps has a more thoughtful position in this area.

I really would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this was a political change and that the Tories weren't prepared to continue with a tough Minister of the Environment, a man who with his own fist broke the top of his desk there about two years ago when he said the polluters must pay. Somebody must have thought that he meant it and so they thought they had better get him out of that department before he did any damage.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, there were some other changes more recently—the decision made by the Premier that the province and the administration would be well served by the appointment of parliamentary assistants Actually I believe he has been embarrassed with the wealth of his support, which extends, of course, all along that side and over into the rump—if you will pardon me, gentlemen—embarrassed by the necessity to occupy these able men and two obviously able ladies, who still sit in the back row and still religiously attend the sessions of this Legislature and are still waiting for the call from the Premier.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): And the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) is here a lot more than he used to be too.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to agree with the member for Sarnia that that is an improvement but—

Mr. Lewis: And he still hasn't looked across the House in four months.

An hon. member. That was his political payoff.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the member for Lambton's seat tilted or does he just sit that way. He looks ahead.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The hon. member is in a new position now—his seat is in a permanent position facing sideways.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): No purpose!

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Keep up the good work, Lorne.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to congratulate those men who have been designated as parliamentary assistants. The member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), I believe: There has been no representation in the cabinet from Hamilton for some time. They had an opportunity during the last two parliaments to have a woman as a representative from Hamilton, and to boot, a very able member of the Legislature, but they didn't appoint the former member for Hamilton West (Mrs. Pritchard) to the cabinet. I am sort of her agent in this, or was, but I didn't do a very good job in getting her placed in the administration. That might have been one of her problems; I don't know. But now the member for Hamilton Mountain is the spokesman for Hamilton.

The new member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes): I presume that his agent was Arthur Wishart. Well obviously they have got a good candidate up there. I am not sure what price they had to pay, and whether it was too much, but nevertheless we find that the former mayor of Sault Ste. Marie is now, at least, one rung up above his colleagues.

On the member for Ottawa South: The word is that he went to the Premier and said: "Listen, if you don't do something for me I am going to run for mayor of Ottawa, and so take your choice." The Premier took his choice and this member is now a parliamentary secretary; so maybe he made the wrong choice—we will see.

The member for York East (Mr. Meen): Nothing but good to say about him. Anybody who can—

Mr. Lewis: Wait that long!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —defeat the Liberal candidate out in York East deserves some recognition.

Mr. Lewis: And commendations!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) may actually have fouled his nest already. His reaction to the decision to locate the Toronto airport wasn't in the best traditions of those who want to get ahead in this administration. I'm a great admirer of the member for Ontario South. I thought he was a good deputy sub-assistant whip for the Conservative Party. While the whip used to have a little trouble getting enough members in—even with their large majority—to maintain the government, it seemed to be the member for Ontario South who was prepared to do the work and get the boys out of the Black Knight and up here to vote.

But, Mr. Speaker, the member for Ontario South, I think, has that strength and impartiality which should stand him in good stead. We look at what's happened to the present policy minister for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) who, I think—in 1959 was it—decided that he had some differences of opinion with Mr. Frost, who was then the Premier. He hasn't expressed many differences with the administration since, but it didn't do him any long-term harm. Twelve years later he is a policy minister.

The member for—what's Carton?

An hon. member: Armourdale (Mr. Carton).

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Armourdale; I remember him making an impassioned speech about the expropriation of highway lands and there were those on this side who said: "Well that's the end of Carton." But he is still doing his laps downs at the "Y" and is now Minister of, well—it used to be Highways, a very important ministry indeed in the bad old days of George Drew and Leslie Frost—but now is Transportation and Communications. Yes. Well, it is a working ministry and I wanted to congratulate him on his appointment.

The policy secretaries: obviously we are going to have a lot of trouble with that—not only on this side but on the government's side as well. The policy minister for Justice, even in the question period today you know, fell back on his rather unhealthy tendency to get snarky with his questioners when he doesn't have a reasonable answer. You know, the sort of thing such as: "If you would pay attention to the business of the House." Or: "If you had heard my answer last year on this matter." That sort of thing; when a minister doesn't really have an answer he tends to respond in that way.

But in matters pertaining to justice and law enforcement, we have quite a choice. The policy minister, the member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) who evidently is not prepared to answer any questions, just thinks. The Attorney General, the member for York Mills (Mr. Bales), who is, I think, a very down-to-earth, hard-working minister, will probably put the Attorney General's department back on an even keel from the political boat-rocking it has had over the recent months.

The Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko), I see, is still occupying the front page of the Toronto Star, shaking hands with pretty little ethnic girls, and there is no doubt in my mind that that is really why he is maintained; that as long as he can slide around the Metro area in a chauffeur-driven, black limousine and be the spokesman for the Conservative Party, then certainly it is worthwhile keeping him as a minister—and a friendlier minister one could never find. He is now Solicitor General, and from time to time he indicates that he is prepared to answer questions too. Even today, he raised his hand. I am not sure whether it was to answer a question or he had something else on his mind.

Mr. Speaker, the list is not complete. We have the soon-to-be Minister of Public Protection, the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler), who joins that group of ministers concerned with law and order and the pro-

tection of the public. So far, consumerism has not led to much of a debate in this session of the House, but once again I would expect that the minister will have a great deal of time taken up with his responsibilities as House leader and the whole area of consumer protection once again will be bypassed in the expansion of policy. We don't have a parliamentary assistant, as yet, in that group of people.

My point, sir, is that the old cabinet, the old Robarts bunch and the organization of the cabinet under those circumstances, had a great deal of overlapping responsibility—and I know the Treasurer doesn't want me to talk again about planning overlapping, where he had a problem with the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) and the former Minister of Trade (Mr. Randall), but that is the sort of problem we had in the bad old days, when the government was unreformed and substantially unrepentant.

Now we have a new approach, and I would say, sir, that it is confused, it is complex and responsibilities still overlap. It is wasteful and inefficient, and I would say it is not in the best interests of either getting the business of government done or even extending information to the House and to the province. I think a mistake has been made; I think there has been too much dependence on, let us say, efficiency expertise of the type that would persuade the leader of the government to say: "Well, we must do this more like a business."

I remember hearing somebody put this to Trudeau, saying: "Surely as the new leader of the government of Canada, you will run it in a businesslike way." And he said: "If I were to do that, I would have to auction off Newfoundland." I think we have to recall that the business of government is something more substantial than simply getting the statutes through the House, getting the committees to rubber-stamp the government's position and getting the Legislature out of session as quickly as possible.

I believe these changes are not going to be in the best interests of democracy, and certainly we will be observing how they work out very carefully indeed.

Mr. Speaker, turning to the Speech from the Throne itself delivered by His Honour, I have said publicly, of course, that it was a typical post-election speech. The phrase that caught my attention must have come from the Treasurer himself, that we are going to revert to "fiscal prudence and restraint." It is interesting to balance that attitude with statements made by this minister and the government in the enunciation of policy over the past year—or until the election came upon us. The proposals are inconsequential in this speech; we are treated to a prospect of six studies, committees and different conferences.

The ministers of finance are going to get together; I think this is very good. I don't think that a decision is to be taken by Ontario alone, however, that this would come about. There is to be a tri-level conference, one that I understand, has already been approved by the federal government and by many municipalities which have felt that for too long they they been left out of governmental decisions at higher levels.

It was not too long ago, Mr. Speaker—and you may have attended it—that a conference was called by the former Minister of Municipal Affairs—I guess the present minister (Mr. McKeough) in his former capacity—involving the municipalities and the provincial government.

I remember a phrase at that conference which was held at the Science Centre calling for a new partnership, which was a hollow phrase indeed when we look at what immediately came from the Department of Municipal Affairs—centralization of assessment responsibility; the imposition of regional government; and in many respects the removal of the kind of power to decide, which has been a characteristic and an earmark of Ontario's municipal government system since its inception in the 1850s.

We read again in this speech the intention of the government to strengthen the autonomy of our municipalities and yet they are highly suspect because of their record in recent months. The Ontario Municipal Board is going to be reviewed. The government no doubt has real problems with the OMB since the decision on appeal, referring to the Spadina Expressway, to reverse the board.

I would think now that any group of citizens, as is their right, would think that it is worthwhile appealing to the cabinet. The procedures for such an appeal are ponderous and really ineffectual in the extreme, but the cabinet simply uses that as a means whereby changes in policy for electroral purposes—or sometimes I suppose more rationally motivated—are made. There is no doubt that this kind of an appeal of Municipal Board decisons must go, but the pressure was brought on the cabinet by itself.

There have been instances from many municipalities when appeals beyond the Municipal Board to the cabinet, on matters which in my view should be settled by the

local municipalities under Municipal Board review, should have been established and accepted. The Spadina decision has changed all that and now the government must find alternatives.

The fourth committee—or commission—is a commission on the function of the Legislature and the role of the members of the Legislature. I understand we will have an opportunity to discuss this in the next few days when the commission is established, and I look forward to that.

The next one is an urgent re-evaluation of Ontario Housing. You may recall, Mr. Speaker—I don't know whether it was an election situation for you but it certainly was in some areas of Metropolitan Toronto and elsewhere—that the government had made an election promise to expedite all of their housing decisons. This was made by the minister, who is now on his way to mainland China, a few weeks before the election. Now we find that this expedition did not occur and that we now have an urgent reassessment of Ontario Housing.

Finally, a select committee on snowmobiles. What I have to say really about this list is that while in most areas what is being considered is of importance, it is left to the Legislature to consider policy on snowmobiles! It seems to be the attitude of the government that if there is something important that is going to affect policy and the future development of the province, it should be done by so-called experts. When it is something of substantial importance in its own way but restricted, nonetheless, like snowmobiles, of course this is something that the Legislature can deal with.

One of the things that concerns me is this attitude on the part of the administration—a disrespect for the will of the Legislature and the individual members in the Legislature. According to them, we are here simply to support blindly, or in their view oppose blindly, government positions. This is insufficient and I feel that their attitude is expressed very well in the Speech from the Throne. As I say, six studies are set up and only one involving snowmobiles is left to the membership of this Legislature to consider.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We look at the speech in general. It is obviously a retrenchment document. It is a design, as far as the government is concerned, that has been dictated by the Treasurer; he has found himself in a box, in a bind.

In previous years, it might even be called a fiscal nightmare and the nightmare is of his own, their own, making. In the last 12 months and actually less time than that, they have promised free Medicare to pensioners, an extra $127 million. You may recall that that was announced the same day that the election was called. They intend to extend coverage under Ontario hospitalization for nursing homes, something we approve of, but which was promised a few months before the election. This is a minimum of $50 million in its first full year, and the problems associated with it are almost insurmountable, according to the policy minister for Health in his first attempt to bring forward legislation to enact this by the promised deadline of April 1.

Tax reform handouts of $150 million were spent, I think, as the most blatant political bribe that in my memory and experience has ever been offered in this province, to assist farmers to pay their property tax and to assist pensioners to pay theirs. Being a farmer myself, I had no compunction or even a conflict of interest in receiving a series of four cheques from the administration. I put the date on it just so I wouldn't forget—October 18, 1971.

The total of these cheques was $260 and, actually, they came in four separate envelopes, Mr. Speaker. I know the Deputy Speaker is a farmer himself and probably got something the same.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Each one of these had a pamphlet of explanation signed in his own hand by William A. Stewart; and Dalton Bales, Minister of Municipal Affairs. The cheque itself had a picture of Queen's Park in the background and it was signed by the then Treasurer, Charles MacNaughton, I believe.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Did the member cash them?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I sure did!

There was every attempt made so that there be no misunderstanding as to who was handing out this largesse. I should tell the people opposite, however, that I had two old ladies phone me up and say: "I hope when you see Mr. Trudeau, you will thank him for us."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is very, very difficult to get all of the credit, even for this kind of a blatant political bribe.

Mr. Speaker, you are aware, being a farmer yourself, that the tax assistance programme went into effect two years ago. The first cheques we received were payable after the final instalment in November. Mine were received in December a year ago. This year, the payments were speeded up. It was possible for the government, through the direction of 70,000 public servants that it controls, to see that these cheques came out a bit early.

I think the most blatant example was the one in Lambton where the cheques were delivered to fine and upstanding citizens in the nursing homes on election day itself. We are not sure just what the—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Nice, crisp $50 bills.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —advice was, but we find that the incumbent was returned and, really, it is very difficult to explain his re-election other than in that way.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we are talking about what amounts to a fiscal nightmare: Free Medicare, $127 million; nursing homes, $50 million; tax reform handouts, another $150 million in all; and a three per cent reduction in tax that as enacted at the short session. It is difficult to tell how much that will cost us, but according to the then Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), about $37 million, I believe, or something like that.

During that year as well, we were treated to an advertising campaign in which all persuasive powers of television, radio, four-colour ads in newspapers and magazines—and of course the weekly and ethnic press, we must not forget them—were all brought into play to persuade us that there was no better place than Ontario. It is interesting to note that this year, the year after the election, such an advertising campaign does not seem to have the priority that it had in the spring of 1971 or the spring of 1967, or the spring of 1963. I cannot talk about 1959; I don't think Leslie Frost would have had the nerve to try to buy an election with public funds.

Mr. Speaker, we also had a promise from the Treasurer, which has been reiterated on more than one occasion, that there would be no new taxes in the province in 1971-1972. So we have a budget of $4.2 billion, a deficit of $145 million, which is now closer to $465 million or $475 million. We have a promise that there will be no new taxes and, in fact, we had a three per cent tax reduction just a few months ago.

Now if ever there was a fiscal nightmare, surely this is it. The interesting and important aspect of this session will be the budget, when we learn from the Treasurer how and what the way out of this maze will be. He has said that, while there will be no new taxes, there may be some reapportionment of tax. In this connection I was interested to read the announcement by the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) that in fact the provincial share of education costs was going to go beyond 60 per cent to 62.5 per cent this year.

There is no doubt that the stand taken by the Liberal Party from 1967, which calls for a larger share of education costs being met from the broader tax base of the province, has become a policy of the Conservative Party and we are going to get this as a piecemeal tax change probably in the name of tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the prudent and restrained attitude of the government following the election, we can't help but feel that the shades of Huey Long and Maurice Duplessis were certainly coming out of the electoral procedures programme of the Conservative Party during the last year. They still believe, and maybe they are right, that public funds can still bribe the electorate at least to the extent of returning a majority as large as the government is supported by at the present time.

We look at the speech itself, and you can see that other changes have occurred. I read to you, Mr. Speaker, from page 3, and I quote:

> . . . my ministers believe it is their duty to maintain a standard of life for all citizens, the quality of which will reflect the compassionate and generous spirit of our people. My government will also seek new ways to encourage the achievement of excellence in the many fields of citizen endeavour from which all of Ontario's people may draw inspiration and example.

I doubt if Bill Rathbun would have manufactured that particular pearl for the Lieutenant Governor to cast before the Legislature.

I go on from the same page:

> It is therefore the primary objective of my government's economic, social and fiscal policy to attain the highest possible rate of employment.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if perhaps their policy before that time was something less than the highest possible rate of employment. Surely this is the kind of pious claptrap that we are treated to by the government, once they have the votes in the bag, once they have them bought and paid for, and once they are faced with the economic nightmare of paying the bills.

The employment policy of this government is simply to blame the government of Canada for what is essentially their own responsibility. We talk about shared responsibilities and shared cost programmes; this obviously is one. With a budget of $5 billion, or one approaching that astronomical figure, still all this government can do is allocate about $125 million in a programme which is supposed to expand the industrial aspect of our economy.

This has been a failure. It has been a waste of the $125 million, and in fact there is no policy pertaining to improving the level of employment in this province, other than the political policy of trying to elect Stanfield Prime Minister, which is doomed to failure.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So the employment and development aspects of the speech are a farce, a simple mouthing of words which do not establish policy of any significance that I can detect.

Mr. Speaker, on a similar matter, really closely allied, I would read to you two brief excerpts from the speech, the first from page 4, and I quote:

> The government is also committed to the pursuit of policies which will encourage more economic activity and greater participation by Canadians in the development of their own resources and the utilization of their own skills.

Something that for my mind is closely associated, from page 17, as follows:

> New policies concerning investments and loans giving preference to Canadian-owned enterprises will be introduced and loans under the venture capital fund for businesses employing new technologies and for assistance in the growth of small enterprises will be broadened.

This is commendable. Of course, it doesn't indicate how this is to be done other than more money for the venture loan fund. I would like to tell you, sir, that Ontario Development Corporation is now at the crossroads. We have dispensed with the services of the former Minister of Trade, Stanley Randall. He was referred to here in the House last Thursday when the Treasurer announced that Harbour City was not going to be continued. This is one of his babies and it was simply thrown out the window.

Mr. Speaker, the thing is that ODC has been a political football in many serious senses. I would recall to you, sir, that a few months before the election, in the spring of 1971, many smaller communities were designated for ODC assistance on a very short term basis.

I call to your attention the town of Delhi in my constituency and the town of Paris in my constituency, both of which fall in that category. They are relatively small towns—4,000 to 6,000 in population—and naturally like other towns they have difficulty in meeting their municipal budget. It was accepted with enthusiasm when the government, through Mr. Randall, made the announcement that they would be designated for ODC assistance.

When asked about the criteria for the designation there was none, other than the department had decided they would be so designated and the designation would be removed without notice and in a very short period of time. Very little new industry was attracted under these circumstances. But my point is this—we of this side as well as the government are concerned with the economic development of this province. We approve of the approach taken by the Treasurer which, in my view, is going to see that the province has what amounts to an official plan sometime within the next four years.

There have to be programmes, however, to direct not only population but industrial expansion along the lines of those plans, and it cannot be done through the present mechanism of ODC. It is shot full of political loopholes. The confidence in the criteria has never been established, and surely something has got to be done about this.

I make the following proposition, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this is what we need in this province. We believe, on this side, that ODC has got to have available not only funds voted by this Legislature but it has to have access to a pool of capital which can be gathered from the citizens of this province, and perhaps of Canada, through their savings.

For many years these people have followed the advice of the member for High Park (Mr.

Shulman) and invested in American securities because they, too, want to make a million. But all this time there has been criticism that our own citizens—those with some money in the bank or stuck in a sock under the mattress—are afraid to invest in the growth of this province.

I would suggest to you, sir, that the amalgamation of the Ontario Development Corporation and the provincial Savings Offices would, in fact, provide a development bank which would have access to funds voted by this Legislature. It would also be a channel through which our citizens could invest in the development of the province in a fair, equitable and effective way. Whether or not it's called the development bank means nothing.

I recall to you, sir, the strange attitude toward the Savings Offices that has been taken by the government over the years. They, of course, don't want to interfere with their friends in the chartered banks by offering banking services. Still, they don't want to give up the access to that $100 million for which they pay an average of about 3.5 per cent, which is on deposit in the Savings Offices and available for general purposes by the government. We believe, on this side, that the Savings Offices can be improved in their position and usefulness, particularly if they are teamed with the Ontario Development Corporation.

It would be parallel to the Canada Development Corporation, which we trust will be effective in the very near future in assisting and strengthening the provision of Canadian capital for Canadian purposes and in the expansion of Canadian industry. We think that such a programme is a progressive one and one which, in fact, would meet many of the present requirements for the expansion of industry here and the strengthening of Canadian ownership and control.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I want, Mr. Speaker, to deal with a subject that is certainly of great importance to us all and of special interest to the Minister of Economics, the Treasurer and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Federal-provincial relationships are a favourite topic of his and must be a favourite of all of us.

In the speech it is dealt with extensively. There have been those who editorially, and I ally myself with them, have said specifically that this interest tends to be a political one in this federal election year; that the commitment of the Premier and his team to the defeat of Mr. Trudeau has certainly led them into positions which are difficult for thoughtful Tories to support. I would say they are not performing a service for Ontario, and I predict a political embarrassment for them as well as for our good friend Bob Stanfield.

Let us assume, at least behind all of the bombast that is usually associated with the approach of this government and the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs with the government at Ottawa, that there is a statement of concern on the part of the government of Ontario for this future, and that they are attempting to work out some mutually acceptable basis, which must be the goal of us all.

Well let's look at it.

Tax sharing: We have got to remember that in the last two years taxes have gone down at the provincial level—much has been said about the three per cent reduction a few weeks ago—succession duties have been decreased and in very few other instances has there been an increase in the imposition of provincial taxes. Municipal taxes have gone up tremendously, but at the provincial level they have not.

It has been the government of Canada which has raised taxes. That famous three per cent surcharge we have heard about so much here, and of course the capital gains tax, have been imposed by the Parliament of Canada and will in fact increase the net revenues at the federal level. But at this level there is always the feeling that, well, the province is not prepared to raise taxes; we should get more money from the government of Canada instead.

I would say once again what some of you have heard me say before, that the government that spends the money must of course have the main responsibility to raise it. This is an oversimplification; and I must be careful that it is not just a statement like that, that is seen as Liberal policy.

We do have shared-cost programmes, and I would predict to you that we will have shared-cost programmes for the future of Canada, because in my opinion the government of Canada has the responsibility to have programmes that will unify our country, that it must have programmes that will reduce the inequalities in those areas which can be improved by government initiative and government intervention.

So let's be realistic about these matters. It is the Treasurer's and the government's responsibility to negotiate the best possible

deal, and on a continuing basis, because there is no end to this kind of a discussion with the government of Canada and the municipalities. But nothing is gained by the kind of vituperative approach that is characteristic of this year's budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I sense that the Treasurer is mellowing a bit. In the first two or three days of this session he had a couple of good things to say about the transport policy and one or two other things. I don't know, he may get so mellow that it won't be any fun around here, but we'll see.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Don't worry about that.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I don't believe that. He is afraid of what is going to go on over there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But let's just look at these shared-cost programmes which we presently have. There is a fairly important one in agriculture; and I am sure that doesn't concern the Treasurer at all. We have got crop insurance—federal people pay part of it. We have got ARDA—in this conection we get about $7 million from Otawa, and I have a feeling that the Treasurer is not that keen to take over 100 per cent of ARDA costs or 100 per cent of crop insurance, unless of course the $7 million was to come from Ottawa without strings attached. This is not a sensitive area, however.

Medicare—that is the big bone of contention. I was interested to look at the report of the Department of Health for 1970, beautifully printed and made available just this year. Once again there is not a single meaningful reference to the cost of OHSIP or OHSC than a reference to the amount of premiums—the total amount of premiums—collected by the Health Insurance Registration Board and by the Treasurer on behalf of those programmes. There is no indication of the total cost. There is no indication of the amount of contribution from the government of Canada or from the government of Ontario, which also supports the programme, besides the premiums involved. In the debate on this matter last December I brought it to the attention of the Minister of Health that there was no effective report for OHSIP.

Frankly, I have been surprised that the Auditor didn't say something about this very matter, because we have been concerned at the exploding costs of the provision of Medicare services, both on the hospital side and for professional services. The minister himself, now the policy minister for Health and Social Services—

Mr. Gaunt: Human Resources!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Human Resources—right—was leading the pack—

Mr. MacDonald: His cabinet is meeting right over there now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just a year ago in criticising the doctors for charging too much money, or for receiving and billing the programme too extensively. But now that seems to have drifted away and we still don't have any kind of a report on the problems that are faced in that connection.

The federal government, I think, is frightened as to the rate of escalation of costs. It is very difficult to get from the reports, either of the Treasurer or the Department of Health, the specific contribution of the government of Canada to the various health programmes, but it is a very large one. In the meetings at the ministerial level over the last year, they have initiated a programme which is designed to keep provincial costs down.

Frankly, I don't blame the Minister of Health or even the Treasurer for being upset about this, because it looks to me as if we have two managers of a programme that is exceedingly complex, and that it is still in its formative years; so formative that, as I say, we have no effective financial report, even to the representatives of the people.

The new minister in one of his first pronouncements said that he favoured 100 per cent payment to the doctors when we know the government policy is 90 per cent. The new minister has also indicated that there should be negotiations—I don't know whether he used that precise word; his predecessor would never use it—between the government and the doctors. It looks as if there are substantial changes, at least from the rather frank statements of the new minister, a man noted for his frankness. We don't know whether he has been pulled into line yet or not.

His predecessor in his frank four days as minister, before he got the party line, said that he felt that Medicare should be paid for completely from tax sources and that premiums should not be charged. So this particular joint-cost programme is one that is confused but about which all of us are adamant that costs be kept under control.

This doesn't mean, however, that the costs are not going to increase tremendously. In answer to a question today, the Minister of Health said that the whole matter of mental health facilities was under review. This is obviously going to be a tremendously expensive programme in the next few years, and it should be.

On the other hand, I believe we have to have some means whereby we can negotiate with the doctors so that their call on the assets of the fund is not going to be growing at the rate that it has over the past two years.

The Treasurer himself has added his comments to the Medicare debate by indicating that perhaps we should consider a return to private enterprise. I don't really see the value of that particular addition to the debate. I know his conservative propensities, that he would probably like to sell Hydro to Oakah Jones, but his reference to the fact that private enterprise would be called upon to meet more and more of the facilities needed for Medicare, I think is a ridiculous one and that it is one that has not added anything of value to the debate.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): We do sell hydro to Oakah Jones.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister wants to sell it too, does he?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I say we do. We do already sell hydro to Oakah Jones.

Mr. MacDonald: Like the federal Liberals wanted to sell Polymer to someone.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about shared-cost programmes. The next one that I want to refer to is the—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member would agree, in any event, that the federal people aren't paying enough?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —Canada Pension Plan. We get about $200 million in shared-cost programmes for this, and surely, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Economics and Municipal Affairs): Canada Assistance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, all right—CAP—right.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No matter what it is, the member will agree it is not enough?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Treasurer would never suggest that we go it alone in this regard, because you cannot predict the need. Where would you be if in a time of economic downturn you didn't have another government to call on to assist in the tremendous payments that are needed to keep the economy, to keep the people going, during times when unemployment is so seriously high? You have got another government to blame for the problem in the first place, but surely when it comes to the specific reaction of government in the provision of welfare services, the Canada Assistance programme is one that is going to continue for a good long time in either its present form or one that is essentially very close to it.

That brings me to one of the adaptations that I think is an important one and that is the tax credit system, which in the long run might very well fulfill most of the requirements for the provision of funds to those people whose regular income does not sustain them. I like the concept, certainly, of a tax credit in this connection and I would give you my assurance, as I have in the past Mr. Speaker, that if this does lead, as it should, to a guaranteed minimum income concept, then I for one, and my party, will support it in concept.

I have said that since I became leader in 1967 and I am delighted that the people opposite—the government—are now considering this sort of an approach to the provision of what we should call welfare, the maintenance of family responsibilities in those areas where the problems have been found in the past. We have a jungle, a nightmare, under our present circumstances; and if we get to the point where a guaranteed basic income approach through tax credits will solve this problem, then I think that we can do away with the shared-cost programme indeed.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: But what do the member for Sarnia and the member for Downsview say to it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I am speaking as the leader of the party. The minister doesn't speak in any capacity at all.

Mr. Bullbrook: You bet you he is. And the minister will never be able to do that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if we were going to predict the future, I think it is about time that the Provincial Secretary for Justice had a mild heart attack here and decided he had withdrawn from provincial politics so that he

could pave the way for another career, because he is dead here. He is dead. He is not going anywhere. Now that they have taken him out of the department there is not even any fun. I bet he doesn't even have guards any more.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): All they can protect him from is his own party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the last shared-cost programme that is of concern is the one that involves the payment for post-secondary education. This in a sense must have been just like a Christmas tree when it first came in. The government of Canada, and I think this was back about 1965 or 1964 this started, decided that in their responsibility to remove inequalities, they would have to help pay for post-secondary education. And unlike their approach to generalized equalization payments, Ontario shared in this this year to the extent of $244 million, a transfer that in fact was a block transfer. It had very few earmarks on it, it simply came to support government programmes, and certainly we could use it in post-secondary education and in grade 13 as well.

So I would say that we should get as much as we can from another level of government that is prepared to levy the taxes and pay them to us. I have tried to add some of these up and the Treasurer knows what my result has been from previous speeches. As a result of the shared income tax responsibility, this year he predicts we will get one billion and fifty million dollars. Programme transfers, $455 million—I don't know why in his budget he separates post-secondary, because that is a block transfer of another $244 million. Our share of the estate tax is $28 million. I add it up to $1.8 billion, which in our expenditure of $4.3 billion—I know that is about what our expenditures will be this year—is 42 per cent of our total income. Mr. Speaker, we should not forget then that in paying the bills for programmes which we administer, 42 per cent of the dollars came from another jurisdiction by agreement. And this $1.8 billion is an interesting figure. From my calculations, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not necessarily.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —we get about $35 million to $37 million for each percentage point that is abated from federal tax and paid to the Province of Ontario. So the Treasurer and the government of Ontario have proposed a 50 per cent deal. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In general terms, the minister said to the government of Canada: "We will take over full responsibility for presently shared programmes if you will consider abating 50 per cent of the taxes raised in the province at the income tax level."

Well I would say that even that deal is not good enough because it would return only about $1.75 billion or $1.8 billion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I haven't said that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the minister is negotiating. The minister is negotiating for a full abatement of the shared-cost programmes that we presently have. My point is this, even the abatement of 50 per cent of all of the income tax collected here would not be enough.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Right!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It wouldn't even pay for the total cost which I have, in general terms, added up on my piece of paper here.

It has got to be some kind of a judgement along these lines: There are those who feel that if the government of Canada has less than 50 per cent control of the income tax in this nation, it will lose control of the fiscal and economic planning for the country. I am not in a position to say whether they are right or whether they are wrong. Frankly, I feel that a 50 per cent division is one that should be considered on both sides, even if some of the programmes remain on a shared basis. I would like to see us take over full responsibility for some of them, some of the ones which are now well established, and the government of Canada simply retain its responsibility to set the basic level of service across this nation. To say that we will not have any shared-cost programmes, either continuing now or new ones in the future, is completely unrealistic; a 50 per cent share of the income tax would not pay for our responsibilities now, so we surely should not negotiate on that basis!

The government in Ottawa is going to be very unwilling even to consider an abatement that large, although from my layman's point of view I can't see anything wrong with a split down the middle as long as there is an understanding that both governments share in the decision that sets the tax base.

Does the minister want to say something?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, just to give my friend a rest because I know he wants to sit down for a minute.

I have not, and I don't think the government has, taken the view that 50 per cent or 50 points of income tax are not necessarily equivalent or are not a trade-off for what we presently receive under the shared-cost programmes.

We may have talked about abatements for all the share-cost programmes. We may have talked about 50 points of personal income tax but we did not necessarily connect the two at one and the same time. As a matter of fact, we published a staff paper three or four years ago indicating that we felt that the government of Canada could control fiscal and monetary policy with 40 per cent of the total income tax field. But we have not related the two things; that is not necessarily agreed to by the member's friends at Ottawa. I wanted, before I leave—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Imagine that!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —Mr. Speaker, to correct the Leader of the Opposition on that point. We have not necessarily related the two things.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would think that somewhere between 50 and 60 per cent there would be a fair amount, yes. Of course, the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that the expected return from these percentage points of income tax is going to escalate very, very fast indeed. At the present time, I would say that the escalation of the cost of medical services is even more rapid than that.

On the other hand, the costs of education, I think, are flattening out and are going to go definitely downward now that the expensive minister has been moved to other responsibilities in this government.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member had better go back to farming, not teaching.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, that may be so. As a matter of fact, I think I can make a profitable living in either one. I just don't have a hardware store; I wish I had something like that.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): I understand the member may be cultivating other things.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just before the Treasurer goes out, I would like to tell him that if his attitude is that there cannot be any more shared-cost programmes he is going to be a substantial block in the development of Canada. I believe that we are going to move on to more shared-cost programmes. I would hope that the government of Canada would come up with an initiative in the environment which would require provinces like Ontario, which have not been doing enough in this connection, to move forward with new programmes. What would the government do, in fact, if there were a specific offer from the government of Canada having to do with new sewage disposal facilities or tertiary facilities for certain areas or a programme for the Great Lakes, which said: "We will pay this percentage if you will go along with us"?

Mr. Speaker, I would say to you that the government of Ontario of Ontario would co-operate with enthusiasm and move forward into yet another shared-cost field. I believe the future of Canada is bound up with and will be involved with shared-cost programmes. Once they are established, then surely the administration should become provincial, but this doesn't mean that the government of Canada relinquishes its responsibility in this connection.

I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to refer briefly to another reference from page 13 of the Speech from the Throne, in which His Honour talks about government programmes referring to the environment. I feel that policies and programmes have been downgraded in this speech in reference to the environment, and I quote as follows:

> My government shares fully the concerns of the people of Ontario in respect to the protection and enhancement of our natural environment. The Ontario Water Resources Commission has maintained constant liaison with officials of the federal government, and has been involved in the discussions with the government of the United States on co-operative measures to clean up the Great Lakes.

I ask you to consider that in conjunction with the ministerial changes in the Department of the Environment.

We now have the member for Leeds (Mr. Auld) replacing the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr), the desk pounder—he has now been elevated to academic concerns. I personally feel that this is going to relieve much of the pressure on the management board, on the policy makers, and the whole thrust of the government, in their efforts to improve the environment here.

I would go so far as to say that the change was politically dictated and that there were those in support of the party in one way or another who felt that the former Minister of the Environment was simply thrusting a little too hard.

I ask you to consider another change; we have a new chairman for the OWRC. While I have the greatest respect on a personal basis for the member for Wellington-Dufferin, still I feel that putting the OWRC in his sole charge as chairman is not a way to indicate that the government is maintaining or strengthening its thrust to improve the environment.

Mr. Lewis: It is a joke. It is a joke, that is what it is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He has responsibilities in this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has the Leader of the Opposition read the report on what is being done with the OWRC?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well Mr. Speaker, the Premier is indicating that he might in fact follow the policy of the Liberal Party and put the OWRC in the Department of the Environment, rather than leaving it out there under the direction of a cattle drover from Fergus.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I also hope that when you finally bring in your bill to remove the right of a member of this House to have a job in a municipal government, you also see that the member for Wellington-Dufferin is fired as chairman of the OWRC. Why isn't he here today telling us about—

Mr. Singer: Sewage sludge.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sewage sludge! So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that the speech and the attitude of the government indicates that once again the Premier, the leader of the government, has ridden the environment as an issue as long as he wants to. He has gone to lunch with Pollution Probe and held the chicken leg aloft while he points to the pollution at Cherry Beach or out on the campus of Queen's Park, or something like that. But now the election is over and we can bring good old Jim Auld in and John Root and that is supposed to clean up the environment of the province.

Well it won't!

Some hon. members: Shame! Shame!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wish that the Minister of Agriculture and Food was here. The Premier has indicated that I am going to do some cultivating back on the ancestral acres.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't mean that!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, he didn't, eh? Does he want to make a speech about something else?

Mr. Singer: No, no; nothing like that.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I want to read to you, sir, from the brief the Federation of Agriculture presented to the cabinet and were good enough to present to the opposition caucuses as well.

From the statistics available to them, they list the realized net income of the farmers in the Province of Ontario for the last few years. In 1969, the realized net income was $442 million. Each year since then, it has gone down rapidly, until this year, in 1972, the realized net income is $274 million. A drop of $168 million in just four years.

The other surprising statistic associated with this is that when you look at the decrease or change in farmers' net income in all provinces, the drop in the Province of Ontario is greater than any other province—38 per cent down in four years. Those are, in my view, dramatic and important figures.

The problem the politicians have, particularly farmer politicians, is to make anybody pay attention to the problems faced by the farm economy. It was interesting to note that when I raised this subject about a year ago at the last session before the election we had catcalls from all sides about Nixon and his bacon-and-eggs speech once more.

Even the Minister of Agriculture and Food was not prepared to consider seriously the problems that are faced by the farm community.

I am not going to dwell on this. I have a conflict of interest. I make my living to some extent by farming and anybody who doesn't believe it can come out there and I'll hand him a fork and he can help me.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to be quite specific about this. While everybody is prepared to be jovial about the farmers and say they are all in Florida this time of year or they have all got support programmes and that they are paid to take land out of cultivation and that sort of thing, this is simply not so.

The investment of the farmers is well known. The average income—and I ask you lawyers and doctors and accountants and other hangers-on to consider this—the average income for the farmer is $5,600 a year. The

average income for a doctor in 1969 was $40,0000. For lawyers, the average income they reported—

Mr. Singer: Not mine!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —was about $38,000. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, that it is time some of the people in this House—all of the people in this House and particularly in the government—got their thinking caps on as to what we can do in this regard.

When we talk about the high-priced doctors and lawyers, I would also mention the high-priced chairman of the OWRC, who I am told gets an indemnity of $34,000.

Mr. Worton: That is salary and extras.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Salary and extras. Mr. Speaker, let me put this to you—

Hon. Mr. Davis: How much?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —I wish the Minister of Agriculture were here because there are at least two areas—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It should be worth a front bench seat.

Hon. Mr. Davis: More money!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —where action is demanded.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The Premier should apply for that job.

Hon. Mr. Davis: More money. That's what the blue book says.

Mr. Deans: If it ever becomes open let me know.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the member looking for a job too?

Mr. Deans: The member never can tell.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I did a little shopping on Friday and I bought some eggs and for grade A large I paid 28 cents a dozen.

An hon. member: They are going to get lower.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There are those who will say: "Well, 28 cents, that is fine. I guess it's time to stock up on eggs and live high."

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is more than double that in northern Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is fine. The member can worry about that himself. Right now I am worrying about the farmers. At 28 cents a dozen it means that for every dozen a farmer sells he is losing three cents. The cost of production is about 31 cents a dozen. This has been a problem for almost two years and the Minister of Agriculture, when presented with it and some pressure was applied during the election, said: "I know what I'll do, we'll have a royal commission." He established a one-man royal commission—Judge Ross?

An hon. member: Ross?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Judge Ross; and because the judge hasn't as yet reported, no action can be taken.

I think you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague, the member for Huron-Bruce, in an address here in the short session when we were talking about this matter, said that the Liberal Party would be prepared to support the government if, instead of waiting for the report of the royal commission, they moved on a temporary basis to bring some order to the marketing of eggs in this province.

You know that the federal legislation has now been proclaimed. The other provinces concerned with egg marketing have marketing boards but Ontario is still the hole in the dike through which marketing is uncontrolled, and as a result the prices are below the costs of production. Now this is a matter of grave concern and our party has gone a long way out on a limb in putting the immediate short-term answer to the government, but still they do nothing.

Every day the egg farmers are losing more money. Many of them are going bankrupt. Even those who have been vertically integrated are suffering the financial pinch. We are not worrying about them, because they have other resources. We are talking about the individual farmers who have been in this particular means of livelihood for many years. It is unconscionable that the government should continue procrastinating, using the royal commission as an excuse for their lack of action.

The second point I would like to refer to specifically has to do with beef marketing. I still don't know the story involving the government programme announced by the minister, in which he said that there were going to be funds made available as incentives to extend beef production in this province. We do know that certain organizations objected and the minister withdrew what was a very tentative offer at best.

Once again, through lack of initiative and leadership in the agricultural department of

this province, the farmers have come out not only second best but 10th best because the net income is falling in this province faster than in any other province. This is a figure which should give concern to everybody, whether they are farmers or not.

I submit that if we were concerned with adding two minutes to the coffee break of the steelworkers in Hamilton, we would certainly have members up here debating at length on this subject. We are talking about a large and important segment of the economy of this province, and while politicians—myself included—have been talking about the plight of farmers for a good long time and have heard some of the figures and statistics, why can't we at least do as well as the other provinces in supporting this industry? This is what we have failed to do.

Mr. Speaker, you know that the government has proposed in the speech to bring about regional government in two other areas, in Waterloo county and in Sudbury, and in spite of what you might have read in the fine print of the Globe and Mail immediately following the Speech from the Throne, we in the Liberal Party are prepared to assess these bills on their merits and not reject them simply because they indicate a continuing approach to regional government. This is obviously the way they must be dealt with here.

It is beyond the scope of my intention this afternoon to talk about the record of regional government already. You know, Mr. Speaker, there have been serious disappointments? The then Minister of Municipal Affairs had to go down to Grimsby and St. Catharines before the election with $1 million stuffed in his pocket so that he would support the electoral activities of his party down there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: A million dollars?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A million dollars! As the policy minister for justice almost said: "What's a million? It was enough Mr. Speaker, to tide the party over in that area.

The minister went up into York with $800,000 in order to pay the increased costs of regional government. We know that local government costs escalated by over 40 per cent in the first 18 months.

But now the government has been returned with a whopping majority. Only one opposition member was returned from the Niagara Peninsula. The people must like regional government, even though I understand we are going to be presented with a bill for secession from St. Catharines. It will be interesting when the member for St. Catharines presents it to the private bills committee; it will be interesting indeed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How is the member going to vote?

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier will be the new Abe Lincoln.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Because, Mr. Speaker, the experience has been that these regional governments have been accompanied by high costs and centralization of decision. We believe certainly that the improvement of municipal government has to be dealt with in an effective way, but I don't believe it is effective when, for example, the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs talks to the officials from the counties of Haldimand and Norfolk and says: "If you don't decide on your own to go together and form a region, well we will put you together." That is a great way to consult the local people and to rely on their judgement. In other words, if you don't decide the way we want you to decide then you will have no decision and we will impose it upon you.

I think the approach with the ironclad rigid criteria of population and assessment has been found wanting where it has been applied elsewhere and I think it is also characteristic that we don't have any move toward regional government in Chatham or even in Peel—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, we have!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —where the local members certainly don't seem to be urging the municipalities to get together. At least there is no indication in the Speech from the Throne, even though studies are available in the case of that little Brampton situation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can always update you about Brampton and Peel.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Bait or debate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No; I say I will update you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, we will hear from the Premier, I am sure, in this debate some time.

So I will look at the bills, but my prediction is that before the next election rolls around the province will be mostly regionalized with the possible exception of Chatham. I would think that even Brampton will get it in the neck. Then we will see what happens in that regard.

But this approach to regionalization seems to have become a fixation. I don't see that the rigid criteria that were established some years ago by the present Minister of Municipal Affairs have any application. It is characteristic that he would give, let us say the counties of Haldimand and Norfolk the right to make their own decision and then tell them that unless they decide in favour of regionalization the bill will be put to the Legislature anyway.

It is typical. He has said that. It is what is wrong with the government. It is what is wrong with its approach to the reform of municipal administration.

Mr. Bullbrook: It sounds like the OMB. It sounds like what the government does with the Ontario Municipal Board—tell them what their policy should be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. We tell them what ours is. There's a distinction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I want, Mr. Speaker, to tell you how impressed I was at the opening of the Pickering power station to hear those wheels humming and to realize that station was turning out more electrical energy than any other atomic plant in the world.

I go back in my mind to a former Minister of Energy and Resources, Mr. Macaulay, when he told the House about 1962 that he was embarking on a brave new programme involving the production of energy from nuclear sources at Douglas Point. Then his successor, Mr. Simonett, about 1964, I believe, said that although there had been some disappointments at Douglas Point: "We expected it to be working in 1965, but it may not be working in 1965, and we are going ahead with a commitment, a large commitment, to build a very large nuclear reactor—four of them as a matter of fact—at Pickering."

You know the problem that Douglas Point suffered and still suffers. It is closed down completely now because of the lack of heavy water, and this is the responsibility of the federal government. The provincial government, the Department of Energy, and Ontario Hydro, were always listed as partners in this development until it ran on evil days. I was interested to note that at the opening of Pickering there was no doubt about who owned and operated and had the responsibility for Douglas Point. It has suddenly become an AECL operation exclusively. Anyway it has closed down. There may be a few lights on, and I hope the provision of power from outside will at least keep that place warm. The thing is they had substantial problems with it.

The decision, however, was made to proceed with the $760 million development at Pickering. There is a good deal to be said about this. You have heard what I have said about it two or three years ago.

Ontario Hydro has the commitment to produce power at cost—not be the arm of public policy for the development of a system which might or might not be marketed elsewhere. One of the indications of the lack of success of our programmes has been that we haven't made an arm's length sale of this system anywhere, anytime, except to Ontario Hydro. It was built on a cost-plus basis with Ontario Hydro contributing something, the government of Ontario contributing heavily and the government of Canada contributing heavily, at least to all of Douglas Point and part of Pickering.

So you know it is a tremendous breakthrough indeed that that place is operating as effectively as it did. None of the prototypes operated to the level of efficiency that was predicted at Pickering. It is a real credit to the engineers concerned that this Pickering place is operating above the speculations.

I must say that it is a credit to the ministers who had the nerve to continue with that commitment even when all of the experience had been, if not disastrous at least bad, and when this system could not stack up on a competitive basis internationally to result in the sale of even one reactor. The place is working and the engineers are satisfied and I think it is a great achievement indeed.

I am also quite interested—I should mention I'll look at my notes here—$760 million is tough to finance because part of that was $100 million borrowed in New York at 9.6 per cent. When George Gathercole says we are going to have an increase in hydro rates every year for the foreseeable future—he mentioned five or six years—and the Premier says that may or may not be so but there is nothing he can do about it, that is an indication that we are going to have increased rates. The Premier may go on saying there is nothing he can do about it so that it will be Ontario Hydro that carries that particular ashcan.

Frankly, I am glad that my house is not electrically heated because I think that this is going to be a very heavy burden indeed to pay for about five years from now. These problems are ones that simply were not foreseen as we committed ourselves to very expensive means of producing power.

There is some personal experience in this connection. I guess I've got plenty of time and I know you are all interested, Mr. Speaker. Once again referring to the family farm back in Brant county; 260 acres, it has been there quite a while. If need be, I think we could make a living on it.

The fellow who went there originally was a very kind and generous chap. Charles Nixon was his name. He went there about 1848 and the survey road that set out our farm on the south went through some very swampy low land indeed. It became the custom to turn off just at the edge of our farm and come up on the high dry land. You know: "We'll go through Charlie's place; his wife makes good cookies." I think there was some attraction there according to family stories.

That road is now King's Highway. It cuts the farm in two and those of you who have been driving past there on a summer afternoon might have seen myself or some other people driving a herd of cattle back and forth across the highway. You can't stand in the way of progress.

About 1860 the politicians of the day in support of progress decided that the Grand Trunk Railway had to have a line that went through there. It is now the Canadian National and it bisects the farm with a very high embankment indeed.

Those of you who have driven by and looked carefully will find that the Henry government provided a tunnel for the Nixon cows to get under the railroad track so we didn't have to drive them up over the top. It was very much appreciated. My dad insisted that the date be etched into the cement—1932—because he knew the government was going to change and he didn't want anybody to think he had had it built there with public funds.

About 1948 Ontario Hydro came out to the farm and said "We've got a pleasant surprise for you. A high-tension power line is going through your farm diagonally. You will require seven towers for which we will pay $75 each." That is one payment giving them rights in perpetuity. This power line now diagonally cuts across the farm. Imperial Esso pipeline had to be built there just after the war.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am pleased the member didn't get the airport.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: My neighbours immediately to the north told the property officers that they didn't want the pipeline on their property because if there was ever a war it would be bombed and they didn't want their farm bombed. That was the argument. The former owner of the property said: "We don't want to stand in the way of progress. Just put a little bend in the pipeline back there." The pipeline goes right through our property! So really we have had the advantages of dealing with property officers both public and private over a good long time.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member has not been making his money from farming.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I will tell the minister, if we were going to make the money out of the right of way and easements associated with Hydro and the Department of Highways, we would be on welfare. I will tell him that.

So I was interested the other day when I got home, when my wife said there was some guy at the back door there who wanted to survey the farm. I asked him what he wanted to do and he said, "Oh, didn't you know? There is a power line going through here."

I just want you to compare this approach with something that you may recall, Mr. Speaker. When we went to the opening of that plant—I think I was the only opposition politician. No —

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Yorkview was there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Yorkview was there as well.

We got a beautifully embossed invitation, and I thought: "I am going to have to go to that. No doubt about it, I have got to go to that opening."

As we approached the front door of this $760 million plant, there were stationed on each side two Ontario Hydro security guards in uniform like you wouldn't believe. They looked like they had come right from Cade's county. They didn't have guns but they did have metal helmets—gold with black stripes; no plumes, that comes next year.

As we approached the door, it was just like going into Loblaws. The door swung open like that, and we walked in. Just as I went in, there was a helicopter circling overhead. It looked like one of these Vietnam gun ships. I mean it was big. Somebody said: "Oh, here comes the Premier." And, if you will pardon me, an electrification just went through the whole place.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is quite right, I am told.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I happened to be there when the Premier himself came through those doors which snapped open. I said: "Boy, this is a great plane you are flying." He said: "It is one of Hydro's. Do you want a ride?" He is generous; he is very generous.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I cannot afford not to be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When Ontario Hydro talks about power at cost, cost is just anything at all.

You remember there was a debate in this House many years ago that the government was establishing some sort of a secret police force or a Gestapo. I would not suggest for a moment; but boy have they got a lot of private security officers and guards! There were platoons of Ontario Hydro guards. Anybody with any status at all, like you know who, had a metal helmet that was gold. I believe the Premier's was white.

Mr. Bullbrook: There is an indicator.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They had a red one for the member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was orange. Maybe that is an indication too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was very becoming to the hon. leader.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I was impressed. They had the banners behind the opening ceremony area. It was very much like the Science Centre for those conferences they have there. It impresses; you really feel you are entering the Sportsplatz back in 1937—something like that. The guards are there; everything is there. They have the speakers and we hear that, and so on and so on.

But then I was talking to some of the press people and they said: "My! Ontario Hydro has excellent PR people." They must have had 30 public relations experts there to see that the press was treated properly. The only thing was that none of them could tell them much about it. They would give them a handout and say: "Well, I'll talk to my boss about this or that."

But I ask you to compare that with the way they deal with the little man, that is the farmer on lot 1, concession 3, South Dumfries. A knock comes on the door and the poor little innocent surveyor says: "We would like to survey your land".

Immediately the wife of the owner gets all bristling and says: "What now? What are you doing now?"

"Well, we are putting a power line in here."

The next day I get a phone call, of course, from my neighbour saying: "What's going on? Somebody wanted to survey through our land."

I had to explain to him that I didn't know anything about it but that I surmised that the line which was proposed two years ago had been changed.

One of my neighbours, a plumbing contractor from Hamilton, who also has racehorse stables and white fences around a beautiful piece of land and who also has an excellent game preserve on his own farm, had been successful in persuading Ontario Hydro that it shouldn't run the line through his property—

Hon. Mr. Davis: So they go through the member's.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We don't have a game preserve, and, believe me, I shall not stand in the way of progress. The lines will be put in there.

But I would just suggest to you, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Has he got a swimming pool?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —I'm talking for myself and my neighbours and many others who will be treated to this sort of an approach—that surely we should have had a letter from the chairman of Hydro, even if it was mimeographed, saying: "These are our plans for your area; this is needed for the provision of power"; or whatever the explanation is. It could say: "We have arranged for an open forum on this subject at some convenient spot, where our experts will be there to explain it, and we will be glad to hear your objections. We hope to have the property acquired by such-and-such a date, because it is essential that we proceed with this line." Of course, they have expropriation powers, and there are ways to get these decisions changed, but essentially the line has to go through.

I've had letters, and I'm sure many of the members have, from people who live in Peel North riding. They do not want a power corridor to go through their land. They don't want it to go through their land. It's got to go somewhere; it will go somewhere else—perhaps.

But it seems to me that if Ontario Hydro has all of these resources and a chairman who, undoubtedly, has great abilities in dealing with individuals—a kind and thoughtful gentleman indeed, who knows how to keep the wheels turning and the lights burning—it is elementary that he should deal in an effective way with the people. He knows and the government knows that the last of the easy decisions is locating power plants and power lines is past.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these introductory remarks, I want to say something that's, well, personal. You are aware, sir, that this will probably be the last time that I will lead off this debate as leader of the great Liberal Party in Ontario. I have no regrets at my decision to step down from this position of importance and eminence.

I look back over a bit of history. I thought 1943 would be a convenient time to start, when my father left the leadership of the party. He was succeeded, after a little fooling around, by a good friend of us all, Farquhar Oliver. In 1948 Oliver was succeeded by Walter Thompson. Do you remember the hospitalization man? Do you remember also that the Conservative Party said that hospitalization was outright socialism and that anybody who wanted a socialist Ontario might vote Liberal. The result was that even the leader of the Liberal Party was defeated and the Conservatives came back in droves because, evidently, Ontario doesn't want socialism.

Mr. Singer: It still doesn't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Thompson, the first, was succeeded by Mr. Oliver again, you will recall. Then Mr. Wintermeyer, in 1959, stayed on for two election—1959 and 1963. I recall him very well and I'm sure many of you do.

Andy Thompson; we all recall his contribution to the House as leader. He's now contributing to the nation as a senator and I succeeded him.

If you were to look at the other side, well, Mr. Drew lasted until 1948, and was succeeded by Mr. Kennedy—the other Mr. Kennedy, Tom. Mr. Frost took over just before the election of 1951—that was his first election—to 1961, when Mr. Robarts took over.

I well remember the day—a personal reference once again—when the Conservative convention was voting for Mr. Robarts. It happened to be the day that my father was being buried. The then Premier, Mr. Frost, went out of his way, even under those circumstances, to come all the way up to St. George and it was much appreciated.

Then Mr. Robarts was succeeded by Mr. Davis, who may be here for two or three years, they tell me.

You look at the course of these things—there are many interesting things that have happened. I don't know whether the course of history is changed dramatically by opposition leader, but certainly it's an important and consuming occupation.

The 1971 campaign—in closing I want to make some brief references to it, I know that the Premier would be disappointed if I did not—was an interesting one. I was talking to the leader of the NDP in a quiet moment just a day or two ago, and we both agreed that these campaigns are good ones for the people directly involved. You travel, you meet people. We all feel we had good candidates and we had reasonable discussion of issues and yet my feeling was that issues certainly took a back seat to an assessment of personality perhaps. We had our famous Blueprint for Government—I wanted to say quite a bit about that, particularly as it pertains to the form of the cabinet, but I will have another chance to do that—and I had the feeling that, well the Blueprint for Government was pitted against Thor the $2 dog—

Hon. Mr. Davis: One dollar and seventy-five cents.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well $1.75 dog, and it plain which the people were interested in. But certainly, if you want to see Ontario you should travel as the leader of a provincial party. We had a palatial DC-3 which we shared with the NDP on some occasions; and we found that we could get there just about as fast and as sure as the Conservative buses and the pancake batter that kept dribbling out of the back there apparently.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The batter was never on the bus.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We had an interesting time with politicians and with the press and with others. I will tell you the things that stick with me as you fly over Ontario, mile after mile of the most productive farmland. It really is a most marvellous sight. In the autumn of the year it's beautiful. Then you come back late at night and see the Metro area and the various cities.

I remember one trip. We left from Muskoka. I had just judged Miss Teenage Muskoka or something like that. I recall the

occasion. We got into a plane at Muskoka airport because it was essential that we get up to Rainy River for a series of meetings, so we flew all night long and I remember we looked out over the Lakehead and Sault Ste. Marie, and we finally arrived at International Falls and were able through very careful work to elect one of the finest members of the House, Mr. Reid—yes, there he is.

So Mr. Speaker, I have no regrets about the campaign, particularly, but I think I must quite seriously say, and repeat for a moment what I said about some of those payments, the payments for tax assistance arriving at my home the Monday before the election. Well it didn't quite change my vote, but it really made my stomach turn over and my heart turn cold, because that was pretty blatant political bribery.

I remember seeing that the Premier had made an announcement on behalf of the officials and experts working for the Treasury Board that the election of a Liberal government would increase expenditure by $3.2 billion and the election of an NDP government by $3.15 billion—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Less than that.

Mr. Deans: We were less.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, and it was interesting for me just to look at the record between 1967 and 1971. The increase in the budget of the Province of Ontario had been in excess of $3 billion and the Premier—

Mr. Bullbrook: How can you say those words?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —the Premier and those hacks who write his election material were not prepared, of course, even to consider the same thing that his own Treasurer was talking about; changes in the tax base; that in fact the cost of education had to come down and that this would mean that the payments would come from the provincial tax base.

I was disgusted at that particular emanation from the Premier. It was unworthy of him or any other Premier. I have no doubt that the people who are employed by the Treasury Board will do as they are told—and some of them might even vote Conservative—but I have my doubts that it was in that capacity that they undertook that particular piece of dirty work. I don't think he does anything for the public service or for the opinion that the people would have of him as the first minister in that sort of chicanery; that he found it impossible to make the kind of policy decisions during and immediately before the campaign that had anything but political meat to them.

The situation at Sturgeon Falls resulted in his Minister of Education wringing his hands and, finding a royal commissioner who couldn't even speak French, to pour some oil on the water as only he can—a very able man indeed; a man who didn't even give his report before the school that was the bone of contention in Sturgeon Falls had been granted and will be in service next September.

The Minister of Agriculture couldn't face the situation on the farm with egg marketing, had to appoint a royal commission and now, while he is waiting for that report, the situation deteriorates and continues to plague the farm community.

Well, you are in a bind of your own making. You have cut taxes and you have promised you will not increase taxes. You have promises – pardon me, commitments; the Premier doesn't use the word promise—which are costing us plenty. The real meat of this session will be the decisions that come down in the budget and not in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, because budgetary problems are the ones that face us now.

Still, the election is over. Certainly the commanding majority is prepared to support the government in the programmes put forward.

We regret a good many things that have been omitted from this speech and as much as anything else we regret some of the attitudes that have been seen and been established by the Davis-McKeough administration.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Singer, the following amendment:

That this House regrets:

The lack of effective policy to stimulate employment, attempting instead to place all responsibility on the federal government;

The downgrading of programmes and policy to improve the environment;

The absence of a farm programme strengthening egg marketing and providing incentives for the expansion of the beef industry;

The reorganization of government and cabinet, seriously tangling lines of responsibility and reducing efficiency;

The cynicism of the government bringing forward many expensive programmes in the months immediately prior to the election,

then embarking on a policy of retrenchment immediately following.

Mr. Bullbrook: Resign!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tomorrow?

Mr. Bullbrook: Right now!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Those fellows are going to have to go a long way to get a better leader.

Mr. Bullbrook: I agree.

Some hon. members: We all agree!

Mr. Bullbrook: Let the record show that we all agree with that!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we proceed with the private members' hour now.

ONTARIO ECOLOGICAL SANCTUARIES ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moves second reading of Bill 4, An Act to provide for the Establishment of Ecological Sanctuaries in the Province of Ontario.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware, although we may not be sufficiently appreciative, of the fact that man's advancement and technology is pushing back the frontiers of nature at an alarming rate.

Aside from the problems associated with the destruction of our ecology, we must also face the psychological depressant of noise technology. There are now few, if any, places in southern Ontario during the winter months where one can appreciate the quiet enjoyment of such things as snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, bird-watching and other forms of passive recreation without the intrusion, and sometimes danger, of snowmobiles.

The purpose of this bill is to establish in Ontario various large areas of land which would be set aside as ecological sanctuaries as a winter protection for the delicate balance between plants and animals which rely to a considerable degree upon nature's winter blanket of snow for their survival in our rigorous climate.

This would mean that ecological sanctuaries would have to be designated by the provincial government and made unavailable for the pleasure or recreational use of snowmobiles and other motorized vehicles during the winter months. The only exception would be for rescue or service equipment.

There are now over 200,000 snowmobiles in Ontario. At present, about one out of every 22 Ontarians uses a snowmobile at some time during the cold months. This in itself is testimony to the unique, even amazing qualities of this machine.

But in many ways, the snowmobile is also a very dangerous mechanism; dangerous, not only because of the number of fatal accidents in which it is involved, but also because its present unlimited use can result in the destruction of plant and animal life all across the province. While we all recognize and enjoy the use of snowmobiles, some rationale must be introduced to curb the adverse effects of snowmobiling upon the provincial ecology.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come for this province to declare certain areas "off limits" to motorized vehicles which are used for recreation and pleasure in the winter months. Some of these areas should include some conservation authority properties and parts of provincial parks, especially those close to urban areas; also, Crown lands and, as well as these, areas that can in some measure still be considered wilderness areas.

It is not my intention in these remarks to leave the impression that I favour an overall ban on snowmobiling. Indeed, I fully understand the interests of the thousands of owners, the large number of people employed in the industry and the importance of this vehicle to our tourist trade. Yet, surely we can all understand that the pursuit of pleasure bears a responsibility, and that in pursuing the pleasure of snowmobiling we must also be aware of the need to preserve the ecology of the province.

Pleasure and preservation are not incompatible. This ought not to entail a conflict of objectives. Obviously, there may be from time to time some inconvenience, inasmuch as the recreationist may have to travel a longer distance to reach an approved snowmobile area. But certainly this is a small price to pay for the salvation of our plant and wildlife.

I bring your attention to a survey conducted by the Ontario Department of Tourism and Information on snowmobiling during the winter of 1969-1970. On page 24 is a result of the question, "What type of area do you prefer when snowmobiling for pleasure or recreation?" The three single most preferred areas given by the respondents were: unorganized open land and bushy areas with no special facilities; wooded areas with trails; hilly lands in wooded settings. The total for these three areas is 77.4 per cent.

This survey, which points up that most people show little interest in organized areas, is not only significant but, indeed alarming. Further, this study of the Department of Tourism and Information contains a number of comments and opinions as expressed by the respondents which run to some seven pages. In only one out of the many comments does a single respondent mention the problem of noise pollution or preservation. Here are some of the more interesting comments:

"I would like to see organized trips under supervision of conservation officers to remote parts of Algonquin Park." "Snowmobiling has led to being able to get into places in the winter which would otherwise be inaccessible." "Open provincial parks and campsites to winter camping which can provide a wider area of serviced Crown land." "Trails on Crown land." "Allow snowmobiling in Metro parks and also in parks within a reasonable distance of Metro Toronto." "Open the provincial parks for snowmobiles." And, finally: "More urban parks open for snowmobiling at no cost to owners."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a study on "Snowmobile Use and Winter Mortality of Small Mammals," presented by two members of the Department of Zoology, University of Minnesota, to the 1971 Snowmobile and Off-the-Road Vehicle Research Symposium at Michigan State University, the observation is made that:

> Snow cover is considered to be important to the survival of many animals that live beneath it (subnivean) because of the protection it affords from stresses of direct exposure to severe winter climate and predation.

And there follow four supporting reference papers.

> The recent explosion in popularity of snowmobiles for winter recreation has raised questions about ecological effects because, in adition to their noise and exhaust fumes, snowmobiles compact the snow. It is the last factor, mechanical compaction of snowfields, that can produce a stress upon subnivean organisms and thereby increase winter mortality rates.
>
> Both the reduction in snow depth and the increase in snow density due to snowmobile packing operate to reduce the insulative value of snow and to increase the mechanical barrier to animal movements beneath the snow.

Now, not only does the unlimited use of the snowmobile for recreation and pleasure destroy animal life, but also, because of compaction, snowmobiling may cause damage yields per acre from forage grassfields and vegetation density. This latter problem should awake many farmers, particularly those who use their snowmobile on their own property, or who open up their fields to city snowmobilers without much thought and in many cases only for profit.

In connection with this, I might suggest that those people who own private property and who do not wish to have their property used by snowmobiles or who have difficulty keeping snowmobilers from trespassing on their land, could ask the the Ontario government to designate their lands as ecological sanctuaries within the meaning of this Act.

Such areas could then be posted as "Ontario ecological sanctuaries," and any who violated the restrictions of this Act would be subject to a fine of up to $1,000.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that legislation is already available to the municipalities allowing them to implement such regulations as they see fit to curb the use of the snowmobile. A few have already moved in this regard, one of the cities being Brantford. However, more encouragement is necessary and I am convinced that leadership by the government of Ontario is urgently required.

In my view, the Ontario government should immediately undertake a province-wide survey to determine what areas in the province cannot be used for snowmobiles for recreation and pleasure. They could be called "Ontario ecological sanctuaries." If the government were to begin such a study right now some areas could be declared off-limits to snowmobiles for the winter of 1972-1973.

Mr. Speaker, I have not commented upon the noise made by the snowmobile. I know that some of the manufacturers are now either conducting research into this noise

problem, or are preparing to introduce a quieter machine into the market. I think that there are some federal noise standards that will be coming into effect. In any event, provincial controls through noise regulations must be brought forward immediately.

I understand that the Department of the Environment is now drafting legislation to combat noise pollution which would include snowmobiles, and I hope that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), will be able to have this legislation ready for this session of the Legislature so that we may have in effect some regulations for the next year.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, you may have noted that the bill confines itself to ecological sanctuaries during the winter months. However, I tend to take the longer view and it is my hope that eventually much wider-ranging legislation can be introduced to create ecological sanctuaries on a year-round basis.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, it is with a certain amount of trepidation that I rise to take part in this debate and to speak in opposition really to the hon. member's bill.

I ask for your judgement, sir, before I begin, as to whether or not the rules and procedures of the Legislature still apply in respect to written speeches in the Legislature? For the benefit of the newer members, I understand that written speeches are not allowed. I might just say that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Come on!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What kind of nonsense is that now?

Mr. Reid: I was about to make a point, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ferrier: Pretty small point—picky, picky.

Mr. Reid: As usual my friends to the left don't wait to hear the point, and if they did hear it, they wouldn't understand it anyway, so they might as well do their barking now rather than later.

Mr. Deans: Why wait for something we wouldn't understand?

Mr. Reid: My point, Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to slip in via the back door the fact that one of the things that I think the government opposite has been very derelict in doing is providing new members of the Legislature with the background information that they require to carry on the job in this Legislature. I well recall when I came in 1967, Mr. Speaker, that I would—

Mr. Speaker: Does this have something to do with the bill before us?

Mr. Reid: Well, it is, perhaps, a little more pertinent than the bill itself.

An hon. member: Out of order!

Mr. Deans: It is about as pertinent as his normal remarks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member really is out of order. He may speak to this bill.

Mr. Reid: Yes, I will speak to the bill, Mr. Speaker. As I say I find it very difficult to—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Don't read, for heaven's sake!

Mr. Reid: Well, I learned it from the member for Lakeshore. I haven't become quite as pious or sanctimonious, but I'm working on it. Perhaps when I reach his esteemed number of years I will be able to do that.

Mr. Lawlor: I see.

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Not nearly as eloquent either.

Mr. Reid: Before I was so rudely interrupted, Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I cannot really support the bill as offered by the hon. member. As she noted herself, there are various acts and regulations that pretty well cover exactly the intent of her bill. I would refer the hon. member, for instance, to the Wilderness Areas Act, chapter 498, which you will find on page 1137 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, and perhaps for her edification, and for those on my left who are not able to read, I will read them sectoin 2 of the Act:

> The Lieutenant Governor in Council may set apart any public lands as a wilderness area for the preservation of the area as nearly as may be in its natural state, in which research and educational activities may be carried on for the protection of the flora and fauna, for the improvement of the area, having regard to its historical, aesthetic, scientific or recreational value, or for such other purpose as may be prescribed.

I recommend the reading of that particular statute to the hon. member because, as I say,

I think it is pretty amply covered in that. As well, the hon. member may not be aware that across the Province of Ontario there are zoning committees, recreation land-use committees, now called advisory committees to the Minister of Lands and Forests or the district forester, who meet periodically throughout the year, who set up zones within the province and within the particular district forest area, which deals with exactly these problems.

I think, if I may say so, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is a good one in that it focuses attention on this problem; but I don't think the bill itself is very necessary nor do I think it is particularly well drawn, which of course is not the particular member's fault. The bill itself is contradictory in spots. It lacks consistency. Section D of part 1 of the bill reads:

> "Winter season" means the period of time commencing with the 22nd day of December in any year and ending with the 21st day of March in the following year.

I can inform the hon. member that our winter in northern Ontario in particular lasts a great deal longer than that.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): All year.

Mr. Reid: As well, section 4 of the bill says:

> No person shall hunt, take or kill or attempt to hunt, take or kill any bird, fish or animal in an ecological sanctuary.

Again I am sure the hon. member is probably not aware, but the present regulations of the game and fish laws of Ontario pretty well take care of that.

Mr. Speaker, there is, and will be in the future in the Province of Ontario, a need to have specific areas laid out for snowmobiles. There is no doubt that they wreak a certain amount of ecological harm on the flora and the fauna of the province, and there is no doubt that within a very few years the snowmobilers will be restricted to particular areas where they can operate their machines.

In a way, it is something I don't look forward to, because one of the reasons we particularly live in the north is to have the unrestricted use of the wilderness; but if we allow the untrammelled use of machines such as this, and all-terrain vehicles, which weren't mentioned in the bill, very shortly we will not have any wilderness left.

Regarding the purpose of the bill, I think the intent is good; to focus attention on this problem. The Premier (Mr. Davis) himself has gone so far as to suggest that he is going to appoint a select committee on snowmobiles in the Province of Ontario. Mr. Speaker, I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the members of this Legislature to have such a committee even suggested to them. It is an important problem, I am sure, both in the urban and rural areas, but to suggest that the members of this Legislature have nothing better to do than to sit on a committee whose views and aims are to study and recommend solutions to a problem that is not really very vital in the life of this province at the moment is, I consider, a personal insult to myself and every other member of this chamber.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Shame.

Mr. Reid: Of all the things there are that need to be done and are of a pressing and crucial nature, for the Premier to have the House listen to a ghost-written, if you like, Speech from the Throne, and to suggest that the best he can come up with to occupy the members' attention is a committee on snowmobiles is also a little frustrating to take, I'm sure, for the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, having made those few short remarks I would say that this party cannot support this bill for the reasons I have outlined. It is already covered by legislation and regulation and we see no necessity for the bill, particularly in the inconsistent form in which it has been drawn up.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to be like the member for Rainy River, hypercritical and sanctimonious. I'm going to talk about what was obviously intended—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Let's not be nasty with each other. There are so few of us left. Let's be nice. There are 79 of the enemy there!

Mr. Deans: Well, let's say that one of the 79 of the enemy has put forward some ideas—

Mr. Bullbrook: I say 78 of the enemy—

Mr. Deans: —which, like the member for Rainy River says, may be redundant to some extent but, nevertheless, I think that—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We serve this great province.

Mr. Deans: —there is sufficient concern throughout the Province of Ontario for the effects of the abuse of the use of motorized snow vehicles to justify some form of debate in this Legislature.

We all know what the private members' hour is all about. Whether or not we support the bill in its drafted form is really immaterial. It's simply to give an opportunity for the expression of some personally held views about matters which are of concern.

I want to say, first of all, that the need to preserve wildlife would gain the support of every member in the House. I know that the member for St. David—am I correct?—is on pretty safe ground in suggesting that we need legislation which will protect wildlife against the abuses that are created by the use of the motorized snow vehicles in areas where they ought not to be permitted to travel. I think also that the numbers of accidents that have occurred over the last two years—deaths due to negligence; deaths due to stupidity; and deaths due to manufacturing defects—justify a closer look at the uses to which motorized snow vehicles might be put.

I'm not sure that the government ought to embark on setting up little areas and calling them ecological sanctuaries. I think that perhaps the government should approach the problem in a little different way. They ought to establish some kind of land-use policy for the Province of Ontario rather than starting at the back and working forward. Let's establish some broader guidelines for the Province of Ontario and the use to which land may be put—

Mr. Bullbrook: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: —whether it be for recreation, whether it be for development purposes, or whether it be for the sanctuary and wildlife preservation.

I think that we have to embark upon a programme that will bring about some sensible regulations that may be applied to the use of snowmobiles in the Province of Ontario. I think that for too long we've sat back and we've watched while people have used them and abused them and nothing has been done by this government.

I feel, quite frankly, that the Premier, in the Speech from the Throne, is simply not dealing as forthrightly with the matter of snowmobiles as he ought to be. The setting up of a committee, whether it be a select committee or otherwise, to study the use of snowmobiles in the province of Ontario is not necessary. I think that we all are aware, particularly those persons in the Department of Transportation and Communications who deal with the matter, of the kinds of regulations that we require in order to keep them off the roads; to provide them with proper safety precautions and procedures; to keep them from going on private property as they presently do on a regular basis.

I feel that we wouldn't be forced to face the problem of ecological sanctuaries if, in fact, we had enforced existing laws. If we had enforced the right of the farmer to maintain and to keep people off his property—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): He shouldn't have to.

Mr. Deans: Well, he shouldn't have to except that he has to do it all the time! That's what law is all about—if we had drafted regulations governing the use of snowmobiles whether it be on the King's highway or whether it be off the King's highway.

As far as this legislation is concerned, we know that the legislation itself will not accomplish a great deal. In fact, it won't come to anything at all as far as the actual drafting of this bill is concerned. We do applaud, though, the concern shown. We recognize that, without an overall land-use policy, anything that we might want to do in this Legislature would be redundant. We understand the need to step, and step rather hard on the manufacturers in order to ensure that the product that they sell can be used with safety in the Province of Ontario.

And we recognize one final thing—that there is a difference between north and south in Ontario. There is a difference in the use to which motorized snow vehicles may be put in northern Ontario from southern Ontario, and it may be that legislation when drafted will have to be applied in a different way in southern Ontario from the way it will be applied in northern Ontario. The need to establish ecological sanctuaries in the north may not be a real need, since in fact a considerable amount of the area is wilderness area in any event, but rather these things may be necessary and forthcoming for the areas immediately adjacent to the metropolitan areas that now exist.

The matter of whether a person may hunt, take or kill, or attempt to hunt, take or kill any birds, fish or animal, I think in fact is something that we have to regulate whether or not in an ecological sanctuary; it isn't only necessary in those areas of pre-

servation. Animals are not that bright. They are not sure where it is safe and where it isn't. We have to preserve them regardless. So we might tighten up on the legislation that now exists with regards to hunting and fishing to ensure that there isn't an abuse, that the kind of wanton killing that has gone on particularly with the use of snowmobiles for tracking purposes can no longer be pursued by people in this province.

I don't think the bill is all that bad, and in actual fact the idea is what's important.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York West.

Mr. Lawlor: See how constructive the New Democratic Party is? Surprised, aren't you!

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to lend my name to second this bill in the preservation of ecological sanctuaries. That is a tough one, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, yes. He says it is something excommunicable.

Mr. Deans: I have trouble with that word too.

Mr. MacBeth: I was very pleased to see that the member for Wentworth had something good to say about the bill; I think it has much in its favour. I would like to reply just for a moment to the criticism that the hon. member for Rainy River made about the bill. He referred to the game laws as being presently adequate. I would suggest to him that the game laws do not cover all the species that we had in mind in connection with this bill. The game laws just cover certain fish and certain animals. This bill relates to all forms of life, Mr. Speaker, and goes far beyond what the game laws contemplated.

In regard to the Wilderness Areas Act, to which he made mention, I would suggest again that the Wilderness Areas Act has in mind a different area and of different size. In this Act, we could have a small area; maybe, as the hon. member for St. David suggested, it might even be in the middle of Algonquin Park or in the middle of some farmer's fields.

First of all, I would point out that this bill in no way attempts to prohibit the use of snowmobiles. It tries to limit them in recreational purposes. I refer to section 5:

> No person shall use or operate a motor vehicle or motorized snow vehicle for pleasure or recreation [those are the limiting words] during the winter season in an ecological sanctuary.

Mr. Speaker, this would not prohibit their use for police purposes or for service purposes of any kind as has been suggested. I noticed the other day, in the Department of Transportation and Communications recent newsletter, a picture of the former Minister of Transportation and Communications gracing one of these snowmobiles, and on the front of it it had "Police". If he can use it, it shows that it has very good purposes and certainly this bill has no thought to limit that in any way.

I am a user of the snowmobile and had some fun as recently as last Saturday riding through the hills of Mulmur, sir, on one of these snowmobiles. I say it is not in any way to try to limit that. However, there is a very fascinating study that has taken place in the United States on the use and effect of snowmobiles. The effect on the subnivean life is, I think, one of the main things, Mr. Speaker, in that it is very detrimental to the life of such things as shrews and mice. I don't know whether anybody has ever given a speech in this House before in support of such things as shrews and mice, but I am making one today.

Mr. Lawlor: Once in a while for shrews!

Mr. MacBeth: These are the basic sorts of animal life that get affected by snowmobile compaction. This is important because it is the commencement of the whole life cycle. If in these areas we lose these small mammals then, Mr. Speaker, we lose the larger ones as well. This is where the effect starts—when the small animals are lost, the whole life cycle is upset.

On such things as golf courses—they are used a great deal as we all know on golf courses—the compaction of the snow turns it eventually into ice; the sun beating down on the ice has a lens effect and this lens effect can burn out the golf courses underneath. This is just an example of the effect it can have on vegetation.

It has an effect on subnivean mammals; it has a detrimental effect on vegetation; it has a detrimental effect on human hearing. I pay credit to the Bombardier company in Valcourt, Quebec, who are spending many thousands of dollars to try to lessen the noise of these machines. In the meantime they do have a detrimental effect on the human ear. Also the suggestion that it has a detrimental effect—the noise—on the animals.

Mr. Speaker, I throw in this little bit of information, although I am no authority on it. It perhaps has a detrimental effect on the mating habits of such animals as deer and moose. As I say, I am no authority on that but again we can see that—

Mr. Lawlor: Might even have a detrimental effect on the mating life of homo sapiens

Mr. MacBeth: —this creates a need for taking these—

Mr. Deans: We need Norris Whitney back in the House. He was an authority on those sorts of things.

Mr. MacBeth: That's right! To continue: —for giving a little more attention to this sort of thing, and to try to keep some of these noisy machines that even pollute the ground—this is of interest to farmers—with their exhausts, through lead; we should take some steps now to control these things.

I mentioned when I was speaking to the House the other day that the younger generation were concerned with pollution; that we in this generation represented by this House were not quite so concerned with it and were not ready to give up any of our pleasures or to sacrifice anything to save our ecology. Now here is one small place where the House can make a start in showing that we are ready to make some actual sacrifice in the interest of ecology and have a little interference with some of our freedoms in this line of snowmobiling in remote areas.

Mr. Speaker, it has given me pleasure to speak in favour of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I regret that, for some of the reasons already mentioned by my colleague from Rainy River, I am not rising to support what are very good intentions that the hon. member for St. David has in this bill.

As has been pointed out, previous legislation covers a great deal of the objectives of the bill. But there are many points which I am sorry she has failed to bring out in the bill that I think could strengthen it if they were incorporated in different types of legislation or a different form of legislation.

First of all, I regret that she has not included all motorized vehicles in this bill. There are motorboats; there are motorcycles; there are combination land-water vehicles that can move about at other than just the winter season and greatly disturb the ecological conditions in an area. A type of pollution of this sort can be equally disturbing. I suggest that any legislation that we bring in should include all types of motorized vehicles and that type of interference with the normal ecological balance.

I also concur with my colleague about confining this control to the winter season stated, because, as he mentioned, the winter season is much more extensive in other parts of Ontario than has been outlined in this bill, and it is quite important that if we are going to bring in suggested legislation we do so in a way that will make it effective.

I am concerned about the lack, in this bill, of other matters that could spoil any ecological sanctuary that could be developed. For example, there could be pollution occurring through some industrial development, or some other type of development, adjoining an ecological sanctuary. I think that in any planned area of this sort it should be ensured that there is no other distraction or no other situation developing that would destroy the whole intent of the bill.

I am concerned about one of the clauses where it talks about things that are excluded, and I am wondering if people are going to be excluded. Surely it is not our intention to do that, although people are the greatest polluters, as my friend from Welland South has mentioned. We have to think about that in Algonquin Park as we go along some of those canoe routes and we see the mess that many of the canoe trippers in that area leave behind them.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the best approach would be to take a more positive approach than just the limited manner in which we have approached the snowmobile problem in this bill. For example, I was very pleased to see the programme that the province is carrying out in co-operation with ARDA to buy up abandoned farms and abandoned properties. By so doing, and by making a list of these properties available, we could not only provide areas for snowmobile use in the winter time, but also for motorcycles in the summer time. I have a couple of lads who are quite keen motorcyclists and they have great difficulty in finding dirt-track areas where they can tear around.

Dune buggies; that is another type of motorized vehicle that would need to have a place for operating that would not be a nuisance to the neighbours around them. This requires a large amount of land, land set aside for this purpose. I would suggest

that one of the ways of overcoming the snowmobile problem would be definitely ensuring that snowmobiles and other motorized vehicles would have areas that they could use and these areas be well publicized and supervised.

I am concerned, with regard to the snowmobile problem—not only for snowmobiles but for other motorized vehicles—about regulations for the operators of these even when they are not operating on the Queen's highways. Motorboats and snowmobiles can be operated by completely incompetent and unskilled people and there is nothing to control that. It is no wonder we have had a great deal of difficulty with these vehicles when so little regulation has been brought into this area by the government.

I therefore regret, Mr. Speaker that I have to join with my colleague in opposing this bill, which I think was brought in with the best of intent but is so sadly lacking in its content.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, I was interested the moment this bill was introduced in one important aspect of it, and the way it was originally presented it appeared that we were setting apart some sanctuaries as sanctuaries for wildlife only. I am glad to see that in the actual printing, in the explanatory note, it contains the words "plant and wildlife," which to me is very important. Although one could have taken the word "wildlife" and expanded that in one's imagination to include plant life, I am very happy to see plant specifically here.

For the area I come from, at the moment the term "winter season" is quite appropriate, if not stretching it a bit. At the moment we are having our crocuses and our daffodils coming through the soil, and in the Windsor-Essex county area we never have enough snow cover so that any part of that county would not be damaged by the use of snowmobiles. It is a critical area of interest to me that wherever and whenever the use of snowmobiles can be banned unless there is a specific area set aside for them that this be done, from the point of view of the county from which I come.

There is one particular area of that county which is of critical interest to all ecologists. On the west side of Windsor there is a park called Ojibway Park, and in one corner of that park, interestingly enough, there is a stand of prairie grass in its original form. How that prairie grass happened to end up in the Windsor area is a matter of some interest to the archaeologists and the geologists, but nonetheless it is there.

It is one of the few, if not the only, stands of prairie grass in its original form. I'm not a botanist but it contains, I understand, some 600 different strains and different forms of grasses and flowers that cannot be found anywhere else in Ontario. They used to be found on the prairies in Canada, but I gather are no longer found there due to the farming which has taken place. It is this type of area where it would be criminal for any type of vehicle to move across and destroy this particular stand of biologically interesting material.

The member for St. David is a new member in the House, not knowing whether bits and pieces of her intended Act are covered adequately elsewhere or not. I must admit that I, being in the same position, knowing the way she feels about this particular bill, would certainly have introduced such a bill myself. I think we can never draw too much attention to the damage which vehicles of any kind do to our environment and in particular the indiscriminate way in which snowmobiles are used on our grasslands, doing damage to them. I have no objection to snowmobiles being used in areas set aside for snowmobiling, or in the northern parts of our country where in the winter months it is absolutely necessary for snowmobiling to take place in order to move from one point to another.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, have no hesitation in supporting this bill. I do not know whether it is covered in other Acts or not, but paragraph 7, in which it is made an offence to use vehicles as defined and snowmobiles within these ecological preserves, to me seems appropriate and I certainly would support this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill for a number of reasons. I would like to say for a start that I support, four square, the previous speaker. I think in many ways he has exemplified my attitude toward this bill. I would also like to point out that I am also four square behind the hon. member for Wentworth as I think he has exemplified my attitude too.

I think what we are coping with today with this kind of bill is that we are trying

to reconcile the old Ontario with the new technology. The old Ontario was a vast land with limitless resources. I think we have all paid lip-service to things that have gone on in other jurisdictions. I think we have seen the decline of forest areas elsewhere and we have comforted ourselves here by saying that our resources were limitless.

The fact of the matter is that we are now faced with the intrusion of the new technology even if it is so simple and so basic a part of the new technology that it is merely a mechanized snow vehicle that runs on an internal combustion engine and a form of tread, which is hardly new or hardly revolutionary in our time.

I think, furthermore, it behoves us in the Legislature to take particular cognizance of the fact that such a bill was brought to our attention by something relatively new in this age, that is, the fact that we now have in somewhat greater numbers than before, although certainly not far enough, female members. I think the fact is particularly appropriate that a female member would bring such an important bill from an ecology standpoint to our attention, because, Mr. Speaker—and I say this in all seriousness—we are now just about at the threshold where we have to decide whether we are going to enjoy the benefits of the advanced technology or we are going to be slaves to it. Again I stress that this is a very basic part—this is hardly a complicated, complex invention—of the technology, a vehicle that runs on snow over terrain that previously no vehicle, other than the horse-drawn sled, and perhaps not even that, had been able to go through.

On the one hand, the snowmobile is a great force for good. I don't think there is any member here, particularly any older member or any member from the north or perhaps from the east, who cannot but recall that perhaps, if the snowmobile had been around, the doctor would have been able to make his rounds years ago and perhaps been able to save a life that was prematurely snuffed out.

So there is no question of the good. But, on the other hand, we are constantly faced with the fact that in the winter months, particularly the dormant period for nature, man is now penetrating with the polluting vehicle —and, be it ever so small, a polluting vehicle; nonetheless a polluting vehicle—into areas that heretofore were sacrosanct against the intrusion of man.

So, on the other hand, we are faced with the prospect that, because of the advent of technology, however small, we are rapidly diminishing year by year those vast wide open spaces which to many, many hundreds of thousands of people in this province are, indeed, the cornerstone of the fact that we call ourselves the "Province of Opportunity."

The one concern I have in discussing this bill is that there seems to be an inordinate amount of nitpicking. I think what we are here today to stand up for—and I emphasize "for"—is the fact that we are concerned with what happens to our natural environment. We are concerned that the natural environment remains as natural as possible, not discounting the fact that we do have population pressures, and notwithstanding the fact that we do have that technology.

So I say to you that it does demand more than cursory attention from this House, because it matters not to us today and it matters not even to our children, but it does matter to our grandchildren and to our great-grandchildren what becomes of the areas of this province that heretofore were regarded as part of a natural wilderness.

To paraphrase the words of a very noted Jesuit saint: "What matters it to us that we gain the whole of the Polar Bear Park from Winisk down on Hudson Bay, if we lose everything to it," because, indeed, it really matters not very much.

So today I suggest the task before the House is that we start to harness this technology. Certainly I am sure—and it is certain in the text of the bill proposed by the hon. member for St. David—that there is no attempt to ban the snowmobile or the motorized snow vehicle. In fact, I am sure she would certainly say it has proved a benefit to a great many of us.

But incumbent upon that is the obligation upon the 117 people in this House that this force be harnessed for the common good. And there is a wide divergence of interest in this force being harnessed for what I call the common good rather than just being harnessed for the good of the greatest number. Because, on the one hand, if we harness it just for the good of the greatest number, with all due respect to the members from the north—and I have lived in the north, I have worked there, I have travelled there—the motorized snow vehicle has been a great boon in the north. I will say to the members from the north—I think it is about time someone said it—the least abuse of that vehicle is in the north.

The abuse of the vehicle is in the southern areas, and particularly the abuse of that vehicle is that it is used with indiscriminate abandon. Not discounting the fact that today we are not interested in the problems of humans, it has been used with indiscriminate abandon upon them. But in southern Ontario, probably for the first time in our history, we are now faced with the obligation of preserving animal life as part of our heritage, and we are using these vehicles to stamp out the kind of animal life. By "stamp out" I don't mean just killing, but destroying the breeding habitats of such animals as are ecologically rather difficult and rather expensive to preserve in zoological gardens. I am talking about such things as the beaver and the otter; I am talking about the traditional feeding grounds of a number of other animals like the raccoon and the fox. These surely are our heritage.

So I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that on the one hand this kind of bill may be somewhat avant garde, because we really haven't faced the time in our conservation areas or in our parks or on countless numbers of farms on byside concessions when we have seen the absence and destruction of the traditional homes or breeding grounds of animals which I think, if not vital, are intrinsic to the life style of this province—but we are on the threshold of doing so.

The argument on the other side, of course, is that this is a Canadian-made vehicle. It is made in Canada; there are a great number of people involved in doing it. I say that is fine. In fact, I say—and I don't think there would be any dispute in this House as to my feelings about things that are Canadian—I think that is tremendous. But surely we are not a game preserve in Africa that has to be operated for the benefit of tourists. Surely we are not something in Minnesota where they can shoot wolves or some other kinds of animals as Sunday sport to see how many pelts they can get for a prize. Surely we in Ontario are above this?

It is true that we are the province of opportunity but it is also very true that we are the province of heritage. And I say to you that if we do this to the least of our numbers, and those are the animals, then we are going to destroy them. Then inevitably—and fortunately it is beyond the lifespan of you, Mr. Speaker, and all of the members in this House—then we are going to get to higher beings and we are going to destroy them too.

So I say to you in conclusion that we have a fundamental obligation here. We have technology and we all talk about technology and we all have great thoughts about technology, and yet here is a very basic, simple part of technology and we have the opportunity, not only for this province but for the jurisdiction of this hemisphere and for other nations, that we can set the standard that technology is of service to us and it does not have to destroy our environment. And I would put to you, that is the intent, that is the meaning and that is the very fibre of the bill that has been presented by the hon. member for St. David.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Muskoka?

The hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few moments on this, particularly in reference to the Rattray Marsh, which is in Clarkson, Mississauga, but the interest in this extends far beyond local municipal boundaries. But first I would like to commend the hon. member for St. David for bringing in this very timely bill. She's to be commended.

Mr. Deans: Why don't we vote on it?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Let's have a vote on it since the members opposite are all for it.

Mr. Kennedy: I would like to make one suggestion though, whereby it might be strengthened—and I think the member for York Centre spoke about this. Section 5 mentioned "during the winter season" and in fact it defined the period of time during which this would be in effect. I think it would be strengthened and be more effective if, in section 5, "during the winter season" was deleted from the bill and it just said no motorized vehicles in the areas at all.

One of the other members mentioned that there are types of motorized vehicles other than the snowmobile and other self-propelled vehicles, such as swamp boats and so forth which go in very shallow water. I am sure the wildlife doesn't wish to be disturbed any more in the summer than the winter.

With respect to the Rattray Marsh, I would like to read part of a letter I received from one of my constituents just last week with respect to the Rattray Marsh:

> I enclose herewith a copy of "The Rattray Marsh. Our Vanishing Wilderness. Is It Worth Saving? The Report of the Meadowwood Rattray Residents' Association." This report outlines the history of

the marsh and the attempts to save it in the past. It goes on to outline the ecological and biological values of the marsh. A great majority of the residents of Clarkson feel quite strongly that the preservation of the marsh as a natural wilderness area is essential.

The enclosed report was adopted unanimously by the executive of our association. In addition, the delegates of the Council of South Mississauga Community Associations, a federation of 10 community associations in the Clarkson-Lorne Park area, voted unanimously that they saw great merit in the preservation of the marsh as a conservation area for the future use of the residents of Mississauga in general.

They mention that the brief was submitted to the government. It continues:

As I mentioned to you on the telephone, the Credit Valley Conservation Authority is considering purchasing part of the marsh. They have, I believe, an option on 22 acres of the wetlands. Consideration is being given by both the conservation authority and the province as to the additional amount of land which is necessary to make the marsh a viable conservation area. I understand that the cost of the wetlands will be approximately $10,000 an acre and that the cost of surrounding tableland would be from $30,000 to $40,000 an acre. There is a total of 97 acres left in the marsh area.

I should caution that the dollar figures just mentioned were not given to me by any authoritative source but are generally rumoured to be based on an appraisal made by the Credit Valley Conservation Authority.

He ends up by saying:

I feel it is important that the province go on record as soon as possible as being in favour of the preservation of the marsh and that the Province of Ontario agree to pay as much as possible.

I may remind members of the grant structures under which conservation authorities operate. Normally, the province gives grants of 50 per cent of the cost of projects undertaken by the Credit Valley Conservation Authority. That is applicable to all authorities. In special cases, provincial grants go as high as 75 per cent. I am convinced after talking with members of the council that if the province agreed to pay 75 per cent of the purchase, the town of Mississauga would gladly pay 95 per cent of the balance, and the conservation authority pick up the rest of the balance.

The report itself, to which this letter refers, mentions the history of the marsh. During the 1960s there was a lot of interest in this acquisition. I shall just quote briefly from part of the report:

By the mid-1960s, interest expressed by the Credit Valley authority, the Ontario Department of Education and the then township of Toronto suggested that the estate would finally end up in the hands of the public. Premier Bill Davis, then Minister of Education, recognized the area as a valuable education facility and offered to pay one-half of the purchase price. However, this was never followed through and so it remains in the private domain.

Aquisition of this piece of the environment is supported by many organizations in our municipality and beyond—as I mentioned, by the director of education as a valuable teaching aid—and I would encourage the preservation of this marsh. I would like to see the interested bodies renew their interest in it.

The total cost is in the millions and you can do some mathematics and find that 22 acres of wetland multiplied by $10,000 is $220,000, and that acreage deducted from 97 acres is about 75 acres of high land estimated at $30,000 or $40,000 an acre. This, of course would be a very serious budgetary item. But even if the marsh portion were preserved, this would be a great step forward. I would hope that the government would be ready and willing to join with other interested parties and that this valuable asset, one of the few remaining along our lakeshore, would be retained in the public domain.

Mr. Speaker: This concludes the private members' hour.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns could the House leader tell us exactly what will occur tomorrow afternoon?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Afairs): Exactly what will occur tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, will be a continuation on the debate before the House today, item No. 1.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:40 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

Response tabled by Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Works) on a question by Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West).

Re: Properties purchased for the Department of Lands and Forests under Niagara Escarpment during 1971-72 Fiscal Year.

Effingham	66 acres	Twp. Louth	June 1971
	90 acres	Twp. Thorold	Sept. 1971
Devil's Glen	20 acres	Nottawasaga Twp.	December 1971
	10 acres	Nottawasaga Twp.	December 1971
	5 acres	Nottawasaga Twp.	December 1971
	34 acres	Nottawasaga Twp.	January 1972
	8 acres	Nottawasaga Twp.	February 1972
Primrose	49 acres	Twp. Mulmer	October 1971
	60 acres	Twp. Mulmer	December 1971
	100 acres	Twp. Mulmer	December 1971
	50 acres	Twp. Mulmer	January 1972
	10 acres	Twp. Mulmer	January 1972
	5 acres	Twp. Mulmer	January 1972
	1 acre	Twp. Mulmer	January 1972
Beaver Valley	90 acres	Euphrasia Twp.	April 1971
	46 acres	Euphrasia Twp.	April 1971
	150 acres	Euphrasia Twp.	May 1971
	50 acres	Euphrasia Twp.	December 1971
	48 acres	Euphrasia Twp.	December 1971
	1 acre	Euphrasia Twp.	September 1971
Osler Bluff	85 acres	Osprey Twp.	December 1971
Colpoy Bay	150 acres	Albermarle Twp.	September 1971
Kolapore Uplands	200 acres	Collingwood Twp.	September 1971
	80 acres	Collingwood Twp.	October 1971
	222 acres	Collingwood Twp.	October 1971
	120 acres	Collingwood Twp.	October 1971
	135 acres	Collingwood Twp.	November 1971
	85 acres	Collingwood Twp.	November 1971
	45 acres	Collingwood Twp.	November 1971
	235 acres	Collingwood Twp.	December 1971
	50 acres	Collingwood Twp.	January 1972
Hogg's Falls	8 acres	Artemesia Twp.	May 1971
	30 acres	Artemesia Twp.	February 1972
	50 acres	Artemesia Twp.	April 1971
Cape Chin	94 acres	Lindsay Twp.	November 1971
	92 acres	Lindsay Twp.	March 1971
Umbrella Lake	89 acres	St. Edmund Twp.	October 1971
	27 acres	Lindsay Twp.	September 1971
	97 acres	St. Edmunds Twp.	February 1972
Cyprus Lake	144 acres	St. Edmunds Twp.	November 1971
	9 acres	St. Edmunds Twp.	November 1971
	10 acres	St. Edmunds Twp.	November 1971

TOTAL ACREAGE—2,950 acres

CONTENTS

Monday, March 6, 1972

Plea bargaining in Ontario courts and government policy statements, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer 85

Organized crime in Ontario—measures to combat, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon 86

Government action against Dow Chemical re suit and court trial, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon 87

Establishment of detoxication centres throughout province, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 88

Telegram Publishing Company inquiry and appointment of Prof. Carter, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 88

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County—tabling report of negotiations, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 89

Mental health facilities re community centres and projects, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 90

National park in Thunder Bay district, clarification re federal-provincial discussions, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Jessiman, Mr. Stokes 91

Improper promotion of shares and civil action procedures, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Deacon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lawlor 92

De Havilland labour dispute re negotiations, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Young 93

Land purchase in Toronto adjoining U of T re appraisal, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer, Mr. Bullbrook 93

Tabling report: Land purchases on the Niagara Escarpment, Mr. Snow 94

Report of committee on golf course assessment, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Meen 94

Bloor Street property use, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Singer 94

Polar bear cubs on Indian reserve, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes 95

Daycare centres on Indian reservations, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Spence, Mr. Reid, Mr. Bounsall 95

Presenting report, committee on golf course assessment and taxation, Mr. McKeough 96

Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 96

Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Drea, first reading 96

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. R. F. Nixon 96

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lewis, agreed to 118

Establishment of ecological sanctuaries in the province of Ontario, bill to provide for, on second reading, Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. Reid, Mr. Deans, Mr. MacBeth, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Drea, Mr. Kennedy 118

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 128

Appendix – Niagara Escarpment land purchases 129

No. 6

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors today; in the west gallery students from Sheridan College, Brampton, and from John Ross Collegiate Institute of Guelph in the east gallery. A little later on, at 3:30, in the west gallery we will be favoured with the presence of students from Georgian Bay Secondary School of Meaford, Ontario.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to advise the hon. members about the review that has been undertaken by the government with respect to offtrack betting and its possible future in Ontario.

As the House is already aware, the Premier last July established a task force of senior civil servants to review the systems, methods and the procedures of offtrack betting and to advise the government on the system most suitable for implementation in Ontario provided, of course, that the Criminal Code of Canada is amended by the federal government.

The task force has now submitted an interim report to the government which I am having distributed at this time to the hon. members.

The interim report assumes that the Criminal Code of Canada will be amended to place offtrack betting under the jurisdiction of those provinces that desire it. It strongly recommends that the Code be amended to prohibit offtrack betting in any form except as may be authorized by the law of a province.

In agreeing with this recommendation, it does seem to this government that if the public is properly served by a lawful provincially operated system, other forms of offtrack betting should be prohibited.

The objectives of any offtrack betting system should be:

1. The suppression or, at least, diminution of illegal bookmaking.

2. The provision of a desired service to the public.

3. The contribution to the financial integrity of the horse racing industry; and by that I mean the breeders, the trainers, the track operators and others.

4. Revenue to, and control or at least supervision by, the government.

We certainly realize, sir, that we may never completely eliminate bookmaking in its illegal context. We can, however, make it more difficult for the illegal bookmaker to do business if we provide the public with an appropriate and accessible service. At the same time, the Criminal Code of Canada should be amended to permit the more effective application of laws originally intended to prohibit illegal bookmaking.

We recognize that a segment of the public wishes to place wagers on horse races. In providing a service to this community, we will be able to assist the horse racing industry in the provision of a better sport. At the same time, we will ensure that any lawful provincial revenues are paid into the province. As well, we will have more control over an obviously lucrative illegal business that has international connections.

The report recommends the establishment of a board or commission having the majority of its members appointed by the government, representatives of the general public interest. The balance of the members are to be appointed on the recommendation of the various segments of the racing industry. The reasons for this conception are set forth in the report and I recommend them to your attention.

At the same time, I would direct the attention of the hon. members to the comments on the type of system which is recommended. In the view of the task force, this might include a combination of a manual ticket-selling procedure together with a computer application in the collation of bets. It also suggests a telephone betting system utilizing existing telecommunication systems between the various components. In case anyone is getting his hopes up too far, sir, I should point out that nowhere is there any suggestion that a credit system is envisaged. Any

government plan would have to be on a cash basis.

This is an interim report. It has not been possible for the task force to make revenue projections of any proposed offtrack betting system that might be implemented by the province. Detailed studies have been undertaken under the direction of the task force and these various reports are presently being reviewed so that the final report may deal with these important matters in full detail.

The government is looking forward to the submission of the final report from the task force in the near future. We wish to be in the position of having these preliminary studies available at the time of amendment of the Criminal Code of Canada which, we trust, will take place in the near future. We have considered this to be most important and it is for this reason that the task force was established prior to the hoped-for amendment to the Criminal Code. We have based our present approach upon the form of amendment that we have asked the federal government to enact, as we wanted to be in the position of having our plans ready to proceed when Ottawa changes its legislation.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that while the government, of course, can make no commitment on its detailed approach to this subject until it has received the final report, we do feel that the interim report and its views will be of interest to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Before further ministerial statements, I have been informed by an hon. member that I am guilty of a gross oversight. I neglected to inform the House that we also have visitors with us in the east gallery who are students from the Burlington Central High School.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, following up on my statement yesterday concerning the closing of the Telegram, I am now in a position to give the hon. members the terms of reference of the one-man inquiry, Mr. Donald D. Carter.

The Telegram payroll as of October 30, 1971, showed 1,130 people. From this group, approximately 900 were members of the Newspaper Guild. All of the employees, except approximately 194, resigned their positions. As at February 12, 1972, there were 11 people still employed.

However, the main investigation will be directed to complaints made on behalf of former employees who were members of the Toronto Newspaper Guild Local 87. The local was the bargaining agent for employees in editorial, circulation, maintenance, advertising, office, and delivery departments of the newspaper and represented all employees except pressmen, stereotypers, electrotypers, and those few who were not members of the guild.

Question one asks if the offer by the publisher to pay severance pay only if an employee resigned, and not the pay required upon termination by the Employment Standards Act, is an offer which is contrary to the Act.

The next question, number two, raises the problem whether the terminated employee who is still under notice is entitled to further termination pay if he obtains a permanent job before the notice has expired.

Question three asks if the publisher had a legal liability to pay severance pay and other fringe benefit payments after he gave notice of termination. This question arises because of Regulation S13 which provides that these benefits are to be stacked on termination pay, and also section 13, subsection 5 of the Act which provides that the conditions of employment cannot be changed during the notice.

Question four arises because the publisher treated those employees still receiving termination pay in December as taking whatever vacation was due to them. The regulation as stands provides that this procedure requires agreement by the employee. If there was no agreement then the publisher would be required to pay any vacation pay owing at the time the notice expired.

Question five is asked and is to clear up the cases of part-time employees who have no normal weekly rate from which to calculate the amount of pay for each week of notice.

Question six is asked because there are some complaints on behalf of those former employees who went on strike or were locked out many years ago.

Question seven raises the technical legal question whether the distributors who had contracts with the publisher for certain districts were self-employed or were employees.

Question eight deals with those members of the mechanical trades who continued to work in the same plant and at the same presses for as much or more money, but for the Toronto Star instead of the Toronto Telegram when the paper closed on October 30 last.

All of the questions raise all matters of complaint, and the investigation will, therefore, be complete. The answers to the ques-

tions will require Prof. Carter to resolve all of the issues and determine what amounts, if any, may be due and owing.

From the information which has been made available to me, it would appear that the majority of the employees have been able to locate in other employment.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

OFFTRACK BETTING

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question resulting from the statement by the hon. member for St. George on offtrack betting. Can he tell the House if the committee of senior civil servants requested that he undertake some research in Australia to assist them in coming to their conclusions?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Did they request me?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Yes.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes. They requested my presence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question: Since the policy of the government as stated by the leader of the government said specifically, that offtrack betting would be operated by the government, and not by private enterprise, what did the former Attorney General think he could find out in Australia, since it is privately operated in that jurisdiction?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What is privately operated?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Offtrack betting.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Nonsense.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sure it is.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Nonsense. In each case it is run by an organization called the Totalizer Agency Board of each of the individual states. These are technically an agency of the non-profit track operators, but in actual fact the boards really relate to the appointment of individual members. The real interest in Australia—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What does that mean? What did the minister just say? I can't understand him.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I can't help it if the member doesn't speak English.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It is set up under legislation.

Mr. Bullbrook: Explain that again.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The real interest in Australia, of course, was the great technical advances they have made there in respect of the computer compilation of the bets, both on the track and off the track. I think it is acknowledged throughout the world that they have by far the best hardware for the mechanical operation of these matters. We wanted to see that in operation. I have not accompanied the task force in all of their perambulations around the western world by any means—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why not?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: —but in Australia they thought it best to have a minister of the Crown with them, especially when the other major representative of the then Department of Justice and the Attorney General was unable to go. In other words the chairman of the task force was unable to go and they requested the minister to go.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Admirable restraint.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister was right on their heels wasn't he, for a while?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it necessary that a formal request of the Minister of Justice in Canada be made before we can expect legislation, or have there been talks that the minister would expect would lead to an introduction of amendments by the federal government?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I have had conversations with the present federal Attorney General and Minister of Justice and his predecessor, and there have been informal requests and requests in writing to the federal government indicating our desires in this field.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Any response?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, there have been responses.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Positive, no doubt.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Sure.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the provincial secretary could tell us whether or not the Globe and Mail was associated

in any way with his request to go to Australia and New Zealand?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Well, I had the idea, but I didn't know when I got back because they were strangely silent for a couple of weeks.

Mr. Lawlor: As a supplementary question: I am a little bemused like the member for Sarnia; that was a good piece of obfuscation, almost on a par with the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis). My understanding was, it was privately run, too. Is there specific legislation in Australia governing the parimutuels?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Could the member for St. George tell us whether it is contemplated that betting will be allowed only on races run in Ontario or on all races in North America? Is it contemplated that betting will only be on horse races or will it be broadened to include hockey games and basketball games and all these other things that people bet on?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Leadership races.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Leadership races? No. These are matters that are still awaiting the advice and recommenadtions of the task force. If the member wants a personal opinion I will be glad to give it to him, but these are questions of detail on which we are awaiting the recommendations of the task force.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is not usually wrong.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: My own personal opinion is that initially, in any event, it has got to be horse races only. Secondly, with a proper computerized setup it can very easily be horse races anywhere in the western world. That is no great mechanical problem.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister didn't go to Sicily?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Not yet.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I might: What liaison has the minister had with the other provincial attorneys general and did they support his request to the federal Attorney General—

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is thinking.

Mr. Bullbrook: —And I am not finished yet —to the federal Attorney General for an amendment to the Criminal Code? Does he or does he not have a commitment from the federal Attorney General?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As to the other attorneys general throughout the country, I have had informal conversations with each of them. In respect of any commitment from the federal government, the only commitment that I was able to obtain was from the predecessor to the present incumbent in that office, who undertook to present it with his recommendation to the federal cabinet.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): They change almost as often as this one.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is no commitment, obviously, on the part of the government. My understanding, however, is that they are coming around to a proper sense of reality in this matter.

Mr. Bullbrook: One further supplementary. Do I understand that the minister met with no resistance from any of the other provincial attorneys general?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I didn't say that!

Mr. Bullbrook: Would the minister care to elaborate on which provinces did resist his request?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I wouldn't care to elaborate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. leader would permit me just a brief moment. I have been requested by one of the hon. ministers to seek the permission of the House to revert to statements by the ministry before we proceed—

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): No!

Mr. Speaker: This, of course, can only be done with the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Shulman: No!

Mr. Speaker: I do not have that unanimous consent.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There are going to be a lot of late-afternoon press conferences in this House, from now on.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is true that only by permitting

reversion to statements at this time would we, as private members of the House, have an opportunity to question the ministers making the statements on what they have to say. That is corerct?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that is correct in accordance with the standing orders. It was my wish the other day to permit one or two points of clarification on important ministerial statements but, of course, it's not in accordance with the standing orders to do that, and the House decided that any questions on ministerial statements would have to be taken up during the oral question period. This is fine; this is in accordance with the rules of this House. Therefore, if any ministerial statements are not put forth on any one particular day, questions may not be asked until the succeeding day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Further to the point of order: Surely, then, it would be incumbent upon you, sir, or perhaps me speaking through you, to draw to the government's attention that there seems to be an individual roadblock in the party immediately to my left because of some imagined slight some months ago, so that there will never be this consent granted, and we would urge upon the ministers to attend upon the House for prayers, which would do them a lot of good so that they could make their statements on time.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bullbrook: Some, more than others!

Mr. Shulman: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak on this point of order—

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information): I am in full accord with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. Erskine May made it very clear in his definitive book on parliamentary procedure that ministers of the Crown have not only the right, but the responsibility, to report to the members of Parliament on matters within their jurisdiction—

Mr. MacDonald: Also to be on time.

Hon. Mr. White: And while I, myself, make it a point to come in for prayers, as the hon. members will note, on occasion it becomes impossible.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The minister needs it more.

Hon. Mr. White: Yesterday I was a couple of minutes late only because of the malfunctioning of an elevator.

Mr. Lewis: Come now—

Mr. Deans: The minister could always walk.

Mr. MacDonald: His excuses are usually better than this.

Mr. Deans: The exercise of walking would do him good.

Mr. Lewis: What has happened to the minister's fantasy world?

Hon. Mr. White: And I sought, immediately on my arrival, through you, Mr. Speaker, the privilege to revert to ministerial statements. Of course, that privilege was not extended to me and, therefore, I had to make the announcement outside the House in a way that, quite frankly, is not appropriate when the Legislature is sitting.

Mr. Lewis: Well—

Hon. Mr. White: Therefore—no doubt, the member can speak later if that is his wish—

Mr. MacDonald: And will.

Mr. Lewis: Doubtless.

Hon. Mr. White: Therefore, I would ask, and in utmost seriousness—and for the benefit of the people of this province—that those one or two members of the opposition who now stand in the way of reverting to a previous order of business, whatever that may be, reconsider their position. I think it is rather important that we continue with the cooperative approach which we've had with such matters.

Mr. Shulman: May I speak on this point of order? It has been the custom of this House, in the four or five years that I've been here, always to agree when unanimous consent is requested—and it always was offered by this side because the request always had come from the government. I don't recall a request from this side until earlier this year, sir. In an earlier part of this session, for the first time, a request was made from this side for unanimous consent to revert. It was refused by the government, and now they're paying the tune.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): No!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Not this year.

Mr. Shulman: It was refused by the government last November.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It is a two-way street—and the government doesn't realize it.

Mr. MacDonald: The leader is a little self-conscious—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a further point of order, which actually relates to a statement made by the member for London South a moment ago when he, in fact, apologized to the House for not making his statement—I presume, on the financial situation at Ontario Place to the House—I think it was a very proper apology; such a statement should be made here. On a point of order I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope the leader of the government would instruct the administration, or the members of the administration, that what the member for London South says is a very important aspect of our responsibilities.

You will recall that just last week the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) made a substantial announcement about school financing in a speech out of this House. When the Legislature is in session surely policy departures or important changes in administration should be announced here and not at press conferences or elsewhere. I would hope, sir, that the Premier would be able to state that it is his policy that his ministers treat the House with at least this amount of respect.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, on this point of order I quite agree with the Leader of the Opposition that matters of significant policy when the House is sitting should be announced in this Legislature. This has been the practice. I regret that the member for High Park is reluctant to bury the hatchet and to see that the other members of this House are accommodated because it really is for the information of members of this House. The opportunity is then given for questions that would normally arise from that statement.

I would just make this observation, Mr. Speaker, also in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, as it related to the statement made by the Minister of Education. While it was very significant in terms of total dollars—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is a change in government policy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I question whether there was any substantial change, if the member is referring to the grant regulations, in that they are just a continuation of the government's continued involvement in the percentage cost of the educational bill in this province. The regulations—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, with respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Come on, the government made a mistake and the Premier is talking around it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No mistake at all.

Mr. Singer: Sure it is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no mistake at all. If the member would like, when we get into the estimates of the Department of Education, he shall have an opportunity to see the differences in the regulations and, really, the insignificant departures in total policies.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It should have been announced here.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I would point out to you, sir, that the urgent matter which the member for London South felt he had to announce at the press conference, the raise in rates, could very well have waited one more day. It could have been done in here today.

Hon. Mr. White: In response to that, Mr. Speaker, I learned, some time after I had intended to make it today when the hon. members refused me permission yesterday, that some number of copies had been mailed to out-of-town newspapers. I thought it would be inappropriate to withhold the information from members of our own press gallery and, reluctantly and for that reason, went ahead with a press conference of my own at 5 o'clock.

Mr. MacDonald: A simple solution—the minister should be here on time.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just to satisfy a rampant curiosity. Which minister has offended today? Which minister is it we are talking about?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Minister of Health (Mr. Potter).

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Who is the minister who wanted to make the statement?

Mr. Speaker: The request came to me from the hon. Minister of Health.

OPERATION OF ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, we might now have an opportunity to ask the Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information to elaborate to the House the reasons why he must now announce that the deficit for Ontario Place is $2.2 million when we were assured by his predecessor that the attendance was, in fact, surpassing expectations and that the costs had been set so that it would be self-supporting.

Further, can he explain to the House why, even with the increase in entrance fees which he has announced, we will still have a substantial deficit even though the attendance would run ahead of what we have experienced already?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, there are several very valid reasons for it.

First of all in the cost of starting up any enterprise in the public sector or the private sector there are non-recurring—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): What about janitorial services?

Hon. Mr. White: Do the members want to hear this or don't they? There are certain non-recurring costs when you start any new business. I point out to members that this was the largest new employer, I think, in Ontario last year—with 1,400 employees, many of them students for whom we were anxious to find gainful employment.

Secondly, we are charging against this account, rightly or wrongly, certain subsidies which I think might be borne by the consolidated revenue fund as such, including free admission for citizens over the age of 65. There are certain policing costs that perhaps should not be charged entirely to the operation.

Thirdly, we are in effect subsidizing certain very valid public services through these accounts, including the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, which I think my hon. friend will agree, deserves the support of this government. Last year, I think I am correct in saying, we expended $150,000; this year the contract would call for $180,000 for the Toronto Symphony. We have sponsored youth symphonies at a cost of $15,000 each. So for a variety of reasons the expenditures in year one were very high indeed.

If I may take another moment, I am in a position to provide operating financial information, which I undertook in the press conference yesterday to provide to the members of the gallery and which I think is of general interest to the members of this Legislature.

Ontario Place operations as of February 29, 1972. Revenue, $2,515,000—will I break it down, Mr. Speaker? Does time permit?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just table them.

Hon. Mr. White: All right, I'll table this, if I may. (See appendix.) Expenditures, $4,460,000, for a difference of $1,945,000. Estimated expenditure for March, $126,000, for a gross deficit at March 31, 1972, of $2,072,000. And I will now table the details.

I think perhaps I will provide information on the capital and non-recurring side. Total capital costs were $24,157,000; non-recurring costs, which included Cinesphere films, exhibits, startup, promotion and such like, $4,584,000.

Mr. Singer: What are "such like"?

Hon. Mr. White: And I would like to table this, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Now, will I take this opportunity to respond to the two questions asked on Friday?

Mr. Speaker: No, I believe it would be out of order at this time. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I ask one short supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: One moment, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition had the floor for questions; he hadn't finished with his questions. If there are supplementaries, they would now be in order.

The hon. member for Sarnia has a supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, may I direct a supplementary to the minister? Now that he has tabled those documents, would he table the profit and loss statement of his lessee restaurant operators down there so that the people of Ontario can be assured that they also lost money and not just the government?

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I have here an exhibit showing the balance sheet and the

profit and loss statement for the Place restaurants, which I will be glad to table. In addition, the Place restaurants had a loss of $92,000 on a volume of $936,000.

Mr. Bullbrook: I asked about the lessee restaurants.

Hon. Mr. White: I am coming to that.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right. Good.

Hon. Mr. White: The member is going to have a chance to give all kinds of speeches to the Liberal membership. He shouldn't be so eager. He'll have lots of time.

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately, he is following the minister's example.

Hon. Mr. White: I have here, Mr. Speaker, information about revenue from facilities like the Haida, boutique No. 1 and so on, and I will be glad to make this available.

Mr. Lewis: Were there losses?

Mr. Bullbrook: Did they lose money?

Hon. Mr. White: Some were profitable and some were not so profitable.

Mr. Lewis: Did they lose money?

Mr. Bullbrook: Some were profitable and some were not so profitable!

Mr. Lewis: How does this government manage to sabotage public enterprise every time? Boy, it knows all the ways to bake a cake!

Hon. Mr. White: The member is the kind of fellow who thought the expenditure on the Colosseum was a waste of money, isn't he?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore has a supplementary?

Mr. Lawlor: If you please, Mr. Speaker. With a loss of close to $3 million and revenue expectations on the increase of fees amounting to about $650,000, and no doubt intending to continue the public concerts of music by folk groups and the Toronto Symphony—otherwise you won't have anybody there—the minister is only making a dint in the armour; he is making no headway at all against the total position. What benefit is the increase of fees really over against the considerable loss?

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend is misinformed. We are indeed going to make progress. Our loss last year on operating account was $2 million approximately. We anticipate a loss this year of between $275,000 to $650,000. Now I am not going to get hung up on this, because it is absolutely impossible to divine the elasticity of demand for a facility such as Ontario Place. And there is no way known to man to make these forecasts accurate.

Mr. MacDonald: Ask Stan.

Mr. Lawlor: On what basis?

Hon. Mr. White: However that is our hope. And our hope is that in the following year, by continuing the improvements to the facilities, we can break even if not make a little money.

An hon. member: It wasn't hopeful last year.

Mr. Lawlor: That was Stanley's hope too.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, if the minister says there is no way known to man whereby these predictions can be made accurately, could he explain how his predecessor was so definite—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Absolutely.

Mr. Singer: —a year ago that this was going to at least break even, if not better, and whether or not he had the same advisers as the minister now has?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They were certainly known to Stan.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, he gave day-to-day attendance figures.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, I learned long ago never to try to teach economics to lawyers.

Mr. Singer: What about the cabinet ministers?

Hon. Mr. White: When I refer now to the elasticity of demand, I am talking about the consequence in the number of units sold after a change in price.

Mr. Lewis: Come on.

An hon. member: How about the elasticity in the minister's figures?

Hon. Mr. White: What I am not talking about is the estimation by the Hon. Stanley Randall of two million people which was exceeded by more than 300,000.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like a freshman lecture.

Hon. Mr. White: It was exceeded by 300,000.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary, since obviously the minister doesn't understand: Would the minister tell me how the same advisers who advised his predecessor and predicted a break-even point, are now advising this minister that even with the increase in entrance fees there will be a deficit?

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Because it is after the election.

Mr. Singer: That's right.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister how long the people of northern Ontario are going to subsidize a non-profitable operation of this government for a facility that isn't available to them unless they travel several hundred miles to get to it?

Hon. Mr. White: Just as long as the people in southern Ontario subsidize Old Fort William.

Mr. Lewis: Not bad. Not bad.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary: Does the newly appointed Minister of Trade and Industry not grant that $2 billion of new wealth comes out of northern Ontario every year? Is he discounting that?

Hon. Mr. White: I have never attempted to prove it, but I suspect that for every dollar collected in taxes in northern Ontario we spend two. And I am going to tell—

Mr. Stokes: Not so.

Hon. Mr. White: —the member that we are really going to do something in the north country notwithstanding the socialists that they send down here.

Mr. Martel: When is that going to happen?

Hon. Mr. White: We are really going to do something up there.

Mr. Martel: We have heard that for 28 years.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, I will permit one more supplementary on that question.

Mr. Stokes: Would the minister care to hazard a guess as to how long the economy of southern Ontario would keep going if it wasn't for the exploitation of our resources in the north? No he wouldn't, you are darn right he wouldn't.

Mr. Lewis: How about the elasticity of demands in the south?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

NURSING HOME REGULATIONS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Health, which I hope will open up for him an opportunity to make a statement to the House concerning his negotiations with nursing homes, which appear to be putting in jeopardy the April 1 date of the beginning of coverage under our Medicare programme. Is he quoted correctly when he indicates that the nursing homes will be forced to accept the remuneration schedule that he has stated on pain of losing their licence?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, first of all let's not use that word "force."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well he is going to threaten them with licence loss?

Hon. Mr. Potter: In order to ensure that we have enough beds available to cover everyone who is entitled to be covered under the programme, we have suggested that when we start the programme we must insist that all licensed nursing homes participate. And we have also asked them to make available to the programme 75 per cent of the beds in the nursing homes. If they don't want to be in the nursing home business, there are lots of opportunities for them to be in the business of operating retirement homes. But, while these homes were built originally as nursing homes, many patients in them today —approximtaely 25 per cent—don't require the nursing care that is available in the homes so they are using them as retirement homes. To start off with, we are asking them to restrict the use for retirement homes to 25 per cent, making available to us 75 per cent of the beds that are there now.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary. When the minister says "ask them" to make it

available, he is saying if they don't do that, he will not continue their licence?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is perfectly true. We are suggesting that as of April 1, all nursing homes have to come up to certain standards. I think the member will agree that we must maintain our standard of care. We don't want to lower it. In addition to maintaining these standards, we must insist that they make available a number of beds to us. So, to start off with, yes, we are insisting that all homes to be licensed must participate in the programme.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the minister not agree that he is confusing standard of care with simply a coercion on the part of the government, based on a threat to remove their licences unless they participate along the lines the government dictates?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the reason nursing homes are licensed in the first place. It is to look after patients who need nursing care, nursing assistance. For many years, all of us in the Legislature have been advocating that we institute a government programme that will cover the cost, or the largest percentage of the cost of patients in these nursing homes. Unless we insist that the nursing homes that we licensed in the first place to look after these patients continue to function in this manner, then we are defeating the purpose that we started out to do. All of us were in favour that we had to have a programme to cover patients in nursing homes. If we are going to allow a few nursing home operators to hold a gun at our head and say, "Unless you pay us more money than you are offering us today, we are not going to admit patients," then, I am afraid we haven't got any alternative, have we?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A final supplementary, as far as I am concerned: Can the minister assure the House that the plan will go into operation as promised three weeks from today?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The plan is going in as promised three weeks from today. Regretfully I was late today and, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if I hadn't been attempting to make appointments to see as many people as want to see me—and this refers to members of the opposition as well as my own party and the public outside—I would have been on time. Unfortunately, I was not allowed to make that statement today so it will have to stay until Thursday.

Mr. Singer: The Leader of the Opposition asked the minister a question. He did not answer the question.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: How many beds are we talking about, effective April 1? To the Minister of Health, how many beds?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Every bed we have in the province. How many would we have?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can't give the member the number off the top of my head.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have an approximation?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Probably 20,000 or 25,000 beds—23,000.

Mr. Lewis: Of which 75 per cent would be eligible for coverage?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Probably. We have found that of those patients in nursing homes, as I said before, about 25 per cent aren't eligible for coverage under the programme. They are using them as retirement homes. About 23,000 beds are available altogether in the province. Of these beds today, yes, 75 to 80 per cent will be eligible for coverage.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How is the minister establishing the criteria to distinguish between those requiring nursing care and those who are in retirement?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a form that is being completed by the family physician, when he is available and, if not, by another physician, in which they are checking off the various types of care that are provided in the homes and whether or not a particular patient requires this care. If he does, he gets it. That is all. If he doesn't, why, he is in the retirement section. Now the other thing, there is a nursing home review board set up too and people can appeal these decisions.

Mr. Lewis: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Have we, by and large, now covered the matters in the ministerial statement or are there are other things to which the minister would like to refer?

Mr. Singer: Read the statement.

Hon. Mr. Potter: First of all, perhaps I should say, can I read the statement?

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I don't think we can permit this. The House did not give unanimous consent to make a ministerial statement so the hon. minister will not make a ministerial statement.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think I asked a perfectly legitimate question—which parts of the various pronouncements the minister wanted to make have not yet been covered?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think we should point out, Mr. Speaker, that starting the first of this year as it was announced by the government some months ago, everyone 65 years of age and over is covered for those payments for both OHSC and OHSIP. Starting April 1, everyone in this age group is covered automatically in nursing homes as well as in any other institution in the province. They will pay the first $3.50 per day and the balance between that and $12.50 is paid through the programme.

Members will also recall that as of the first of the month HIRB, OHSC and OHSIP are all amalgamated into one programme so that there will be one premium to cover everybody. For those with restricted incomes, previously, for OHSIP, if they didn't pay any income tax they got their premiums paid for them. If they had a restricted income they paid half the premium. Now that is extended to cover the whole programme. In other words what we have now is an Ontario health care programme which takes in not only hospitalization but also the medical portion of it. I think that covers it pretty much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North has a supplementary.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A supplementary question regarding the rate structure: I understand from the statement that the rate paid by the government will be $9 and the usage charge is $3.50. Will nursing homes that have a higher rate than the resulting $12.50 be allowed to charge a larger usage charge?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, Mr. Speaker. They won't for the basic standard of care. I think that we all probably appreciate that in establishing nursing home care, as in establishing any other type of hospital care in the province, we are interested in establishing a good high-quality basic standard of care—the same as we do with our hospital programme in which we are providing hospital care in our general hospitals, whether it be in a chronic hospital, or whatever it is.

Until now, the rates paid by the department for patients who could not pay their own way in nursing homes was $11 a day. During the past year I have visited a fair number of nursing homes in the province. I have talked with administrators of some of the larger nursing homes outside of Metro Toronto. I have talked with individuals who operate their own nursing homes and they have told me that they were making money at $11 a day.

Now we are told when we have set a rate of $12.50 a day to cover the same quality of care and, in addition to provide drugs and dressing, they are making a fair amount more than they were before. When somebody who has been operating a nursing home for the past several years tells me that for the past two or three years he has been losing money, I ask him why he is still in the business.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Because quite frankly we have a pile of applications about this deep from individuals who are interested in getting into the nursing home business, who know what our rates are going to be and they are prepared to operate. I don't think there is any hardship on anyone, in suggesting that at $12.50 a day they are not doing pretty well.

I would like to see the programme administered more or less on a budget basis the same as we do with our hospitals. At the present time in order to get it in operation we suggested the per diem rate. There really wasn't any way that we could establish it on a budget basis because there isn't a nursing home in Ontario today that has offered to make available to us its books to show us what their actual costs are so that we could work out a budget to give them a fair return on their investments. I would be delighted if any of them would be prepared to come to me with a proposal that they would like to enter into an agreement on this basis because then we would be able to budget them the same as we do the hospitals.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, of the Minister of Health. How many of the 490 nursing homes in the province have returned these resident applications and doctors' forms to give an indication of how many people are going to be covered initially under the plan?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I cannot tell you offhand, Mr. Speaker. I haven't got that information with me. But I can assure the members of this Legislature that everybody who is entitled to it will be covered by April 1.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a question?

DATES OF ENACTMENT FOR ENVIRONMENT BILL SOUGHT

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of the Environment. When is he promulgating the regulations on the now memorable environment bill? When will the regulations under the Act—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Would the hon. member tell me which specific field he is concerned about?

Mr. Lewis: Well, there was reference to the littering field and there was reference to non-returnable bottles, and there was reference to updated regulations on noise pollution, and there was reference to some changes in the OWRC regulations. Any of them at all. Just when will they be coming? What dates does he have in mind?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I can't give the hon. member specific dates, but they will be coming out over the period of the next few months in various regulations. Not all at once.

Mr. Reid: The government is only six months late now.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister intend to carry out the pledge to ban non-returnable bottles?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the government's policy will be announced in due course.

Mr. Shulman: It has been announced already. Is the minister going to carry it out?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Just before the election.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, to the minister of Trade and Development.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, the hon. member is out of order unless he has a supplementary.

Mr. Givens: Oh, I am sorry, I thought that was the last one.

NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time factor. I will just ask one question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. In view of the remarks of his cabinet confrere, has he perhaps wished to make a policy statement on the matter of non-returnable bottles?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Not today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: How about tomorrow?

Mr. Martel: The minister is still thinking about it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, it is under lively debate within the policy field, and I think that the answer given by my colleague is the appropriate one.

Mr. Shulman: But the minister did announce it earlier.

Mr. MacDonald: How can the government pass a law and then debate it afterwards?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We passed the law. This is a question of the regulations, and this is where the question was directed.

Mr. Singer: That is certainly not policy. That is administration.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it is policy that we have regulations that—

Mr. MacDonald: That was in the statute.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, it is a most pertinent question because, as the questioner will allow, it not only impinges upon the field of the environment, but it also hinges on the question of how many people will be unemployed by particular activities or how many firms will be closed down by particular activities. So we have a typical balance on the kind of thing that is very much on the platter of the policy minister in this field.

Mr. MacDonald: So the government's law isn't always a pious hope?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member never thought of that, did he?

Mr. Lewis: I don't believe it! There need be no shutdowns and no unemployment if the minister brings that in. There are lots of alternatives—and he knows it.

Mr. Reid: I thought the government was against the ban?

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like a pre-election gimmick.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further supplementaries? Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but no.

Mr. Speaker: All right, there are a few minutes remaining then. The hon. Minister of Social and Family Services has the answer to questions asked previously by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Spence) and the hon. member for Rainy River.

DAYCARE CENTRES FOR INDIAN BANDS

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): Mr. Speaker, the two hon. members asked me questions about the operation of day nurseries as it related to Indian bands. The member for Kent was inquiring as to the number of applications for capital assistance made by Indian bands. There were 20 applications, and out of that number 10 were approved. I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that the decisions on approvals were made on the basis of geographical locations, the needs of each band which applied and whether or not there were enough children to support a nursery. With reference to geographical locations, I might add that most of the applications were approved in the north and the northwest part of the province.

The hon. member for Rainy River raised a question yesterday about the approval of a nursery for the Couchiching band. The member said that the band administrator wrote and asked for details and that within a week the nursery was approved without any applications being submitted.

Mr. Speaker, my department received a letter on December 14, 1971, from Mr. William Jourdain, band administrator, which expressed a definite interest in obtaining assistance to construct a nursery. Mr. Jourdain wrote to the department on January 11, 1972, concerning possible assistance. His letter said in part, and I quite:

> We are definitely interested in the project and would very much like to avail ourselves of its benefits, but since the deadline for submissions has passed we are wondering if we are not too late to take part in this project.

An hon. member: The member should apologize.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, my department took this letter to be a formal request for approval by the band. Officials of Project Daycare have contacted the band immediately to clarify its proposals in detail. When this was completed the band's proposal to renovate an existing building was approved by myself on February 8, 1972 and the band was informed of this approval on February 10, 1972.

Mr. Renwick: Thanks.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I should add, Mr. Speaker, that the band has not received any money as yet because no renovation work has been undertaken to this date. As soon as the work is under way the band will receive a full subsidy of 100 per cent of the cost of renovation, equipment and furnishings.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member is going to apologize, isn't he?

Mr. Reid: Apologize?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes! Misinformation.

Mr. Reid: Is it the policy of the minister's department to make a grant or to give an okay on a programme when someone writes and states that they are definitely interested in the programme? And the second question: If someone in my riding writes ODC or NODC and says they are definitely interested in getting a loan for a project, I would like further information. Are those same projects going to be okayed and will they get a nice letter with 40,000 press releases going out from the government saying this has been approved? Now surely the minister doesn't believe—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a statement. Just the question please.

Mr. Reid: —that indication of interest is an application?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, by the tone of the hon. member's comment it appears as if he is against this application for a grant.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: This was approved in principle and as yet, as I just indicated—if he had been listening—no money has been allocated. But we are prepared, however, to allocate the grant if they make the necessary renovations. I see nothing wrong. The member comes from northwestern Ontario; surely he must be aware that communications are difficult and the mail takes a long time—but the people acted very promptly. So, from what the hon. member says, he leaves the impression that he is against this grant. Is this correct?

Mr. Breithaupt: Not at all!

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): He is against the grant. He is against the Indians.

Mr. Reid: No! On a point of order or privilege.

An hon. member: Oh, he is against it!

Mr. Reid: No. The whole point is simply that the minister makes a mockery of what his department does and of the whole programme. The Indians themselves are confused when they receive a letter of approval for something they have not yet asked for.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Were there further supplementaries?

The hon. Minister of Trade and Development has the answer to a question asked on Friday by the hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

COST OF ONTARIO PLACE

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked:

Could the minister tell the House what the final cost of Ontario Place is and why there is a considerable discrepancy now between the original forecast and expenditures already made?

The answer is as follows: The capital cost for Ontario Place was originally estimated at $13 million. The final cost has been placed at $28.7 million.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Double or nothing!

Mr. Ruston: Thirteen to 28 million!

Mr. Stokes: What's a million here or there?

Hon. Mr. White: The original estimate provided only for the five exhibit pods, a domed theatre and 18.6 acres of landfill. The final cost figure provided for the addition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They added a whole lot of boutiques.

Mr. Ruston: There will be lots of work.

Hon. Mr. White: —of an outdoor amphitheatre with a seating capacity of 2,000 under canopy and 6,000 on fully landscaped surroundings; also a fully serviced marina with a capacity for 320 boats, nine major restaurant complexes, nine snack bars, three land rides for public transportation, pedal and tour boats—

Mr. Shulman: Votes not boats!

Hon. Mr. White: —and an additional 33 acres of landfill, making the facility about three times as large as was originally planned.

Mr. Martel: We are sure peddling it today.

Mr. Reid: What about rat control?

Mr. MacDonald: It's obvious the cabinet lost control of Stan Randall. Now it is dealing with the consequences.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A two per cent override!

Hon. Mr. White: The second question read as follows:

Can the minister inform the Legislature how much of the multi-million-dollar deficit he had on Ontario Place he expects to make up by increasing the price of admission to Ontario Place?

To answer the question fully I would like to give some background about the policy on admissions to Ontario Place.

When Ontario Place was being built it was decided to keep admissions as low as possible to encourage family visits to this provincial showcase.

Mr. Shulman: Up until election time.

Hon. Mr. White: On the other hand, it was necessary to derive the maximum amount of revenue from admissions to offset the costs of the free films, exhibits and entertainment. Last year, admissions were set at $1 for adults, 50 cents for students, 25 cents for children from 7 to 12. To recognize the contributions by senior citizens of this province and to encourage those large families with small children, those over 65 and under six years of age were allowed in free.

For this year with the age of majority lowered to 18, a new admission structure has

been drawn up as follows: Adults, $1.50; students or juniors from 12 to 17 years of age, 75 cents, and children on school tours pay 25 cents each. Senior citizens are again welcome to the site free, and the age limit has been raised from 6 to 12 years for free admission of children if accompanied by adults.

As a result of these changes we expect the revenue from paid admissions to rise by $596,000. Last year, revenue from paid admissions totalled $1,442,000; to the end of February, including season tickets, the total is $1,561,091. The attendance at Ontario Place for 1971 was 2,316,000, of which 79 per cent were paid admissions. I think you will agree that this percentage is high when senior citizens and children under seven are taken into account.

A breakdown of the 2,316,000 attendance figure shows 1,230,000 adults, 386,000 students, 225,000 children from 7 to 12, and 475,000 senior citizens and children six and under visited Ontario Place.

For this year we have conservatively estimated attendance at 2.1 million—I used the figure two million yesterday. While there may be some loss in attendance due to increased prices, the lowering of the age of majority offsets this with higher revenue in the adult category. Of the 2.1 million attendance forecast, 1.22—that is 1,220,000—will be adults; 236,000 students; 125,000 children on school tours; 519,000 senior citizens and children 12 and under.

Mr. Reid: Are the rats included?

Hon. Mr. White: There are no rats.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has now expired.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to clarify something for the other members of the House.

During the question period I asked the Minister of Trade and Development if he would file, along with the documents he had previously filed, profit and loss statements from the lessee restaurants. Perhaps it was his normal dissemblance, or his lack of knowledge of what he was filing, but he hasn't filed those at all and he certainly led me to believe he was filing them. I want to clarify this so that Hansard will record that all he has filed is the concession revenue from those restaurants and the people of Ontario don't know what profit the lessees made in those restaurants.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I take exception to that word "dissemblance"—

Mr. Bullbrook: It is a proper word.

Hon. Mr. White: —and I ask you to ask the hon. member to retract it.

Mr. Lewis: So he should, because I don't think it is a word.

An hon. member: I am trying to understand what it means.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is dissembling all the time. Either that or he is ignorant of what he himself is claiming—and I think it is the latter.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member may make it yet. By gosh, he may.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister has asked that the hon. member withdraw certain words; I am not at all sure I realize what word it was he wanted withdrawn.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you both respectfully I will not withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. minister would repeat to me what it was he wanted withdrawn?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We have a new Sergeant-at-Arms.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, this is your first test.

Mr. Reid: First of all do you know what the word means?

Hon. Mr. White: I gave the Clerk all of the information—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order please.

Hon. Mr. White: I gave the Clerk all of the information I have available, and the standing instructions in my department are to keep none of this information secret from any member of this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: Well how do you like that? You wouldn't want them to dissemble?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Dissembling in the assembly!

Hon. Mr. White: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have tabled all of the information which we have available.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not the point.

Hon. Mr. White: I will investigate the matter and see if indeed we have complete profit and loss figures for these concessionaires, and if it should be that we have full operating statements I will further explore the propriety of making the figures for these private enterprises public.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, that isn't what he said before. You heard the question directly—"Will he file those profit and loss statements?"—

Mr. Singer: Absolutely.

Mr. Bullbrook: —and in his normal smug dissemblance he said, "Yes, I will." But he didn't know what he was doing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That puts the member way out front now.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, what did the minister mean when he said he would look into the propriety of further documents when he had already said that nothing was secret in his department?

Mr. Breithaupt: That's private enterprise.

Hon. Mr. White: Certainly none of the figures which we ourselves are responsible for are to be kept from any member of this Legislature or press media, I can assure you. There is the question of propriety concerning confidential profit and loss information. As the former Minister of Revenue here I can tell you that information made available in certain circumstances is a closely held secret on behalf of the taxpayers and fee payers and others. I do not know, without looking into the matter, into which category these concessionaires fit.

Mr. Speaker: I am not at all certain that the word to which the hon. member took exception is a word that actually was meant in the manner in which he has taken it. I am not sure of the meaning of the word. I believe the word was "dissemblance."

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't understand it either.

Mr. Speaker: I should like to consult my dictionary and determine whether or not there is anything offensive. If, in fact, there is any need to pursue this further I will certainly rule upon it tomorrow, or rather on Thursday.

Mr. Lewis: It is a garbled piece of obscenity.

Hon. Mr. White: May I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: He doesn't know either.

Hon. Mr. White: It isn't the word I find offensive; it is the hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: Vindicated again!

Mr. Speaker: Is everybody happy?

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Henderson (Lambton), from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed of the following members:

1. PROCEDURAL AFFAIRS: Messrs. Burr, Dymond, Eaton, Edighoffer, Ewen, Foulds, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton), Johnston, MacDonald, Meen, Reid, Scrivener, Smith (Hamilton Mountain), Spence, Timbrell, Turner, Walker—18.

2. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: Messrs. Bullbrook, Carruthers, Clement, Davison, Downer, Givens, Havrot, Irvine, Lane, Lawlor, MacBeth, McNeil, Nixon (Dovercourt), Renwick, Rhodes, Singer, Taylor, Wardle—18.

3. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT: Messrs. Beckett, Belanger, Birch, Drea, Dukszta, Gisborn, Hamilton, Handleman, Leluk, Loughren, McIlveen, McNie, Morningstar, Morrow, Newman (Windsor-Walkerville), Parrott, Paterson, Smith (Nipissing)—18.

4. RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT: Messrs. Allan, Bennett, Deans, Evans, Ferrier, Gaunt, Good, Jessiman, Maeck, Miller, Newman (Ontario South), Nuttall, Rollins, Sargent, Stokes, Villeneuve, Wiseman, Yakabuski—18.

5. ESTIMATES: Messrs. Beckett, Braithwaite, Cassidy, Drea, Eaton, Gilbertson, Haggerty, Hamilton, Jessiman, MacBeth, Martel, McIlveen, Nuttall, Parrott, Scrivener (Mrs.), Stokes, Walker, Worton—18.

6. PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Messrs. Allan, Breithaupt, Cassidy, Deacon, Dymond, Germa, Lane, Morrow, Nixon (Dovercourt), Taylor, Wardle, Wiseman—12.

7. REGULATIONS: Messrs. Belanger, Bounsall, Havrot, Irvine, Johnston, Leluk, Maeck, Reilly, Roy, Ruston, Turner, Young—12.

The quorum of committees 1 to 5 and of the private bills committee to be seven in each

case. The quorum of committees 6 and 7 to be five in each case.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before the adoption of the report I want to raise a matter with you and with the House leader in regard to the matter of substitution on committees. During the last session of the Legislature, it was possible to substitute on all of the five first-named committees for the purpose of studying estimates. We would hope that this would continue during this session. Although it wasn't a part of the recommendation of the committee, it in fact is a requirement of the committee.

In regard to the other committees, with the restructuring of government and with the overlapping of jurisdiction, and with the fact that the committees only permit a certain number of members to sit on them, and that the opposition parties are permitted only three members each, it becomes extremely difficult for the critics of the opposition parties to take part in the deliberations of the committee, when the committee is studying legislation which has been referred to it by this House dealing with his department, if that member is not named as a member of the committee. I ask the House leader to consider permitting substitution to take place in all of these committees when dealing with estimates and bills.

For example if the resource committee, which overlaps a number of departments, is dealing with the agriculture bills and I am not a member of that committee, I should be able to be substituted on that day in order that I could lead the debate for this party on the position that we might want to put forward on the bill that was being studied.

I think it makes sense. I think that in past years the committees were aligned in such a way as to allow the critic to be on the committee that studied the appropriate bills referred to it by this House. This is no longer the case. It wasn't brought about by our doing but rather brought about by the reorganization of government and I feel that some appropriate change and substitution, to deal both with estimates and the study of bills referred, is necessary.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will take the hon. member's suggestion under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the report be received and adopted?

Report agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, can you inform the House what arrangements have been made to organize the committees tomorrow, which is the first day the House does not sit to accommodate committees.

Mr. Speaker: According to the order paper, the standing procedural affairs committee will meet on Wednesday, March 8, at 11 a.m., in committee room No. 2; and this committee of course will deal with the matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No other committees will be organized?

Mr. Speaker: Not on the order paper; no.

Mr. Lewis: On a further point of order Mr. Speaker, it becomes clear, I think, that given the time limit, in the rules, at which the Throne debate must terminate before the budget is tabled, unless we begin to meet in the evenings, this week and next, it will simply not be possible for all the members of this House who wish to enter the Throne debate, in this the first of a new session, to do so. Has the House Leader the intention then of meeting in the evenings—and which evenings—to facilitate that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I think I made a statement in this regard. If there is a variation from that position I will report to the leader.

Mr. Lewis: What is the position exactly?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: At the moment it is our intention not to sit in the evenings until after the Easter recess; but I recognize the request and I will report back.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the House leader: Is he aiming for a Throne Speech windup next Friday, a week Friday, or the 27th, a Monday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I believe that in accordance with the rules that is about it.

Mr. Shulman: On a point of order, if I may Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that any member of this House who wishes to speak in this debate may do so; and if there are members who have not yet spoken who wish to contribute they must be allowed to do so?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, in accordance with the rules, and I believe the rules state it very clearly, a Throne Speech debate is concluded before the introduction of the budget. But I think it must be borne in mind that all members can speak equally as freely on the budget debate as on the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Martel: How do we speak if the House does not sit?

Mr. Shulman: If I may have further elucidation, will the member not agree, or will you not agree. Mr. Speaker, that on the Throne debate each and every member may speak if he so wishes?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, I was a member of the committee that drafted the new rules—

Mr. Shulman: It is not a matter of committee.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Now just a moment—the gentlemen's agreements that exist between leaders and whips is acknowledged and adhered to and I believe that that is the way it operates.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had an answer from you, sir. I am not asking the government for permission on this, I am asking you, as a Speaker, and as the guardian of our privileges, to reiterate a privilege which has been common to this House and the House of Westminster back for hundreds of years, that any member may speak regardless of what the House leader says.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is not correct. The standing orders of this House prevail. The Throne Speech must be completed prior to the introduction of the budget. If the House leader deems that it is necessary to hold night sittings in order to accomplish that fact, that will be done as I understand the words of the House leader. There is nothing in the standing orders which, to my knowledge, covers the point raised by the hon. member for High Park. It's not up to me to determine whether or not they will sit in the evenings to accomplish the objectives.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, if I may further, on this same point. I'm not referring to the standing orders. I'm referring to the traditions of Parliament and of this House. The tradition has been, and I must go back at least to the Magna Carta, that in the Throne debate any member who wishes to participate may do so and no standing orders can supervene that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I don't recall any instance where a private member of this House has not had an opportunity to speak on the Throne debate. I think, may be, we're getting worried before we have to—

Mr. Martel: We are not to have any time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would say, Mr. Speaker, we are spending a considerable amount of time now. I am quite sure that we'll all have a chance to speak. I don't want to speak in defence of the House leader, but if it's up to him to call night sessions I suppose we'll have them. Let's get on with the business.

Mr. Shulman: Let him do it.

Mr. Martel: There is a good Tory for you!

Mr. Speaker: I am sure that the party leaders and the House leader will get together on this thing and arrange for all members to speak who should have an opportunity to speak before the budget date arrives.

Mr. Shulman: After it is too late.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, may I just add to that that the rules were set by an all-party committee. Certainly, the rules can be changed by the House itself and there is no desire on my part or the government's part to inhibit any desire of any member to speak. Although the hon. member himself curtails it occasionally.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may, in an endeavour to clarify this, I would ask the Speaker: Is it not true that the rules do not contain any statement as to a particular sessional day on which the budget will be introduced? That all the rules, in fact, say is that the Throne Speech must be completed before the introduction of the budget?

Mr. Shulman: The hon. member is correct.

Mr. Renwick: Is it, therefore, not true that the important point is that if necessary, the government's decision to bring in the budget would have to be delayed until such time as each member of the Legislature who desired to speak in the Throne debate had an opportunity to do so?

Mr. Speaker: In answer to that particular point, it seems to me that the presentation of the budget has, in some manner, something to do with the end of our fiscal period, which is March 31—

Mr. MacDonald: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: —insofar as the government is concerned in its efforts to introduce the budget by a certain date. Other than that, as far as the hon. member is concerned, he is quite right—there is nothing in the standing

orders, to my knowledge, which stipulates any date upon which a budget must or should be introduced.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, every session we have ended up sitting into those little hours of the morning trying to close out debate, whether it be the Throne or whether it be the budget debate.

An hon. member: Or estimates!

Mr. Deans: Or estimates for that matter. What we're trying to avoid on this side of the House is not bills but that hectic rush that inevitably takes place on the day before the House rises. We don't anticipate, with any eagerness, the prospect of sitting on the Friday evening or perhaps into the wee hours of Saturday morning, trying to get in all of the members who want to speak.

Surely it makes good sense that we should allocate the time that is now available. There are only six days on which the Legislature will sit before we rise for the Easter recess. It makes sense that we should use that time as usefully and meaningfully as possible. Since there are a great number of members who anticipate speaking in the debate, we should inaugurate evening sessions now and, thereby, will be able to complete the business in a reasonable time and with reasonable hours. That is what we are asking.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): That is for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the points raised by the hon. members who have spoken on this topic are quite important points. They are valid points and should be given full consideration. I think the hon. House leader has indicated to the House that he will take these matters under consideration. We would hope that he will come back and inform the House of his decision in connection with the points raised by all the hon. members, which, as I say, in my opinion are valid points and should be considered.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, would the House leader consider having the House sit tomorrow afternoon if committees are not meeting so that, in fact, the Throne debate could be proceeded with?

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear. Good idea.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I cannot accede to that request at this time.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, let me ask you this. You have attempted to be very reasonable here; the House leader may be in a different position but he is the House leader and, therefore, he has to face up to the facts of it. We have only six days for the Throne debate and if he does not decide now that we are meeting tonight, he is eliminating one of the four possible evenings. This should have been done last week. In short, to postpone the decision is, in effect, to deny the possibility of implementing the decision. If he is not going to truncate the Throne debate and make it the shortest Throne debate, certainly in a normal session, that I have ever seen around this Legislature, he has to make that decision immediately before we rise at 6 o'clock. The only alternative or substitute for tonight, if we cannot meet tonight, is to meet tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would like to inform the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow the cabinet has a rather full session in meeting the chambers of commerce of northern Ontario, which is well known, and we do not intend to change that arrangement. People spend money and travel a lot of miles to come in for that particular annual event. If I have the opportunity I shall report before 6 o'clock this evening and if not I shall report on Thursday.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a final point of order, the cabinet members do not sit in here to listen to Throne speeches; they clear out as soon as anybody in the opposition side starts.

Mr. Stokes: Look at them now!

Mr. MacDonald: They can come in for the question period and go out and speak to their buddies in the chambers of commerce. We will carry on the business of the province here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There are other people involved.

Mr. Bullbrook: We are going to be here.

Mr. Lewis: The point is we are turning up tomorrow afternoon. We are going to pass some legislation!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am the protector of the members' best interests.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT.

Mr. Deans moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, as has been my practice over the past three years, I am introducing this Act which will make it mandatory in the Province of Ontario that drugs and medicines be sold only in child-proof containers.

I received a great deal of support during the last session from persons outside the Legislature who deal with children and who know the extent of the problem. Each year we read of more and more children dying as a result of inadvertently taking medicines and drugs that are left in containers which can be readily opened by them. I had anticipated that the Minister of Health might have adopted this measure last year. He indicated that he was considering it and I hope that, if possible, prior to the opportunity for second reading the government might consider moving a bill of similar nature and I will be happy to withdraw this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

CEMETERIES ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Cemeteries Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to try to prevent the annual waste of some thousands of dollars which has been taking place for many years now, in duplicate issuing of coroner's certificates on the same death; which the government has been promising to clean up for some five years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

HEALTH STUDIOS

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Health Studios.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): I would say to the hon. member for Scarborough West, I didn't hear him on the second exchange. Nobody is excited, because I am quite sure he would support this as well.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is the same as Bill 8 which I introduced concerning dancing studios. The intent is that those who profit from emotional response to certain advertising or other types of promotions will no longer be able to trap the unwary into long-term binding contracts. I say to the hon. members of the house, in case the words "health studio" may be too all-embracing, the intent of this bill—and I am taking dead aim at the Vic Tanny Studios, the FigurMagic Studios and the Hilton-Stauffer Studios. We all know what I am talking about.

Mr. Lewis: Having not yet been to Vic Tanny's, I am not sure.

Mr. Drea: The member knows.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't think the member for Scarborough Centre has been there.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable The Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin—indeed, perhaps I should have done this yesterday, but I didn't feel that I wanted to then, but I want to now—by saying how much I enjoyed the generous, typically strong speech which was delivered by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) in this House; it was a speech very much rooted in the Province of Ontario, as those of us who have heard him on many occasions recognize. If I may say in a personal way, it was a privilege to have campaigned with him in the last campaign. Albeit one's adversaries often engender mixed feelings during the course of the campaign, I am pleased to have had that experience.

I am particularly impressed by the unselfconsciousness and confident way that the hon. member for Brant speaks of his father, Mr. Speaker. As a devotee of nepotism I was filled with admiration for this particular trend. I do not want to provide any obituaries until retirement, because I sense there

is much fight left in the hon. member for Brant and that we will be on the receiving end, so I shall reserve some pugnacity.

My only regret—and it didn't by any means mar the speech yesterday—was the observation of the hon. member for Brant in the wake of the election, that the election had somehow constituted a rejection of the NDP. I couldn't imagine such an analysis being made.

I noted in the Ottawa Journal in the middle of February a comment on the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Brant. The Ottawa Journal said:

> Now wait a bit. In the October, 1971 election the Tories gained 10 seats for a total of 78. The Liberals lost seven seats for a total of 20, the NDP lost two seats for a total of 19. No matter how you equate this, that looks to us as though the Liberals were the ones rejected last October.

I put that in as a modest salve to our party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I guess we both know who won.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, we have that generally in mind.

I want to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Unfortunately it included the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. Lewis: Well I am going to deal with the member for Lambton in a moment, if he stays in the House. I may say, Mr. Speaker, it will only take me a moment to deal with him.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I have to leave at 4 o'clock; will the hon. member do it before 4?

Mr. Lewis: I will do it before 4; I'll do it within 10 minutes.

I want to compliment the Speaker, as others have, on his appointment. A man of greater justice, wisdom and balance cannot be imagined. As Anthony said of Caesar: "Will there ever be such another?" I rather doubt it.

I want to make a speech of moderate length, offering sweet and gentle reflections on the politicians opposite, who govern neither wisely nor well but endlessly. The electoral outcome last October, Mr. Speaker, implied to most of us a Conservative victory, and their physical presence in the House would seem to confirm it; rather like a pincer movement closing in on the opposition.

As a matter of fact I think it is time to reveal, Mr. Speaker, that there was a plot afoot to surround our little remnant of virtue and integrity with hordes of Tory infidels on all sides, to achieve by intimidation what they were unable to achieve by election. It was only the Speaker's intervention which saved us from that fate, and that's why I pay him homage.

Still, it is a pleasure of sorts to be back, back at the club where men are men and women are women and the member for Lambton who cherishes the difference.

When we prorogued there were 68 across the way; now by some strange mutation there are 77 and the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), who is a hybrid unto himself. When we prorogued there were 20-odd equal ministers; now there are 16 mortals and six of the elect. Well, six who govern with almost absolute authority, known by their colleagues—in muted whispers in the hallway—as the politburo of the Progressive Conservative Party. Everyone is thankful that they suffer democracy at all.

But alas Mr. Speaker, as the oligarchy took shape only the fittest survived. It is always true in this world of free enterprise where the corridors of power are littered with those who fell from favour. There are a great many on the government side who fell from favour. One need only look at all these cabinet ministers in front of me talking an active part in this debate. I see the minister, the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr). That I suppose was the unkindest cut of all; one day Minister of the Environment, next day executive assistant to Douglas Wright. It is one of the great demotions in modern political history.

I am sorry, I am sorry about the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman). What a man was that, Mr. Speaker?—I say interrogatively. He is now stripped of Trade and Development, stripped of forgivable loans, stripped of Ontario Place, stripped of overall housing policy, left with the tattered rump of Revenue, and only temporarily the Ontario Housing Corporation. And now, Mr. Speaker, if I understand it, they have shipped him to China.

I believe that is true. Well I guess that is why they call him the red Tory. I have heard that with his little book of the chairman tucked firmly under his arm he'll dine with Mao and lunch with Chou and play ping-pong with Lin Piao. I may say, so much for East-West relations, Mr. Speaker—

An hon. member: Better call Richard Nixon.

Mr. Lewis: Well, if Richard had known what was following he might never have gone, as it happens. Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, there would have been better emissaries? I mean even the member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko) would have been a finer emissary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Now, now.

Mr. Lewis: Well now I don't know, I don't want to understate it.

His centuries of training in this House—at least it seems like centuries, Mr. Speaker—his decades of intense commitment to the aspirations of ethnic peoples around the world.

An hon. member: In the third world!

Mr. Lewis: For third world, sorry!

His months of nurturing the multicultural congress, the like of which is without parallel anywhere in the solar system, so he has suggested to some of his colleagues.

I am truly sorry that the minister from Bellwoods with his tact, his diplomacy, his sensitivity, did not find it within him to make the voyage to China.

Picture it, Mr. Speaker: The state dinner, rounds of testimonials and speeches; the orders of the day having ended the member from Bellwoods rises, the hon. John Yaremko to his feet and toasts movingly, tears streaming no doubt, the 20th anniversary of the island of Formosa.

I could well see it in the content of that time.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Let Hansard record the raucous laughter on the opposite side of the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought it was mostly coming from the press gallery.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If the minister had only been listening he would have known what the raucous laughter was about.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The people of Formosa are human beings just as much as any supporter of—

An hon. member: Oh John, John!

Mr. Lewis: I knew it, I knew I would regret it; and I did it anyway Mr. Speaker. I knew that if the Taiwanese had a champion he was here in this House in the presence of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If men who want freedom find a champion, it is on this side of the House.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is a joke and he doesn't know it.

Mr. Lewis: Well, no provocation is sufficient—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have never seen the leader of the NDP walking down University on behalf of freedom for men.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You tell him.

Mr. Lewis: Okay! Is the minister finished? Thank you. Don't fail to intervene.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: All depends whether the member is.

Mr. Lewis: What of the policy ministers Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Last year I said I outlived six opposition leaders, I will outlive one more.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member is tempting fate.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Is the minister apologizing?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: One down and one to go.

Mr. MacDonald: Some people never get the difference between laughed at and laughed with.

Mr. Lewis: That is all right.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for York South was counted out two years ago.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is in rare form. Had I known he was going to be in the House I wouldn't even have ventured in. If he will allow me to continue.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: By all means.

Mr. Lewis: Well by all means. Is the minister leaving? What a pity.

Now as for the policy ministers, Mr. Speaker, what strange enigma are these people? What strange admixture of man and beast?

The absence of any direct contribution from the policy ministers in this House is something that worries the House a great deal. They are in here for a fleeting period

of time during the question period and they flee very quickly thereafter as is seen.

The policy minister for Social Development (Mr. Welch) I don't think has offered nary a word, well maybe a few words in the House. I tried to find what it was that was preoccupying him since he assumed the burden of such high office, and I came across an article which explained it all. It is an article of the Toronto Globe and Mail, February 22 last, and I'll read members the first paragraph germane as it is to this debate:

> Robert Welch, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, said last night that Ontario must work to protect Canada from the fate of Uruguay.

Now I know that that may arouse certain incredulity in the minds of some.

Mr. Singer: That was particularly inclined to the author who was chortling up there.

Mr. Lewis: To continue:

> He told the Dovercourt Conservative Association in Toronto that the mismanagement that led the South American country from a prime example of a welfare state into a stagnant slump within 20 years is being avoided in Ontario by a Conservative government, and the lesson of Uruguay's slump must not be missed, said Mr. Welch.

Well, they now have a Uruguay bureau in the Ministry of Social Development making pronouncements of equal depth and thought.

The Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), who likes to be known as the minister who links and thinks, has also made an occasional statement in this House—one today.

The man who is emerging most quickly, let it be said, is the hybrid to whom I referred before, the Treasurer of Ontario, about whom the historians will refer to as the McKeough years in Ontario. He is, admittedly Mr. Speaker, the most turbulent and volatile amongst the members of the cabinet, a strong man of the government, his cherubic grins and loud guffaws barely containing his innermost socialist impulses.

He is very much the centre of the stage here. As a matter of fact, voices in the gallery have been heard to say, "Who is that fellow on Darcy's right?"

Many have pondered the same. Who is it indeed? Well, according to John Slinger of the Globe and Mail, the man on Darcy's right is the man who renders publishers and senior editors or 20 daily newspapers in Ontario questionless with one speech, comatose with two. In that peculiar liaison dangereuse which the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) has with the Canada's leading newspaper, an onagain, offagain affair that allows for the tiny private glimpses of personal life against the backdrop of the forever public man, may I read a most extraordinary quotation from Mr. Slinger's article into the record:

> Bill Davis played varsity quarterback at Toronto and sometimes when no outsiders are around you can tell. He clenches the cigar in his teeth, unbuttons his jacket, sticks out his gut and loops his thumbs in his belt.

I won't tell them the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Brunelle) was smiling. Take that out of Hansard. I don't want the Premier to know the duplicity in his ranks.

> Standing a bit pigeon-toed, he squints through the smoke and looks like a middle-aged former jock who cherishes his Argo season tickets, which he is and which he does.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this is a man who clearly relishes the role and has now gathered around him a retinue of advisers, admirers and star-struck disciples that is the envy of the western world; together with direction from Detroit they formed "the big blue machine."

With the help of this assorted collection of the great and the near-great, the Throne Speech was fashioned for this Legislature. Like all Throne Speeches it slipped into immediately forgettable history the instant it was delivered; except for the part that was delivered in French, Mr. Speaker, that will live with me for some time. The Throne Speech slipped into memory. Before it departs entirely, I would like to comment on some of its aspects. My fellow caucus members in the New Democratic Party will be covering much of the ground specifically over the period of the next several day and evening sessions.

The Throne Speech had a good deal of nonsense; very few pretensions in it, of course. There are a number of areas to which I would like to address myself quickly and, I hope, to the point:

First, the speech abandoned, for the first time in any document of its kind that has come from the government, the so-called quest for full employment, which for the Tories signals a maximum of three per cent unemployment in the Province of Ontario. There was not a single mention of the three per cent goal. There were muttered homilies about unacceptable employment levels, but not a single

obvious solution to counteract the present accelerating unemployment trend. The province has already thrown away a quarter of a billion dollars, or is about to, on the so-called tax credit to corporations; and they needn't preach austerity to us when there have been so many major concessions made to the corporate world.

I remind you of the investment tax credit, which is a quarter of a billion dollars over two years; pollution control equipment, which will amount now to $12 million a year; retail sales tax lifted from certain production machinery, $7 million a year; $2.5 million a year to the beer producers; succession duty relaxation, which will lose us $30 million; resource revenue, which has not increased since 1969-1970 despite the increase in mineral and forest wealth generated from this province. As a result, whereas the total of corporation income tax in the province in 1962-1963 represented 19 per cent of provincial revenues, in 1971-1972 it represents eight per cent, and none of it has seriously reversed the levels of unemployment in this province.

I am reminded of that speech on October 14 prior to election day, when the Premier said: "We intend to pursue employment policies and to give priority to actions designed to restore employment and productivity to appropriate levels." Where are the actions and where are the appropriate levels?

Second, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech urges a re-evaluation of its role and responsibility with regard to the Ontario housing industry. How the mighty have collapsed.

Do the ministers opposite remember the pretensions of the Throne Speech last year? Half a billion dollars to create new housing. I can't recall how many units and how many new jobs that would have created—I think 30,000 units and 90,000 jobs. Very little has been seen since. So the head of the Ontario Housing Corporation can still say authoritatively that we are 65,000 units behind. Again, in Canada's morning daily three or four days ago, there was a major article on the housing market crisis in the Metropolitan Toronto area. The house of cards that was never heard of again.

Third, health services. The Speech from the Throne refers to the Grange report, to nursing homes, to better services to isolated parts of the province. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what of the restructuring of health services in Ontario?

What of all the amendments to the professional Acts which the Committee on the Healing Arts indicated were a requirement in this province in the near future? What of the new delivery system which has been promised by the former Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) and now by the present minister (Mr. Potter)? What of the move to community models and reduced costs and the move away from the dependence on medical models?

What of mental health, Mr. Speaker? I asked a question in this Legislature about a report called "Treating the Untreatable Adolescent," which is in the special services branch of the mental health division of the Department of Health. It is a report which chronicles what amounts to a tragedy in the wastage of adolescents in the Province of Ontario, adolescents who are profoundly disturbed and mentally ill; whose case histories fill the files of Children's Aid Societies and other agencies of a similar nature throughout the province.

There was not a single response worthy of the name when the minister stood in his place on Friday. He was guilty of what some would call dissemblance, Mr. Speaker, because he implied that some of the programmes had changed—or maybe it was just yesterday, Monday.

I wonder if the members of the House can be made aware of the kinds of kids we are speaking of. I am going to table this document for the interest of the members of the Legislature, but let me give them the flavour of those adolescents in Ontario who wait desperately for some therapeutic setting of which none is available while the government cannot approve nine or 10 programmes for which the Department of Health, through its mental health division, is desperately applying to Treasury Board.

Let me read you brief resumes of some of the case histories, Mr. Speaker.

> Willi M, Children's Aid Society—age 14; no father and rejected by mother. On probation for stealing. Has much potential, high IQ but refused to go to school. Has refused placement in group home. Runs away from home, becomes involved in vandalism. Private boarding placement attempted but failed after 10 days. Only untried resource is training school, which seems inevitable at this time.
>
> Rick W, (CAS)—aged 12—bright severely troubled youngster on edge of drug community. Stealing, glue sniffing, running away, refuses to attend school. Seen at Scarborough Mental Health Clinic.

Recommended for residential treatment . . . no funds available.

Susan E, (CAS)—age 14. Lives alone with father. Incest suspected. Sexually involved with male adult in community; cannot be held in outpatient treatment; currently on drugs; sees guidance counsellor at school daily; an acting-out bright teenager in need of residential development.

Douglas B, (CAS)—age 14. In court for sexually molesting younger sister. Numerous court appearances. One of six illegitimate children. Mother has history of reform institutions. A bright boy, severely disturbed, in need of residential treatment. All centres refuse admission.

Beverly P., (CAS)—age 16. Crown ward with repeated foster home failures, average intelligence. Disobedient, uncontrolled, lying, stealing, enuretic. Repeating grade 9; many psychosomatic symptoms. Needs residential treatment in controlled setting.

Margaret F., (CAS)—age 16. A very bright disturbed youngster, IQ 138. Tense, anxious, bitter, acting-out girl with unresolved feelings around family and wardship. Cannot be helped or held in foster or group home care. High community risk.

Marlene G, (CAS)—age 15. A seriously disturbed girl. Angry, disillusioned, rejected, impulsive, involved with alcohol and drugs. Refused admission by Maryvale. In court for car theft and running away. Responds to firm controls and treatment but no facility available.

Just a brief glance at the Children's Aid Society files, Mr. Speaker; 150 such cases were elicited. When I talked to Mr. Lloyd Richardson, the director of the Metropolitan Toronto Children's Aid Society last week and asked him if a similar analysis could be made now, precisely the same cases would show themselves. When I was in the office of Doug Finlay, the treatment placement director for the special services division of the Department of Health, he had within the last 10 days received 25 cases of a precisely similar kind.

The Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto is $300,000 over its institutional budget in the last year and cannot find placement for its children. I know I have never been able to get anywhere with this government on this subject, and I say it in a deeply personal way Mr. Speaker. But all of us in this House—and I assume it applies to government members as well as everybody else—deeply resent the distorted sense of priorities which allow so quickly for an announcement that $70 million is available to acquire land for a new airport but cannot fashion the facilities or find a few hundred thousand dollars necessary to salvage lives that are going down the drain at this moment. There is no ad hominem in that.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it goes on far too long—for almost eight years. Long before that people raised this question in the House, I don't mean to be presumptuous.

For the eight or nine years that I have been in this House, treating of this issue, we make occasional progress, but how it is possible to neglect the reality of a major segment of the adolescent community in Ontario in this fashion is absolutely beyond me.

You can toy with Ontario Place. One can have one's science centres. One can have one's monolithic institutions and all the festivities that surround the opening of a nuclear station, which the Leader of the Opposition described so vividly yesterday; but to find the money necessary to salvage human beings is still beyond the capacity of this government to resolve!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: A fourth point I want to make about the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. It says, "My government shares fully the concerns of the people of Ontario in respect of the protection and enhancement of our natural environment."

What a single-minded piece of hypocrisy that is, Mr. Speaker. If the government shares concern, why was there such a deliberate demotion—I am sorry to say it in his presence—of the one minister who appeared capable of coping with this particular issue? If the government shares concern, where is the legislation on non-returnable bottles or other regulations which this minister promised as far back as June 15, 1971?

If the government shares concern, why is it still seeking whom to sue in the Dow Chemical suit a year after the issuance of the writ?

If the government shares concern, where are the regulations for the environment bill? If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Protection Act received royal assent on July 28, 1971, Proclamation took place on August 11, 1971. It is now March 7, 1972, and all the innovative sections of that Act are as yet without regulation.

I don't know if that is why the minister was dumped, if I may use an uncharitable phrase. I don't know what it is that prevents the government from coming to grips with this kind of thing. Surely in all the thinking creativity of the policy ministers over there it is possible with some wit and some perception to draft the regulations we are still awaiting.

If the government shares concern, why does it permit the rapacious devastation of the Sandbanks month by month, as one cabinet minister after another enters into an unwritten agreement with Lake Ontario Cement to destroy the dunes before the transfer of title is made? They are paying a dollar a year for that lease of Crown land. How much more generous can a government be expected to be?

A dollar a year! In the last several months, Lake Ontario Cement has gone beserk in the amount of aggregate which it has taken from the dunes.

The Globe and Mail was kind in its description of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) as suffering from a perceptual handicap. He is physically immobilized and administratively defunct. This one basic recreational issue has single-handedly frustrated government action for as long as that lease has been under discussion in this Legislature, which is well more than a year. There is no excuse in the world for not applying a moratorium to the taking out of aggregate at this point, returning to the company a dollar a year for the unused portion of the lease and settling them into the alternative site, whenever the geological festivities of the head of the Audubon Society, or whatever his qualifications were, have been completed.

If there is concern, then where is the legislation to amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act, to return to the citizens of Ontario access to the beaches of Lake Erie?

If there is concern, then why hasn't all the intended land acquisition on the Niagara Escarpment been frozen by the government? After all, as soon as the airport was announced, the surrounding acreage was frozen in order to maintain reasonable land prices. How much of the $30 million has been spent? How long must we wait? How much more will we spend by the refusal to freeze the land?

With regard to the fifth of six points I want to make, Mr. Speaker, page 14 of the Throne Speech says:

> Experiments will be undertaken to test promising new systems and equipment in the field of urban transit, in the anticipation that Ontario may achieve technological leadership which can become the basis for new types of industries.

Who can take it seriously, Mr. Speaker? The Highway Improvement Act was passed in this House in the last session. To this day we still do not have the regulations governing that Act. All the subsidies for urban transit, which those regulations would free, are still not available nor, as many members know, is the solution to the northwest quadrant of Metropolitan Toronto.

Page 16 of the speech says:

> The board of directors of the Ontario Development Corporation and the Northern Ontario Development Corporation will be enlarged and their membership further diversified.

Yet again for the umpteenth time, the back of the hand to northern Ontario. Even the government's relative repudiation in the election hasn't humbled it a little about the realities of northern Ontario. My colleague, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), gets to his feet to have an exchange with the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. White)—God help northern Ontario if that man is in charge of what happens to the development of that part of the province. Because if the Minister of Trade and Development isn't even aware of the economics of Ontario, isn't even aware of how much more comes out of the north than has ever been returned to it, then he has no right to pretend to be able to plan for northern Ontario in the context of the economic priorities of this Legislature.

You remember the October 14 speech of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, on the economic strategy for Ontario? He said:

> We will be introducing a fiscal and economic policy designed to move us toward the objective of processing more Ontario resources in Canada and I have asked that a white paper on resources policy be prepared to recommend those policies which are best able to achieve this goal.

You tell me, Mr. Speaker—close as you are to the Premier, intimate with and a confidant of the great man—where is the white paper? Do you covet it, sir? Do you have it? Do you know when it will be released? And where has the increase in processing of northern ores been given evidence in the Throne Speech or in the deliberations of this House? Where are the policies? Why is it

that northern Ontario must always occupy its desperate quest for a place in the sun?

Mr. Renwick: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: It is laudatory, I suppose, to promote projects on Youth and the Law, and to reorganize departments, and to prohibit the holding of more than one office at a time by any individual, to bring the schools closer to the community, and to remove the blight of automobile hulks, and to extend the programme of annual achievement awards. But in all the key socio-economic areas of this government—from jobs to agriculture, to Canadian economic independence—the Throne Speech is totally deficient.

So in fact we are in for a pretty combative four years, Mr. Speaker. And starting with this Throne Speech, the New Democratic Party members will again outline a series of strong critiques and alternative positions; and I promise the government, Mr. Speaker, they will have no respite simply because of the size of their majority.

Mr. Renwick: Hear, hear. Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: The NDP will be at your flanks every day of this and every other session, with relevance and substance, I hope. There are at this point certain other matters with which I would like briefly to deal.

I want to speak of two other aspects of the Throne Speech which strike me as extremely important. One relates to the auto trade agreement, which is right at the heart of Ontario's economy. The other deals with election financing, Mr. Speaker, where I hope to detail some of the expenses of this last election campaign and refer to some of the possible reforms which are available in the field of electoral law.

But first, let me relate my remarks to the automotive pact because it is mentioned in the Throne Speech as a matter of discussion between Ottawa and Ontario; a "vital consideration of the auto pact between Canada and the United States," the Throne Speech says.

This vital concern, Mr. Speaker, is not expressed through abject pleas to the federal government and a series of earnest hopes from the public platform, which is what the Tories have engaged in for the last several months. The issue strikes right at Ontario's economy. There are more communities than I care to name which can be adversely affected by any change in the automotive trade agreement.

It is true that the federal Liberals are engaged in negotiations which could mean a sellout of the safeguards and Ontario should take as intractable a stand on this issue as it has ever taken and jolt Ottawa out of its complacent continentalism, with demands which are categorical. We don't usually ask that of the government here in relation to the government in that other place, but on this occasion I do.

Let me refer, if I may Mr. Speaker, to the pact. Let me try to draw on some careful research which the research branch of the New Democratic caucus has done and let me try to draw attention to some of the particulars.

In terms of value of production, the motor vehicle manufacturing sector is the single most important industry in the province, and, interestingly enough Mr. Speaker, the parts and accessories industry ranks second. Together they employ 70,000 people in this province, nine per cent of manufacturing employment in Ontario. One of every eight jobs in Ontario is either directly or indirectly related to the automobile industry. Motor vehicle production and employment in Ontario amount to well over 80 per cent of the industry's Canadian total, and the comparable figure for the parts industry is 97 per cent.

I won't go into the background which created the auto trade agreement in 1965, Mr. Speaker, but let me remind the House of the provisions of the auto pact.

The Canadian government granted duty-free access to United States exports of new assembled autos and original equipment parts imported by manufacturers prepared to meet certain production requirements in Canada. The United States government granted duty-free access to Canadian exports of new and used assembled automobiles imported by both manufacturers and individuals and permitted manufacturers to import original equipment parts duty-free.

The safeguards written into the auto pact were: 1. That the ratio of Canadian production to the sale of North American cars in Canada would not fall below the base-year (1964) level of 92 per cent; and 2. That Canadian value added would not fall below the base-year level of $775 million.

Let me just add this parenthetically: When discussing the safeguards, Mr. Speaker, it is important to keep in mind that Canadian production and Canadian value added are not the same thing. Production refers to the units rolling off the assembly lines. Canadian value

added refers to the total Canadian content in those vehicles. Thus the production safeguard guarantees a Canadian assembly industry and ensures that Canada does not become a mere supplier of parts for the U.S. industry. The Canadian value added safeguard guarantees a base level of Canadian content. That base in 1965 was $775 million. It has risen to $1.5 billion in 1969, which is an astonishing and gratifying jump.

Now let me point out something else about the auto pact, Mr. Speaker. Total employment across Canada has gone from 81,000 in 1965 to 83,000—sorry, I'll make a comparison with 1969, because 1970 was a special year as a result of the General Motors strike—to 92,000 in 1969, which is a 13 per cent increase in employment through the auto pact. In terms of units of production—cars, trucks and buses—there has been an increase from 846,000 to 1,373,000, which is an increase of more than 60 per cent.

But in terms of prices, Mr. Speaker, there has not been the same sudden benefit to the public at large and the consumer in particular. Let me give you some actual price differentials, carefully worked out.

For a 1972 Vega, two-door, four-cylinder, the Canadian price, less excise tax and dealer preparation—f.o.b. factory price, Mr. Speaker, the price that should be compared—is $2,163. The U.S. price is $2,021. The difference is $142 per vehicle. For a 1972 Nova, four-door, six-cylinder, the Canadian price, less excise tax and dealer preparation, is $2,544; the U.S. price is $2,335—a difference of $209 per vehicle. For a 1972 Chevelle, four-door, six-cylinder, the Canadian price is $2,806; the U.S. price is $2,592—a difference of $214. For a 1972 Impala, four-door, six-cylinder, the Canadian price is $3,613; the U.S. price is $3,310—a difference of $303 a vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, it is the contention of the New Democratic Party that there is no conceivable reason why these price disparities should continue.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: It is the contention of the New Democratic Party that one of the aspects which legitimized the auto pact was a passing onto the consumer of major dollar savings and an equalization of cost, given the tax differential.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: In fact, that has not occurred, although General Motors and Ford, which have started to file balance sheets in Ontario, show a profit for each of the two companies ranging between $70 million and $80 million over the last year or two. And clearly, in terms of the return on their investment and certainly the return on their total sales, which figures we have, they are perfectly capable of reducing the price by the amounts which we have indicated as constituting the present differential.

Now we come, Mr. Speaker, to the actual United States-Canadian trade in this period. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that we had an enormous trade deficit at the beginning of the auto pact in 1965. The deficit, as I recall, was $737 million in that year alone. By 1970 we had a surplus of $195 million, and in 1971 it was probably a surplus of $168 million. So the pendulum has swung a considerable measure in favour of Canada, and there is no question whatsoever that in those terms the auto pact has been profoundly beneficial to the Canadian economy.

Overall, through the entire period from 1965 to now, we are still $1.9 billion in a trade deficit. But in terms of the last year or two, we have finally reached the breakeven point.

What is ominous, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1972 it looks as though we're going into a deficit position again. Why? Because the surplus position which we achieved in 1970, and 1971, was largely attributable to snowmobiles, not to cars, trucks and buses. And as the snowmobile market levels off; as the degree of American investment in the Canadian industry depreciates; as the consumer interest in small cars is reduced, the Canadian auto industry faces a considerable threat.

That leads me directly to the present dilemma and situation in the Canadian automobile industry. I suppose the basic problem with the auto pact, ironically, has been its rapid success in eliminating the very large trade deficit in cars which Canada suffered in the early 1960s. The US clearly didn't expect such a rapid turn around in trade and wants to alter that. But as I say, the trend in Canada's favour is changing, and we have now become vulnerable once again.

In the area of investment alone, Mr. Speaker, it might interest members of the House to know that in 1970 the four major American automobile manufacturers invested in the United States $1.3 billion; in Canada just $122 million. And no new investment decisions have been announced. Obviously we'll lose our competitive edge as the investment in Canada dries up. So the pleasant trend of the moment is not likely to continue, and we therefore must preserve what we have gained.

And what does preservation mean, Mr. Speaker? The Canadian goal should continue to be, in the words of the automotive trade agreement, "a fair and equitable share of the market"; and what this means is that the Canadian value added should equal the value of the Canadian market for North American cars. That is not now the case. When it becomes the case—and we may only be a year or two away from it—then we will probably be in the best possible position since the pact began.

We have to reject out of hand, Secretary of the Treasury Connally's position of free trade on automobiles, the position which he has been putting for some considerable time. We have to ask for iron-clad guarantees that the Canadian industry will continue to expand, that Canadian value added will equal the value of the Canadian market for North American cars. We cannot contemplate doing anything involving surrendering or abandoning present safeguards, because that's all we've got even though they were exceeded many years ago.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we have to attempt to diversify the industry in its operations within Canada. By concentrating on assembly we have become a nation involved mostly withm nuts and bolts. We need a share of research and design work and a greater concentration on the high technology areas of automobile production in order to maximize the spinoffs from the industry.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated we must achieve parity in car prices.

There are no alternatives, other than those, which are realistic. Those are the minimum guarantees which must be entered into.

Now one of the things which I did not outline, and it was delinquent of me not to outline, Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks, were the letters of commitment which were signed between the major manufacturers and the Canadian government back in 1965.

The commitment said, first, that the industry would invest an additional $260 million in Canadian plant and equipment by 1968; and second, that until 1968 and thereafter, until the letters were renegotiated, the manufacturers would increase Canadian value added by at least 60 per cent of any increase in Canadian sales. Those letters of agreement terminated in 1968 and, as part of the present guarantees, we must renegotiate new letters of agreement with the automobile manufacturers.

Obviously there will be counter measures from the United States to which we cannot allow ourselves to succumb. Our bargaining power, Mr. Speaker, is immense. Our natural resource wealth alone gives us all the muscle we need. The most modern automobile plant in North America is located in this country for anyone who would wish to visit Talbotville or St. Therese and see.

We should not give an inch on the auto pact, and more important we cannot begin to settle for the old level. We have to demand a confirmation of the present position and an increased share of the markup and a guarantee of increased productivity.

In order to pursue these objectives, clearly the Canadian government will have to be on the firing line. I suppose the Canadian government will have to adopt different postures with respect to the United States government and the automobile manufacturer because they bargain almost independently. But I plead with the government of Canada that they must be tough and play for time. Until November at least, Washington will not be making concessions.

Now for Ontario, Mr. Speaker, there are some very important specifics. First of all, the Ontario government must make it clear to Pierre Elliott Trudeau and his fellow Liberals that we will not surrender an inch of the ground that we have won. For whatever reasons—and one can only regard them as perverse, unthinking and unbalanced—the federal Liberals are prepared to relinquish some of that ground. We in this caucus would support a position which put to the federal government the proposition that we maintain the existing levels and improve them.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we must press for price equalization. In that regard Ontario should consider an independent provincial committee of inquiry—perhaps the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Winkler) might be the person to constitute it—which will inquire into price differentials with power to recommend to government.

This is no joking matter. GM, Ford, Chrysler and American Motors are taking the citizens of this province for several hundred dollars per standard model of car with no justification whatsoever. There is no reason in the world why the Ontario government couldn't call the manufacturers before a committee and indicate why those differentials are unjustified and the government pass legislation accordingly. In addition, Mr. Speaker, we obviously have to plug the loopholes—

Hon. A. E. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): A good idea!

Mr. Lewis: A good idea, is it? I will await the minister's announcement of the commission before the House rises for the Easter recess. I won't wait long, I know.

Mr. Singer: Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Lewis: We must ensure, Mr. Speaker, that we plug the loopholes in the Employment Standards Act so those automobile workers who are affected by the increasing pattern of layoffs and shutdowns have certain protection under that Act.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could go further. We could think of certain selective incentives, tax incentives, for the parts industry in Ontario and in Canada which would allow us to achieve a greater viability in that sector. As matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the parts industry is more Canadian-owned than the assembly portion of the automotive sector.

The New Democratic caucus feels that if we are going to give tax incentives to the parts industry, it should be given to Canadian-controlled operations in the parts industry and that would make considerable sense. Finally—

Mr. Singer: The member doesn't think much of Watkins' ideas?

Mr. Lewis: No, I don't think much of other ideas which have come forward. I think little enough of them that I don't intend to deal with them.

Further Mr. Speaker, we would insist on direct government dealings with the manufacturers themselves. There is a tremendous frustration in this area, Mr. Speaker; and we cannot consider anything less than the Canadian value added, that I indicated earlier.

Can I make one final point, Mr. Speaker? The automotive trade pact has improved the efficiency of the Canadian automobile industry. It has raised employment slightly. It has raised wages. It has, of course, made it impossible for the Canadian section of the industry to exercise independence, if ever that was possible, and there are many who deem it highly unlikely, given the nature of the automobile industry in 1965.

But that doesn't mean that we would approve for a moment a continental pattern in the rationalization of other manufacturing industry in this country, or in this province. If we are ever going to undertake further experiments in industrial rationalization—let us say, for example, the appliance industry in Canada—let's try it first on an east-west basis, Mr. Speaker. Let's try it on a countrywide basis, dealing with the Canadian domestic market, and not paying the political price that one inevitably pays with continentalism.

There was no alternative in the case of the automotive trade agreement. That possibility has been lost forever for automobiles. It hasn't been lost in the area of appliances, or other manufacturing industry.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like—if I can find my notes—to move to the next section of the Throne Speech with which I would like to deal. It relates to a little paragraph on page 7 which says:

> As a result of the study by the committee on local election law, the government will introduce a bill designed to reform election procedures, which will include the abolition of property qualifications for voters in municipal elections.

All of us in this caucus felt, Mr. Speaker, that the reforms should extend to provincial election procedures.

Indeed, the last campaign alone gave good argument for reconstituting the select committee on election reform in the Province of Ontario.

One hardly knows where to begin. Putting aside the electoral outcome entirely, accepting it as the decisive Tory victory which it was, it is still fair to say that the mechanics and administration of the campaign were, in many areas of the province, a shambles throughout. The Election Act in Ontario, as amended in 1971, is probably that piece of legislation more honoured in the breach than any other coming from this Legislature.

Politicians are, of course, very covetous of campaigns. We don't like our electoral sorties tampered with, Mr. Speaker. But, with all the self-interest in the world, there is clearly a case for reform.

1. At local riding levels, more often than not, the returning officers were poorly informed about rules and procedures. Information was faulty. Enumeration was sometimes poor, sometimes awful. The provision of voters' lists was late. Names were added to the lists late. Electoral appointees were badly instructed.

Candidates and electors frequently experienced an overriding sense of chaos. All of us in this House—well, maybe there are some exceptions.

If you think there are exceptions, speak to my Tory opponent in Scarborough West at the time—whose name happily passes from my mind—I would not defile Hansard in that fashion. But speak to my Tory opponent in Scarborough West about the nature of the conduct of the campaign, although I think he suffered from certain aberrations and fantasies, but—well, he suffered from at least 170 votes, which is very comfortable. That's why I am here looking at you today. One of the great pleasures that I knew would one day experience.

An hon. member: A landslide!

Mr. MacDonald: It was 169 more than is needed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If that is a landslide how about me?

Mr. Lewis: Well, the member scraped through by the skin of his teeth as I recall.

I know that many of the errors in the electoral process are human, Mr. Speaker, but there is still far too loose and frivolous and indifferent a control exerted over the actual conduct of the campaign. I accuse no one. It is in a permanent state of disarray from election to election and we have come to live with it. We, for one, would like to see it change; we in this party. I may say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Election Act is violated in so many clauses that it would be hard to enumerate them all in the process.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, is the election day conduct itself. It is often disgraceful. The irregularities and the absurdities which occur—from the handing out of cheques in Lambton, which was chronicled by the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), to the ineligible voting in Dovercourt, which has now been chronicled publicly—cannot be chalked up to inevitable human frailty. Not only the New Democratic Party has the view —many members have the view—that election day procedures are clearly fractious to put it at best.

Mr. Singer: Is the NDP going to put up the $1,000 in Dovercourt?

Mr. Lewis: We already have.

Mr. Singer: Oh they have! Good.

Mr. Lewis: The situation cries out for direction and reform, else the law is truly an ass. Can I remind members of that interesting sitation in St. Andrew-St. Patrick which was reported on at some length by one of the members of the legislative press gallery. He reported, and I quote:

> At least 10 voters learned at the polls that persons impersonating them had already voted in their names. Aliens and new residents of the province were included on the voters' lists and in some cases voted even though Ontario's Election Act says voters must be Canadian citizens who have lived in the province at least 12 months. Dozens of qualified voters were left off the voters' lists, even though they had been enumerated, that is, their names had been taken by door-to-door election workers who were paid to list eligible voters. In one of 85 polls examined, the number of votes cast exceeded the number of voters.

Now that takes some doing! I mean, that takes a little invention—the number of votes cast exceeded the number of voters.

> Dozens of election officials and party workers did not sign oaths of secrecy required by the provincial Election Act. The Clerk of the Legislature, the chief electoral officer, Mr. Roderick Lewis, indicated that it is a violation of the Criminal Code to impersonate.

But of course never has there been a case that one can recall. He said he cannot recall a charge being laid in his 26 years as chief election officer and assistant chief election officer.

> He said there is no person or section in the government responsible for investigating reports of election irregularities. It would be up to a private citizen to lay a charge under the Election Act. Mary Brand, assistant chief election officer for the province found that paid election officials had "completely ignored some things."
>
> "In some cases," said Roderick Lewis, "it is at least partly the fault of the returning officer for not instructing them properly."

Let me tell you about poll 87 at 250 Davenport Road in St. Andrew-St. Patrick. It had its own strange incident.

> At the end of the day there were 451 voters listed in the poll book but 459 ballots in the ballot box. That was eight votes too many. To further confuse the count, there were 116 unused ballots remaining, making a total of 575 ballots. But the poll book says only 549 ballots had been received from the returning officer at the beginning of the day. [Erle Stanley Gardner would have done well with this, Mr. Speaker.]

> Nevertheless, deputy returning officer Lucy Maddox submitted the figure of 459 votes as the final count and the source of the extra ballots was never revealed. Later she said she didn't want to discuss the matter. "I can't be bothered, I'm too busy," she told the reporter and she shut her apartment door.
>
> Section 136 of the Election Act provides a fine of up to $1,000 for any returning officer, deputy returning officer or poll clerk who "neglects to perform any of the duties imposed upon him by this Act."

Mr. Speaker, on the face of it, there have been, in the St. Andrew-St. Patrick's case, in many other cases in the province, clear violations of section 133, section 135, section 136 and section 142. No one, obviously, wants to seek prosecution of these things, but why the farce of allowing the sections to which no one pays heed?

What about section 144 which gives the chief electoral officer the power to institute some due process of law?

> The chief election officer, in addition to any other requirements of this Act with respect to the tabling of the results of an election, shall report to the assembly whether or not in his opinion the conduct of the election was free or otherwise of any of the actions which are declared to be offences or corrupt practices under the Act.

That is kind of interesting. I don't know whether the chief electoral officer ever made a report to the assembly. Perhaps his report to the assembly is that orange book indicating the poll results in the various ridings.

Mr. Singer: No, that is a new section; it is the first time.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Well, certainly, he has yet to make a report, and I suppose in cases like St. Andrew-St. Patrick or Lambton, or in many cases where the margins were big, where there would be no overturning of seats —I am not implying anything of the kind— there were clear irregularities and distortions which violate several aspects of the law. Certainly section 145, subsection 3, says:

> A candidate at an election or any voter qualified to vote at an election, or the chief electoral officer, if he considers that it is in the public interest that an action be commenced, may commence an action.

Well, no one commences an action. I suppose I shouldn't say "no one" commences an action—clearly it does not come from the chief electoral officer—rarely would anyone consider commencing an action in these areas at all. Why then all of the definitions to these sections? Why are they there? If we want to have controls over election procedures, which clearly everyone has agreed upon, let us draft the sections that reflect the realities.

The third point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the element of unreality persists into the declarations of income and expenditure required by law to be filed by official agents or candidates within a given time. All of the parties in the Legislature are guilty of non-filing. Usually, I think, the practice is that people who are elected can file quite regularly; people who are not elected tend to file less enthusiastically or not to file at all. I have no doubt that if a careful check was made of all the constituencies across Ontario there would be a great many candidates of all three parties who in fact had not filed a return as required under section 139 of the Act.

The returning officer is required to file an abstract; often the abstract is so abstract it's incomprehensible. There is a candidate of one of the parties in this province—I will not mention his name—who filed an abstract which listed his expenses as "$50 and contra;" he listed his income as "$50 and contra." That was the total extent of the filing.

The Speaker looks at me with some perplexity. He wonders whether "and contra" means dissemblance. I am not at all certain, Mr. Speaker; perhaps you can give it a ruling. Maybe it means contraband. I have never been able myself to figure out exactly what multitude of sins that may or may not cover. I know only that in the hands of the returning officer there is no further detail than that lucid, precise definition of what went into the campaign.

Others of us, in the Legislature and out, file one or two lines; citizens can pay 25 cents for the details if the returning officer is prepared to give the details. No one takes it seriously, if I may suggest, Mr. Speaker, primarily because the amount of money spent and the absence of disclosure don't allow it to be taken seriously.

That brings me to the fourth point, Mr. Speaker. I would submit to you, sir, that it all should be taken seriously. Most jurisdictions in the western world, even the United States, and now three Canadian provinces, require certain ceilings and financial disclosure in the public interest. We would argue in this party that that is valid, that elections can be profoundly distorted and the public profoundly

unsettled by a total absence of real information about costs and sources. It seems to us to be an elemental democratic principle, albeit there will be tremendous variation.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I was curious; I had an insatiable curiosity about the expenditures of the "big blue machine". Clearly, the individual returns filed by members would give us little insight into those costs, unless $50 and contra is expected to give insight, and there are no provincial figures in such costs.

So how do you estimate the figures that are spent, of which there was much rumour, ranging into the millions? Clearly, it would require an enormous amount of research and the availability of the figures. There were some areas from which we were excluded, but the New Democratic research department at Queen's Park thought we would take a stab at it to begin to get some sense of what was occurring. So the NDP did a complete survey of most of the newspapers, daily and weekly, in the Province of Ontario. We did a line count of every advertisement inserted both provincially and locally by the Progressive Conservative Party during the course of the last campaign. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it comes to a fairly impressive tally. I have it in front of me and I have it broken down.

I may also say that the figure at which we arrive, Mr. Speaker, does not include, for a variety of reasons, the separate candidate insertions in the Windsor Star; most of the ethnic press across the province, to which the legislative library, curiously enough, does not subscribe; about 100 additional weekly papers to which the legislative library does not subscribe; university campus newspapers; community newspapers and other handouts. Without all of those newspapers, the total amount that we were able to estimate—I think on a pretty judicious assessment of all the newspapers that I indicated—using their given advertising rates, times the line count, was $375,783.

We have reliably estimated that all of the other newspapers which we were not able to survey, because of their absence, would add roughly another $40,000 to that total, giving us a $415,000 minimum total for newspaper advertising alone, provincially and locally, across the Province of Ontario. That does not include, Mr. Speaker, just for interest's sake, the $40,000 to $45,000 which the automobile insurance association in the Province of Ontario paid to insert advertisements in the Galt Evening Reporter and others across the province.

It is difficult of course to do extrapolations. They are done most hesitantly. I have spoken with a number of public relations people who suggest that the newspaper advertising in that kind of a campaign would represent something within the range of 5 to 20 per cent of the total public relations outlay. I suppose that means that at the top level, giving them the benefit of the doubt as it were, there would have been a minimum $2 million plus campaign in the world of the media; conceivably twice that figure or better. We will never know.

It is a very great deal of money, Mr. Speaker. It is not so much the total amount of money. It is the ratio of the money in respect to other moneys spent, in respect to other concerns that have occupied the minds of some other jurisdictions and raised the questions that I am asking today. Little anomalies emerged. I will mention a couple of them just to show you.

In the case of the riding of Sault Ste. Marie, the line count we were able to assess would suggest an expenditure of $14,778 on newspapers alone. And yet, under the official return filed by the Progressive Conservative Party in Sault Ste. Marie, the total amount spent on advertising—which would include newspapers, radio, television, leaflets, banners, signs, etc.—was $14,699. In other words, considerably less than what the line count would seem to evidence.

In the case of the riding of Welland the newspaper calculation alone, in terms of cost, amounts to $7,979. The provincial election file, officially returned, shows for newspaper, radio, television and band expenses—and I have no doubt the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) would use a band—it totals $7,813. Considerably less than the apparent cost of the newspapers alone.

Mr. Singer: Does that cost figure include provincial party expenditures?

Mr. Lewis: No, the cost figure I have given is for the riding only—we very scrupulously separated the two. The provincial portion is in excess of the figures I gave.

Now I say "apparently." Maybe it was given free. I rather doubt that. Maybe there were miscalculations. Maybe it's covered in other items, although the files are fairly complete in these cases. Maybe there is a world of explanations. I'm sure they can be offered.

It does show the imbalance, in terms of overall budget, in the context of election expenditures. It leads to the elusive quarry of

what is spent on the electronic media, which clearly commands such a tremendous percentage of election budgets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I relate to the House an interesting little saga, because I think it has some interest. We were trying to ascertain what might have been spent in terms of radio and television. So I called Mr. Pierre Juneau of the Canadian Radio and Television Commission and I asked him if he would release to me the commercial logs and expenditures of the various parties during the election campaign. I told him that I thought it was in the public interest.

The hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) is looking at me as with some incredulity; perhaps he's right. I told Mr. Juneau I thought it was in the public interest. I told him I thought it would help in a discussion of campaign expenditures.

Mr. Pierre Juneau said, quite strongly and quite confidently, that he had had one such request from a newspaper and had turned it down. I think I quote him accurately when I say that he argued that because he was not specifically obligated or required to do it under the Act which governs the commission, he felt he did not need to respond to my request.

He said to me that if we in the New Democratic caucus disagreed, he would be readily available to hear submissions—that he and his counsel would meet with us. He has been, in his dealings with me, therefore, entirely straightforward.

Well, the New Democratic Party is pursuing that with Mr. Juneau. You would be interested to know, Mr. Speaker, that we have made a tentative appointment for Wednesday, March 22 when, with two of my legal colleagues in this caucus—their names are known to all—I hope to approach the CRTC and to make the following argument.

Section 3B of the Act states:

> The Canadian broadcasting system should be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.

Our own argument will be that the extent of expenditure on the electronic media distorts the strengthening of the political fabric of this country. That in fact damage is done and that is an inequity which the CRTC should seek to correct.

It may well be that we will be unsuccessful, Mr. Speaker. We, therefore, can, under section 19 1c of the Act, file a complaint by a person with respect to any matter within the powers of this commission. That we will then do, and force a public discussion of the question of campaign expenditures and campaign sources.

But Mr. Juneau said something else to me. I suggested to him that if I had the permission of the radio and television stations involved, surely he would not deny us access to the logs. He said: "No, by all means. If you can get permission you can see the logs."

I therefore wrote a letter, which I'd like to put on the records, to the heads of all the television and radio stations in the Province of Ontario. The letter reads as follows:

> Dear So-and-So:
>
> I am writing to make a specific request of your station. In the interests of general public debate, I am trying to assemble some basic facts on campaign expenditures during the last provincial election campaign.
>
> To that end, I would appreciate it if you would grant me, or a research officer of my caucus, permission to view your commercial logs during the actual period of the election; that is, between the date the writ was issued, September 13, and October 21, 1971. If such permission were granted it would not be necessary for me to travel to your station itself; the logs can be viewed as filed with the Canadian Radio-Television Commission at Ottawa.
>
> The election now having receded into history and the advertising expenditures being part of that history, I hope it will be possible to satisfy my request without prejudicing competitive advantage in any way.
>
> With thanks,
>
> Yours sincerely.

The letters only went out a week to 10 days ago, maybe even more recent in some cases. I frankly expected an avalanche of negatives. Some that I got did not treat the suggestion with favour. One name that comes to mind is Mr. John Bassett of Baton Broadcasting. He didn't think that such information should be vouchsafed to me.

But, Mr. Speaker, to my amazement, the replies are running better than two to one in favour of permission to allow the logs to be viewed. I have a number of stations now assembled, though not enough to give one the kind of pattern which I would feel confident about using in the Legislature. Much of the material was garnered yesterday and today; in fact, I would like to look at it further.

Suffice it to say, Mr. Speaker, that what it shows apart from total dollars—which we will never be able to ascertain—so far is the most remarkable disparities in expenditures among the politicial parties. Precisely the point which the United States Congress in its electoral reform suggested was the basis for that reform, because there should be a far more equal access to media and to the electorate than these figures would seem to convey.

As soon as I have the figures compiled in a representative way, Mr. Speaker, I hope to release them. I do not feel competent to do so this afternoon, because of the many, many letters I sent out I suppose I have received now replies covering 15 to 20 stations, which is a goodly number. I have not yet been able to see the records of any television stations. They do show quite astonishing disparities.

As a matter of fact, it is very humbling for the Liberals and sometimes for Social Credit and occasionally for New Democrats, to note the disparities of money invested in various stations by the political parties. Many of the letters I received put in a plaintive little aside, Mr. Speaker, about the degree to which the New Democratic Party did not purchase commercial time on those stations. Perhaps in a very friendly way they solicit our future investment.

I must say on behalf of the stations which have replied, that the great majority of them have been astonishingly frank, very straight and clearly combine a sense of integrity about costs with a public sense that this is a legitimate area of discussion. You know, Mr. Speaker—I didn't know this; perhaps many members do not know it—each radio and television station in the Province of Ontario has to file a separate sheet at the end of the campaign, itemizing the number of spots and the cost involved for each of the political parties plus the dispensation of free time.

It isn't necessary to go through the logs laboriously day after day. It is all there summarized in readily available information. It was clear from many of the letters received from a number of the stations that they thought that having filed it with the CRTC it was in the public sector and they had no selfconsciousness about it.

Mr. Speaker, I think without belabouring it further that I shall continue to pursue this avenue because it gives rise to a great many interesting aspects. In the meantime, there is surely a fair case to be made for electoral reform, based on the simple proposition of greater equality of opportunity in accessibility to media and voter.

In the United States on February 7 last, President Nixon signed a bill with three principal thrusts, which are exactly the thrusts I am making, Mr. Speaker: First, a restriction on how much money a candidate can spend on media advertising, particularly radio and television. The United States legislation gives a total of 10 cents per voter for all public relations; six cents per voter for radio and television. This in the United States—not always thought of as the most enlightened jurisdiction in this area. If you transfered that six cents per voter to the Province of Ontario it would have meant a central party allocation of between $250,000 and $300,000 roughly. I would say appreciably less, of course, than what was spent.

The second thrust of the American legislation increased disclosure of who contributed how much to campaign expenses; and third, much more generous levy of equal free network time.

I know that the Conservatives have argued for a long time that you should not know who gives to a campaign. But that seems to me to be invalid in that we now have a number of basic principles to be considered for legislation, and maybe we can reconstitute the committee on election law to do so. I suggest it would mean a far healthier political climate, Mr. Speaker, while still maintaining, if that is the worry, the enormous political advantage which any government has, purely and simply by being the government.

May I suggest these five areas:

1. Clear expenditure ceilings on the use of the mass media by candidates and parties.

2. A formula for much greater use of free time, observing principles of equity.

3. Possible overall ceilings on election expenditures. I say "possible" because I am not at all sure how one polices it, looking at the problems of Nova Scotia and Quebec. But we should base our law on the Quebec and Nova Scotia models with tougher enforcement.

4. Full disclosure of election contributions for public scrutiny.

5. The creation of a legislative registry which would audit and publish all the financial reports as required, so that the chief electoral officer would not have to assume that particular burden, which is surely more than the Legislature should ask of him.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Can't you see the Tories jumping for that?

Mr. Lewis: There are other more contentious issues, from the question of the legal incorporation of political parties, to public service in campaigns, public mailings and so forth. I don't pretend to pronounce judgement on them; they are auxiliary to the main concern. I suspect that the "big blue machine" would survive the reform. Political life would be much more healthy for undertaking it.

I think that roughly encompasses those reflections, Mr. Speaker. I will have a report to the Legislature as the latest tabulations come in; a report, because some of the members might be interested in their various ridings to have a sense of what was spent. I think it is legitimate that members should know.

I have one last observation. In the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, we see the next four years as a period of competing social philosophies in this House, sharper and more toughly defined as economic and political realities emerge. We in this caucus would be the first to concede that the Tories have an infinite adaptability, a great flexibility, in areas of social reform. Where that flexibility wears down, where the impasse occurs, where the crunch comes, is in the area of basic economic change. And when we are dealing with economic planning, when we are dealing with Canadian autonomy, when we are dealing with tax reform, the capacity of Tories to respond runs out. The New Democratic Party therefore becomes ever more secure and relevant in its own mind, and in the public mind Mr. Speaker, by continuing to emphasize the economic areas.

I think the evidence of the process that is taking place is to be found in what I thought to be the most important speech to emerge since the election, a speech delivered by the hon. treasurer to the Proprietary Association of Canada on February 8 last. It made three points:

First, the need for further opting out of cost-sharing agreements with Ottawa, which all of us on this side of the House reject, out of hand, because it would mean the undermining of the fiscal basis of Confederation.

Second, the provincial Treasurer says that the best direction for progress is to give incentives, "to design ways to make it more in the private interest to do public good." And he therefore indicates special concessions to those who pollute to clean up the environment.

We reject that line of argument, Mr. Speaker. We do not believe that those who despoil and profit from their despoliation should receive new public concessions. That has never worked. The private sector has never been able to function in that kind of area, whether it is pollution, housing or regional disparities.

Third, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Treasurer would have the government make an indiscriminate return to the private sector as the long-run solution to present social predicaments. He speaks of health above all.

Again, we in the New Democratic Party reject that out of hand, believing that the public sector must be enlarged and must play an ever greater role in socio-economic planning.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, in our mind the lines are set and our positions are again established. And perhaps without quite the bravado of a few months past, which I admit to at the time, I want to tell the Tories opposite that they'll know this party is around for the next four years and they'll know we are there in 1975—make no mistake about it.

As a first step and to that end I would move, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the address in reply to the speech of His Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario be further amended as follows:

That this House regrets:

1. The lack of action by this government to ensure housing for the citizens of Ontario of medium and low incomes;

2. The failure to initiate programmes for public participation in the growth of the economy of Ontario and in particular in the areas of the resource industries;

3. The failure to initiate programmes to expand and develop the secondary manufacturing sector of the economy so that it will be modern, efficient and able to compete in world markets;

4. The government's refusal to guarantee adequate no-fault automobile insurance at the lowest possible cost to the consumer by the introduction of a public automobile insurance plan;

5. The inability of this government to effect meaningful electoral reform in the area of campaign costs and to ensure full disclosure of election expenditures and contributions;

6. The failure to initiate procedures for review of managed prices and marketing

practices to maintain stability in the price and quality of goods, services and utilities;

And urges the government to adopt, in its discussions with the federal government about the auto pact, that there be (a) no abandonment of present safeguards, (b) no decline whatsoever in the present share of production and a guarantee from the government of the United States and the automobile manufacturers that Canadian value added will equal the value of the Canadian market for North American cars, and (c) parity of consumer prices.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to point out, however inadvertently—and I am sure it was inadvertent—the hon. member for Scarborough West made certain allegations about a candidate who filed an election report of $50 and contra. I have waited very patiently for the hon. member to name the person. I am asking for it now, because it casts a slur upon everybody in the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: I don't mind, Mr. Speaker. I did it in lightheartedness. The candidate who filed that return is Mr. Herb Bryant, the Conservative candidate in the riding of Windsor West. I didn't particularly want to supply the name, and I wouldn't have slurred anyone in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Next question.

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, I think I used the word "inadvertently" and I waited very patiently.

Mr. Lewis: We are quite patient.

Mr. Deans: The member should have waited—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Muskoka.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to address this House and to offer my thoughts on the contents of the Lieutenant Governor's Throne Speech.

I am sure those of you present realize that it is not an easy task for a person to give his maiden speech following the previous speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West. His facility with phrase, his articulation, his enunciation, his range of vocabulary are all commendable. But, I suppose, if one has no meaningful thought to add to the all-inclusive programmes proposed by our government, one must resort to humour, repartee and lengthy quotations.

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Get him into the government.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Very well handled.

Mr. Miller: I must say too, that while much was said about the shortcomings of our government in the last few minutes, as one who has just finished completing his federal income tax form in the last week, it was no small pleasure, to alleviate the otherwise painful experience, to discover that this province has the lowest personal income tax in Canada and that in fact governments run by the party he leads have as much as 50 per cent more.

Mr. J. S. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Who has the highest regressive taxes?

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. Miller: First, I want to compliment the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) for his leadership during the recent election campaign.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): They put him in a bag like a bag of potatoes, and sold him, spending millions of bucks.

Mr. Miller: There can be little doubt, even in the minds of the few members sitting on this side of the House who are not members of the governing party, that the voters of Ontario share my personal admiration of and confidence in his abilities.

I said often during the election campaign that the quality of government is the sum total of the individual member's ability. I even went so far as to admit that the Progressive Conservative Party did not have, nor should have, a monopoly on quality candidates. Men of good will, commonsense and ability are to be found in all three parties. It just happens that the most people with these admirable traits happen to be of the same political persuasion as the Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Davis).

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The trained seals are back in action.

Mr. Martel: Throw them another fish.

Mr. Miller: I like them.

Mr. Martel: Throw them another fish.

Mr. Miller: The provincial riding of Muskoka has been well and faithfully served for 17 years by my immediate predecessor Robert Boyer. I would like to express my appreciation to him before this House for his years of service to Muskoka and to Ontario Hydro in his role as vice-chairman.

Muskoka, I am happy to say, is a riding familiar and dear to many members of this House. It provides a second home for a surprising number of them. Included in this number is the Prime Minister. Its rugged beauty, relative tranquility and friendly people provide a sanctuary for thousands of city dwellers who escape to it in increasing numbers each year. They go there to recharge their bodies and minds; to appraise the achievements of our technological society in an environment little changed by time and man.

Moreover, the resident voters of Muskoka have shown an almost unequalled sensibility at election time. For more than 100 years they have scarcely ever sent anyone but a Conservative to speak for them in Toronto. The few exceptions occurred only when a bit a gerrymandering temporarily associated the relatively pure—I'm speaking politically—district of Muskoka with somewhat less enlightened neighbouring areas such as Ontario county or Parry Sound district.

Mr. Martel: Ontario county? Is that where the member for Ontario (Mr. Dymond) is from?

Mr. Miller: Of late, these neighbouring ridings too have seen the light.

As a practicing professional engineer—and one characteristic of an engineer, I hope, is brevity—I, like many others raised and educated in Muskoka, found it necessary to leave the district to practice my chosen profession of chemical engineering.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Things were that bad, were they?

Mr. Miller: After some 10 years' absence I realized that it was more important to live in a district I loved than to work as a professional in the cities of the south. So I returned to Muskoka in 1960 as a summer resort owner.

Some 13 years' experience as a small, independent businessman have helped me to appreciate the problems of a Canadian entrepreneur, and so on this occasion I would like to express some ideas on their behalf. My concern that the independent businessman could be legislated out of existence made me decide to seek a provincial seat.

We hear much about aid to Canadian businessmen. Yet the hospitality industry, especially the independent motel and tourist operator, goes largely ignored. He provides the nucleus of an industry whose sales exceed that of agriculture. Without wishing for less assistance to that vital sector of our Canadian economy, I still find myself envious of the many forms of governmental assistance this department has obtained while the pleas of tourism have gone largely unheard.

Mr. Martel: Who has been in power?

Mr. Miller: Like the egg producer, of whom much has been said, the independent resort operators, restaurant owners, gasoline retailers are fighting for their survival. While we designate large sections of Canada as depressed areas eligible for grants to induce industry to locate there, we ignore one industry which is indigenous; which is almost entirely Canadian-owned; which does not defile the assets it uses; which is not exhausting a non-renewable resource; which creates one job for about $5,000 of capital invested; which basically earns foreign capital and which provides a very real social need.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): How much does the member pay his employees?

Mr. Miller: It is true that excellent advertising and promotional programmes are provided and that Ontario leads Canada in recreating authentic historical sites. But it is equally true that unless tangible capital assistance programmes geared to the realities of the tourist business are provided to make it possible for young, trained, energetic people to buy into existing businesses, the present inexorable disappearance—

An hon. member: The Holiday Inn is doing all right.

Mr. Miller: —of the privately-owned tourist industry will continue. Like food, it is something we cannot do without. It is much cheaper to assist the present industry than to create publicly-owned alternatives.

Mr. Martel: The government bragged about the millions it gave the industry last year.

Mr. Miller: Other embryonic nations in the Caribbean and Africa, and older, less affluent

countries like Spain and England, have been quick to seize upon the potential of the tourist industry. In these countries assistance takes many forms. In some it is a quick write-off of depreciable assets. In others it is a subsidy against commercially negotiated loans. In still others it is the provision of per unit cash grants to stimulate expansion of plant.

This winter we have dramatically witnessed the effectiveness of provincially-funded winter works programmes. These were limited to municipal and provincial projects. If, in effect, the purpose of these programmes is the creation of off-season employment as an alternative to local welfare, does it not make sense to extend the winter works programme to depressed capital- and labour-intensive sectors of the business community like the tourist resort industry? Not only would jobs be created immediately, but by creating badly needed new facilities future jobs for workers in the less skilled domains would be created too. Then the immediate need would be met and simultaneously, foreign income-producing, tax-generating facilities would be created.

The second and most important area of concern to me is that of the environment. Members of the engineering profession have been noticed mainly by their absence in this political field. While I scarcely feel qualified to argue, as I hear done daily in the House, the literal and legal implications of phraseology of some of our bills, I feel by extrapolation that members of the legal and business profession may be inclined to avoid the technical jargon presented by exponents of alternative forms of pollution control measures.

While all of us are concerned about pollution, the relative position of Ontario in the race to implement control measures should be recognized. I think it is safe to say that Ontario has led the way in North America. The OWRC, viewed from a vantage point beyond Ontario's boundaries, such as Quebec or Ohio, is admired as a model of wise government intervention into this extremely complex field.

For example, while we in Ontario are setting deadlines for the installation of nutrient removal systems, a neighbouring province is just beginning to install primary sewage treatment plants. A city of over two million people has only recently installed its first treatment plant. While we are insisting that all new industry must include sophisticated recycling and chemical waste treatment systems before they may build, neighbouring provinces and states are begging industry to locate within their boundaries on their own terms.

All this is not to say that we have done enough. We have not. We must seek solutions to our current problems, only recently recognized, like eutrophication of our lakes. In my opinion not enough is known about the fundamentals of sewage treatment.

In the past most of our concern has dealt with the health aspects only and we now recognize many other complicating factors. I feel we must experiment, in co-operation with manufacturers and educational institutions, with radical new sewage disposal systems and nutrient removal systems to determine, for example, if presently enforced health unit specifications for tile beds and septic tanks are meaningful. I cannot help but feel, at times, that instead they appear to solve problems and so placate an aroused public opinion. One only need ask two or three experts in slightly different aspects of water management their opinion to realize how little unanimity exists.

We must also recognize the community of interest in solving sewage disposal problems. For example, the treatment and collection systems being proposed for three small towns in Muskoka—Port Carling, MacTier and Bala —are being demanded for the sake of all users of the Muskoka lakes, not just the people concentrated into the towns themselves. Thus the cost of these facilities should be spread across a much wider base than simply those of the people whom they service.

At present, a 50 per cent grant is given to reduce the average annual cost if it exceeds $120. Even so, cost per user in MacTier, for sewage alone, is estimated to be $220 a year in a town where taxes average $100 for all normal municipal services. This is an unbearable increase.

Because of their rocky town sites and low per capita incomes and locations on the edge of tourist lakes, special consideration is required. A fair subsidy would be 100 per cent of all costs over $120 a year. But realizing the demands for such projects, I am sure that a 75 per cent subsidy with no increase in the present floor of $120 would make these systems bearable to local taxpayers.

In conclusion, I want to express my appreciation to the voters of my riding, the district of Muskoka, for their confidence in me. With your help, Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to deserve it. Thank you.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the time has come when this House is to be subjected to a Deacon speech and a speech was recently described by a leading member of the press gallery as almost impossible to listen to.

An hon. member: Don't let them tell you that.

Mr. Deacon: Well, I regret I have earned this reputation with him and some others because there are some matters I want them not only to listen to, not only to hear, but also to thoroughly understand, because these matters are of importance to the people of this province.

The government feels that it has "a renewed responsibility to make the growing complexity and scope of government services more efficient and productive while, at the same time, bringing government closer to the people . . . " If its members are to be judged on their past performance, this means two things.

First, they will talk in generalities for most of the session about the bills they are going to introduce and then, as they did in the last session, they will introduce about 65 bills in the final two weeks. They will attempt to force these bills through the House, without sufficient debate and study, by sitting extended hours, long into the night and into the morning, and having overlapping sittings of the House and the committees of the House.

Second, this government will continue to remove responsibility from local municipal elected representatives and they will concentrate that power in the tortuous caverns of Queen's Park bureaucracy by creating regional government structures that can be easily manipulated. This is called "bringing government closer to the people."

Poor Sudbury. Poor Kitchener-Waterloo. You are going to get regional government. You are going to be sacrificed on the twin altars of so-called greater government efficiency and productivity. It is simply another name for greater control from Queen's Park.

Take, for example, regional government York style, April, 1969. April Fool Day, I believe it was, that the local leaders, who had been requesting reform of local government for some time, were called to Queen's Park to have a meeting with Lord Darcy McKeough himself. These leaders had understandably, after 100 years of no change in their government structure, wanted to have a review of the local government structure and have it reformed to meet the distortions and the pressures of development.

I personally was delighted when the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) said that he would organize an intermunicipal committee to study the needs of reform of local government and that, based on that committee's recommendations, regional government would be brought into force in the county of York. But here is what actually happened after that.

On May 17, or about that time, he had the first meeting of that intermunicipal committee, a matter of over six weeks later. At that time there was opportunity for each of the municipal leaders on the committee to express their views as to what they felt was needed. Whether they thought that welfare should continue to be a regional matter, or put on some other level. Whether police should be brought under the control of a regional police force, instead of being on a local basis.

All these various matters of local responsibility and county responsibility were discussed, not on the basis of facts presented to them as to their costs or the various levels of quality of performance that could be expected, but rather on what their off-the-cuff feelings would be. That was the first intermunicipal meeting.

During the next several months, the minister had private meetings with each of the heads of councils, so that they would have an opportunity to review with him his views as to how this reform of government in the county of York should be carried out. These meetings, again, were without the benefit of facts and figures – of information that would help them understand what any change in boundary would result in in the way of change of costs. Or on the effect of changing the levels of responsibility from local level to a more senior level. There wasn't any basis of fact to go on, but it was just really to get the off-the-cuff impressions that these people would have, to be sure they understood what the minister wanted.

Then, after many sessions of this type, the 1970, in Bayview Secondary School in Richond Hill. It was a beautiful setup, with flags and wih television cameras, with all types of PR people there and all the leaders of the municipalities, all the council members, members of the various boards and commissions within the county. And then Lord Darcy himself brought in his speech, with the spotlights on him, and read for the next 15

or 20 minutes exactly what regional government would be in the region of York. That was the next meeting of the inter-municipal council where consultation on what form regional government would take was held.

In other words, the edict was given. Regional government in York was not the result of a co-operative work carried out over a period of a year between the Department of Municipal Affairs and the leaders of these municipalities, but rather something that was worked out piecemeal so that it could reflect the views of the minister and members of his staff at Queen's Park.

At the same time, during this same period of one year, there was a major effort made by councillors in the south part of the county to get facts and figures together so that they could objectively review what might be the most advantageous changes in local government. There were many ideas presented. But it was important to have an idea, if we were to change local boundaries, about what impact those changes would have on taxation, what impact they would have on the operating procedures within the local municipalities. We had the benefit of some professional advice, which indicated that at a cost of approximately $75,000—an amount which could have been raised to the extent of one-third by the local municipalities, or the municipalities within the county, and two-thirds by the provincial government—we could have had all the facts and figures necessary on which we could base a sound, planned reform of the government within the county of York.

But, no; the minister had made his decision. Regional government legislation was introduced in the House a few weeks later. The bill was given no consideration before the standing committee, only before the committee of the whole House, so there was no opportunity for those who had many concerns about the plan to express their views.

It is interesting that many of the prediction that were made at that time have borne true. First of all, Mr. Speaker—and you yourself are well informed on this matter—the costs were much higher than had been estimated, even though the province was prepared to add some $2 million of extra grants to take care of the higher costs of the regional government in York.

It was necessary for the Minister of Municipal Affairs, holding that office since last June, to make a trip to the regional council and to advise them of grants of approximately $860,000 which were necessary, combined with a cut in their budget which he instructed them to make to keep the taxes in line, and keep them in line with what had been predicted a year before by his predecessor. It showed how, because of the lack of study, because of the lack of opportunity for the local people who were concerned with the change in the form of government to examine what was being done, these costs incurred were far higher than had been estimated.

Of course, it does not have an immediate effect on the local taxpayers because they see their taxes in the form of their property taxes. When they look at the total provincial deficits and the contribution which these high costs of regional government are adding to our provincial expenditures—not until he sees that will the local taxpayer realize this new inefficient, centralized bureaucracy is hurting us in this province. That is what we are likely to see coming into Kitchener-Waterloo and Sudbury. As I mentioned, poor pity them that they face this destiny.

Then there is the Toronto-centred region plan. I see that according to this speech action is to be taken to further its implementation. This plan is a disaster. It is a disaster because it will restrict all development in the area to a 15-mile band along Lake Ontario. The people of Toronto and of the developments either side of Toronto will be forced to drive miles before they reach the first fringes of green belt. It is a disaster because the whole concept of a megalopolis is wrong.

The essential item that makes the community is local involvement. The area should be decentralized, not centralized. It should be in the form of a star type of development connected by efficient, public transit, And an artificial city like the proposed Cedarwood of 200,000 is not the answer. I am talking about similar units.

Recall the difference between the type of development we are proposing here and the type of development we see around that great city of London, England. They have literally scores of wonderful little communities with green belt around them where they can go for their walks or for their recreation just outside their own communities of 10,000 to 15,000 people. They have ready access to the city of London by means of excellent public transportation. The people can live in a community where they are known to their neighbours; they can be involved with their neighbours in the betterment of their community and they are not lost in a sprawl like

we are creating from one end of this Toronto-centred region to the other.

Mostly the Toronto-centred region plan is a disaster because it exhibits once again the Ontario government's total inability to grasp the simplest economics related to land and services. The government seems to fail to understand that by its actions in the field of housing, it is actually forcing up the minimum cost of a home. Even now, the government planners are blunting their pencils to work on the new Cedarwood project. Behind them, they have the awful example of Malvern.

Remember Malvern? Malvern was the 1,700 acres of Scarborough farmland acquired by the provincial government in 1953 with the help of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corp. Malvern was supposed to break the back of land speculation on prices. That was 1953. In 1968, 15 weary years later, Central Mortgage and Housing said that costs to date —land, taxes, survey, maintenance, killing weeds plus interest—was $3.5 million for that 1,700 acres. That works out to about $2,000 per acre. But at that time the president of the Toronto Real Estate Board valued the raw land on the market at $10,000 an acre. In 1971, the Ontario government purchased a further 56 acres at an average price—are you ready?—at an average price of $22,768 an acre—

An hon. member: Holy mackerel!

Mr. Deacon: —compared with $2,000 an acre in 1953.

An hon. member: That's unserviced land.

Mr. Deacon: And that is unserviced land. This is while the provincial government sat on its beam end and talked about building houses—and talked, and talked, and talked.

Because of its inaction the government did exactly the opposite of what it said it set out to do. It forced up the price of land; it didn't provide a surplus of places where people could build so that land prices could be kept at a reasonable level.

It is the provincial government's policy to sell land at market value. It is also the government's policy to place the burden of supplying schools, water and other people's services on the municipal property taxpayer. These two aspects of government policy force developers into paying exorbitant prices for serviced lots. In Malvern, a single family lot could cost $15,000. Even the government should understand the simple economics that one cannot build a home on a $15,000 lot and sell it for $25,000.

And now, here comes Cedarwood.

The Minister of Economics (Mr. McKeough) has said that the provincial government will acquire the land and resell it to private developers. In another 19 years is Pickering to be "Malvernized" like Scarborough? Is Cedarwood's land to lie fallow waiting for the government to act? Is this government sincere in its desire to reduce home prices? If so, I have a suggestion.

An average of 75,000 lots a year are needed in Ontario. The supply barely meets the demand. The result: high land prices. It should be the policy of this government to ensure that the supply of lots always exceeds the demand. Prices of homes for the people of Ontario would be forced back to affordable levels. The Minister of Economics may say that he has no control over the law of supply and demand. I say the government has it in its power, if it wishes, to repeal that. Where are these lower-cost lots to be found? Outside the cities? Outside the suburbs? In and around the small communities of Ontario, that is where they are.

We must decentralize our population. We have heard a number of complaints from the Ontario government that it wants more freedom to control its own destiny. It wants less interference from the federal government. But apparently that is a one-way street. Why not let the municipalities control their destiny? Give them the unconditional revenues to cover the major portion of schools and ther needed local services. Let them set their own priorities. Remove their dependency on property taxes and conditional provincial handouts.

If we examine the grants that were handed out to the regional government in York last June, we will find every single grant had a condition attached to it. Incidentally, we have been concerned in York about when the government was going to complete Highway 404, and if the traffic betwen Newmarket, the base of that regional government, and Queen's Park continues to increase at the present pace, we are going to need a four-lane highway to handle the traffic between the regional government and Queen's Park as these people go down to Queen's Park to get their orders as to what they have got to do to get the grants.

Remove the dependence of municipal governments on property taxes and conditional provincial handouts. The job of the Ontario government should be to co-ordinate. It should make it possible for the people of

Ontario to live in these smaller communities; not large 200,000 soulless conglomerates, but real communities.

The government must make it possible for the people to move rapidly from where they live to where they work by public transit—public transit planned with people in mind. I note the government plans experiments with new systems in the field of urban transit. More pie in the sky. The problems of urban transit are here with us now. And, Mr. Speaker, we have the facilities here and now. The research and information on the need for public transit is here now. If the government doesn't have it, I do. But don't tell us that Ottawa is holding up development of these new transit facilities. That statement won't hold water.

Because of the apathy of this government, a group of interested, public-spirited citizens, the Go North Group as they are called, applied for a federal grant for $97,000. It was needed to operate a trial, three-month commuter rail service between Toronto and Barrie. This would have established, at no cost to the Province of Ontario, whether such a commuter service was needed. It would have shown whether the service would attract a sufficient number of passengers to make it worthwhile. But, unfortunately, it might also have interfered to some extent with the operation of the GO bus service.

The applicants were advised that because of the objections raised by the Ontario government—the Ontario Department of Transportation and Communications—the federal government could not advance the proposed $97,000 grant. The provincial authorities threatened to cut off the GO bus service if it was granted. How cynical can you get? On the one hand, the Speech from the Throne refers to the testing of promising new systems and equipment; with the other hand the government turns down the opportunity to find out whether a commuter service between Toronto and Barrie is needed. It wouldn't even have cost the government of Ontario a penny.

I can only imagine that the government of Ontario feared that the need for a GO North commuter service would be demonstrated for once and for all. And that doesn't fit in with their plans. No, they'd like us to think that their shuttle bus service, jammed in rush-hour traffic, is filling the basic commuter need of citizens living north of Metro. They would like to continue adding to the atmospheric pollution with their buses. But of course they don't say that. What they say is, and I quote again, "the government shares fully the concerns of the people of Ontario in respect to the protection and enhancement of our natural environment."

They want to clean up the Great Lakes, apparently by emptying all the sewage effluent from the Toronto centred region into Lake Ontario. Of course, they don't say that in this speech. They talk about the United States and what the federal government should do to get the United States to clean up the lakes.

They're also going to implement a programme to remove the blight of abandoned automobile hulks and automobile graveyards from our landscape. Now we know the reason for the rise in the civil service from 45,000 to 69,000 in the last four years. Each government employee is to be given one abandoned used car to bury in his backyard.

If this government is as interested in pollution as it says it is, where are the plans for research into finding a better way of disposing of our own wastes? They've made no advances in the field of sewage treatment. Their only solution is to pollute our lakes instead of our rivers. In other countries sewage effluent performs a valuable function as an organic fertilizer, bringing overworked land back to life. Where are the studies which relate to this? Is the Ontario Water Resources Commission content with its penny-ante research operation in Alliston, or has it not heard of the work being done outside of Canada in this field?

So far though the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) has come up with two helpful suggestions in pollution control, for the handling of our garbage. First, a plan to transport trainloads of Metro's garbage into less than grateful municipalities perched on Metro's boundaries, or even to Muskoka. And here is a coincidence. The tracks for the Ontario garbage express just happen to pass by a veritable Mount Everest of garbage owned by that friend of the government, Mr. Norman Goodhead, at Maple. We are also told that garbage will now be dumped in adjoining mined-out gravel pits, because Mr. Goodhead has some of these under option, I understand. Another coincidence?

Secondly, the former minister has decreed that Metro Toronto must shut down all its incinerators over the next three years because they are antiquated and inefficient. I agree with him that they are. Is this the best suggestion, though, that can be made—to shut down incinerators? Cannot the government assist the municipalities in solving this most serious problem affecting our lives? The most

recent technology suggests that incinerators can be very effective and need not pollute our air, or anything else. In fact, incinerators can recycle garbage.

Modern incinerators can even be used to produce steam for fuel, and a good example is the new Hamilton incinerator which is just starting up. Unfortunately, the Hamilton authorities have received no assistance from Ontario Hydro in their wish to sell the steam produced in this very modern incinerator. The revenues from that steam, if sold at commercial values, could more than offset all the operating costs of that unit. I guess Hydro would like to keep the steam-heating market all to itself. "If the citizens of Hamilton want efficient garbage disposal, let them pay for it," says the government. This appears to be their attitude.

I have a suggestion for this government and for the ministers. Recycling waste can be profitable and government action to ensure modern plants are developed need not be expensive. As I have mentioned before, if the Hamilton plant's steam were sold at commercial rates, it would cover the whole cost of operation of that plant and its debt service charges as well.

The minister should remember that his duties include control of the sale of vast quantities of steam for heating purposes. The Hamilton incinerator demonstrates that such steam can be produced cleanly and efficiently from garbage. The air management branch requires a stack of only 150 feet on that incinerator, because when steam is produced from an incinerator, one reduces the stack temperature to a point at which the precipitators can be extremely effective, and it is almost impossible to see any smoke coming out from that huge incinerator.

I suggest to the minister that he should attempt to bring together the steam consumers and the waste disposers. That, Mr. Speaker, is efficiency.

This government talks of continuing past progress. A Toronto-centred region plan that separates the city people from the countryside? A land-price control policy that actually causes land prices to go up? A rapid transit plan that is anything but rapid? And a waste control plan that bears little evidence of modern research or planning? This is progress?

The government wants to be more efficient and bring people closer to the government, at least, that is what it says. We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have seen many times that what this government says and what is does are two totally different things.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, because of the hour, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Drea moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.45 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

ONTARIO PLACE OPERATIONS AS AT FEBRUARY 29, 1972

Revenue			
Admissions		$1,561,091	
Facilities		833,788	
Winter operations		72,464	
Miscellaneous		47,827	$2,515,170
Expenditures			
Salaries		$1,622,815	
Benefits		29,963	
Transportation and communication		118,814	
Services		1,037,443	
Supplies and equipment		672,164	
Intergovernment charges:			
General maintenance—DPW	$699,000		
Security services—OPP	143,159		
Miscellaneous	45,502	887,661	
The Place restaurants— deficit to February 28, 1972		92,034	4,460,894
Deficit at February 29, 1972			1,945,724
Estimated expenditure for March			126,502
Deficit at March 31, 1972			$2,072,226

ONTARIO PLACE CONSTRUCTION COSTS

A. **Capital Costs**			
1. General construction including buildings, landscaping, services, marina and restaurants		$16,789,000	
—Less federal sales tax rebate		745,000	$16,044,000
2. Land creation			3,350,000
3. Licences/permits			5,000
4. Cinesphere equipment			456,800
5. Pod 2 restaurant equipment			237,900
6. Architects/consultants fees			1,625,000
8. Exhibits			2,064,800
9. Site equipment			374,000
Total capital costs			$24,157,500
B. **Non-capital costs—$4,584,500:**			
1. DPW construction administration			$ 611,000
7. Cinesphere films			654,600
8. Exhibits—Initial year concept development costs		$ 211,000	
—Exhibit and film design		765,000	
—Exhibit film production		630,000	1,606,000
9. Site equipment—paddle boats		$ 35,000	
—land ride		36,000	
—canal boats		55,000	126,000
10. Administration and promotion			1,586,900
Total non-capital costs			$ 4,584,500
Total capital costs		$24,157,500	
Total non-capital costs		4,584,500	$28,742,000

THE PLACE RESTAURANTS

Balance Sheet as at February 28, 1972

Assets

Currents assets		
Cash	$24,723	
Accounts receivables	21,749	
Food and liquor inventory	27,724	
Prepaid expenses	7,974	$ 82,170
Fixed assets		
Silverware	$ 8,197	
Accumulated depreciation	(4,918)	
	$ 3,279	
Equipment	24,090	27,369
Deficit from operations		92,034
Total		$201,573

Liabilities

Current		
Accounts payables	$81,584	
Accruals	1,454	
Accrued payable	7,245	
Employers income tax and payroll	4,358	$ 94,641
Others		
Banquet deposits	$ 1,104	
Sales tax payable	40,352	
George Brown College	17,180	
Department of Trade and Development	8,296	
Advance from Department of Trade and Development	40,000	106,932
Total		$201,573

Income Statement for Period Ending February 29, 1972

Sales		
Food sales	$662,215	
Liquor sales	171,313	
Wine and sundry sales	43,934	
Beer sales	58,569	$936,031
Cost of sales		
Cost of food	$293,100	
Cost of liquor	46,562	
Cost of wine and sundries	19,566	
Cost of beer	16,724	375,952
Gross profit on sales		$560,079
Operating expenses		
Wages	$481,590	
Kitchen and bar supplies	31,588	
Uniforms and laundry	27,784	
Equipment and equipment rental	12,339	
Fringe benefits	31,275	
Repairs and maintenance	853	
Advertising and promotion	40,287	
Credit card expense	6,264	
Postage and printing	17,603	

Bank charges	4,735	
Security	1,613	
Telephone	516	
Depreciation	4,918	
Miscellaneous	5,957	667,322
Profit or (loss) after expenses		$(107,243)
Other income		15,209
Net profit or (loss)		$(92,034)

ONTARIO PLACE

Revenue for period ending February 29, 1972

Fiscal year 1971/1972

Admissions:	
General	$1,442,063
Day pass books (10s)	6,050
Day pass books (25s)	33,344
Season passes	51,384
Bus tours	28,250
	$1,561,091
Facilities:	
Haida	$ 88,650
Marina	61,473
Boats	82,058
Boutiques	298,722
Concessions	302,885
	$ 833,788
Miscellaneous:	
Coin machines	$ 6,086
Parking	17,994
Land rides	21,769
Other	1,978
	$ 47,827
Winter operations:	
Cinesphere	$ 61,453
Snack bar	11,011
	$ 72,464
Final total	$2,515,170

Boat revenue

For the period ending February 1-29, 1972

Paddle boats	$54,967
Canal boats	24,448
Ferries	2,643
Totals	$82,058

Boutique revenue
For the period ending February 1-29, 1972

Boutique I (east island)	$ 35,662
Boutique II (east island)	82,886
Boutique III (kiosk-east island)	68,532
Boutique IV (8 push carts)	106,083
Boutique V (kiosk-quayside)	5,490
Boutique VI (kiosk-west island)	69
Totals	$298,722

Concession revenue 1971/1972
For the period ending February 29, 1972

Dennis restaurants—snack bar	$ 14,709
Lakeshore pubs—English pub	58,299
—snack bar	21,856
Laura Secord—snack bar	11,125
Lonlaw—beer garden and lounge	58,711
Points East—Chinese restaurant	17,202
—snack bar	20,024
Ruhanyi—coffee house	18,238
—snack bar	3,440
Stoodleigh—restaurant and Sailor pub	51,604
—snack bar	12,726
Rivertown—snack bar	11,519
R.M. Hall Portraits	3,432
Totals	$302,885

Winter operations 1971/1972
For the period ending February 29, 1972

Cinesphere:	
Adults	$56,606
Students	18,612
Children	1,210
Snack bar	11,011
	$87,439
Less:	
Film distributor's cost	(14,975)
	$72,464

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 7, 1972

Tabling report, task force interim review of offtrack betting, Mr. A. F. Lawrence 133

Telegram Publishing Company inquiry by Prof. Donald Carter, statement by Mr. Guindon 134

Offtrack betting re research of Australian system, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bullbrook 135

Operation of Ontario Place—revenue estimates and entrance fees, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Lawlor, Mr. Singer, Mr. Stokes 139

Tabling reports, Ontario Place fiscal operations, Mr. White 140

Nursing home regulations and rate structure, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Good, Mr. Paterson 141

Dates of enactment for environment bill sought, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis 144

Non-returnable bottles and future policy statement, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 144

Daycare centres for Indian bands, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Spence, Mr. Reid 145

Cost of Ontario Place, questions of Mr. White: Mr. Givens 146

Presenting report re select committee on standing committees, Mr. Henderson, agreed to 148

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Deans, first reading 152

Cemeteries Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 152

Health studios, bill respecting, Mr. Drea, first reading 152

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Miller, Mr. Deacon 152

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Drea, agreed to 176

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 176

Appendix, Ontario Place fiscal operations 177

No. 7

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today, in the east gallery, from Courtland Avenue Senior School of Kitchener. Also in the east gallery from John Calvin Christian School, of Guelph, and from Georgetown High School, of Georgetown. Students from Georgetown High School of Georgetown are also in the west gallery. And in the west gallery, the Public Service Commission, the Bicultural Development Programme, and persons from the Hamilton Mountain and Hamilton East Progressive Conservative Association.

Some of the guests from the Hamilton Mountain and Hamilton East Progressive Conservative Association are also in the Speaker's gallery.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Mr. Speaker, I can outline today the award of the civil service arbitration board on employee benefits for the Ontario public service covering a two-year period beginning October 1, 1971.

The question of fringe benefits was referred to the board late in 1971 following periods of negotiation and mediation. The board consisted of His Honour Judge J. C. Anderson, chairman; K. W. Preston, representing the official side of the Ontario Joint Council, and Professor S. Dupre, representing the staff side.

The highlights of the award are as follows:

Health insurance: the government's contribution to Ontario Health Insurance premiums will be increased from the current 59 per cent to 75 per cent of premium, effective April 1, 1972, and to 90 per cent of premium, effective October 1, 1972.

Long term income protection: From October 1, 1972, the government's contribution will be increased from 50 per cent to 66⅔ per cent of premium.

Basic life insurance: From April 1, 1972, the present compulsory basic life insurance of $2,000 will be increased to 75 per cent of annual salary with the government continuing to contribute 75 per cent of premium.

Effective April 1, 1972, the present accidental death and dismemberment benefit of $2,000 will be cancelled.

Sick or attendance credits: No change is made in the number of credits. However, each employee will be credited with 15 days at the beginning of each attendance year, as defined in section 14(1)(a) of the regulations under the Public Service Act, 1970.

Separation allowance:

(a) No change is recommended for those employees appointed prior to October 1, 1965, or after January 1, 1970.

(b) Employees appointed between October 1, 1965, and January 1, 1970, who involuntarily cease to be public servants after April 1, 1972, shall be entitled to severance pay equal to one-half a week's salary for each year of service from and after October 1, 1965, and prior to January 1, 1970, and for each year of service after January 1, 1970, shall be entitled to one week's salary.

Vacations: Employees with 30 or more years of completed service are granted five weeks of vacation commencing with vacations for 1972.

Pre-retirement leave: For employees who have completed 25 or more years of service, six-week vacations are granted in the final year of service before compulsory retirement, which will include their vacation entitlement for that year.

Compassionate leave: In the event of the death of a member of his immediate family, an employee is entitled to three days leave of absence with pay, which will not be charged against attendance credits.

Mr. Speaker: Satements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

HAMILTON HARBOUR LANDFILL

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Has he received formal notification from the council of the city of Hamilton requesting that the Hamilton harbour be exempted from the jurisdiction of the Hamilton conservation authority regarding landfill operations that Dofasco and Stelco propose to carry out?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't had formal notification, although I understand it's on the way.

I understand that the council, by a 12-8 vote on early Wednesday morning, voted to ask that the regulations which were passed by cabinet a week ago—amendments to the fill regulations which the conservation authority has had, and which extended their dump and fill control over three other areas, one of which was Hamilton harbour—be varied so that they would not apply to the two steel companies, Stelco and Dofasco.

As a matter of fact, I issued a release this morning, saying—I won't read it all—that the amendment to the dump and fill regulations of the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority passed by cabinet on March 1 would be gazetted as of March 25, that is, for the next issue of the Gazette. I emphasized it in my recent meeting with the groups involved, which included the Hamilton Harbour Commission, the mayor and one controller of the city of Hamilton, the chairman and general manager of the Hamilton conservation authority and people from OWRC and this department. At that time, Mr. Powell, the chairman of the Hamilton Region Conservation Authority stated that his organization recognized that there may be areas where landfill operations would continue without any adverse effect on the harbour.

I might say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there are three fill operations going on there which are separate, in that one is by the Hamilton Harbour Commission, and two are by Dofasco and Stelco. Another one is being carried out by a developer, I believe, who proposes to build an apartment building once he gets his fill done.

I have said this morning in this statement that I felt there couldn't be any exemption to the dump and fill regulations as it would lead to further fragmentation of the authority's regulatory power. I also said that I understand Mr. Powell, the chairman of the conservation authority, is getting in touch with the two steel companies to work out details of what it is specifically they want to do and whether some or all of this may be possible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Perhaps the minister would explain what he means when he says there will be no exemptions to the regulation, but that the chairman of the conservation authority is going to contact the two steel companies to see if what they want to do might be permissible. Surely there is an area where it doesn't jibe?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. Perhaps, I wasn't clear, Mr. Speaker. I don't feel that we should exempt any property or person from the application of the regulations, but this does not mean that the authority may not issue a permit to do certain things which would fit in with the plan.

I may say that I also said we have undertaken to do a model of the Hamilton harbour by OWRC to see just what the requirements for water supply, waste and so on are, and that we would expedite this. In the meantime, the harbour commission has indicated that it will carry out only about half of their filling, the half which it has to do to deepen the harbour for shipping and which has been approved by OWRC as far as the health aspects are concerned.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A final supplementary, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker: Are we to understand then that the minister will not approve of any regulation giving special exemption, but that if the conservation authority permits it it is okay with him?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That's correct.

MEDICARE COVERAGE OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Can he explain to the House the outcome, or can he tell the House the outcome of his negotiations with the nursing home owners and operators which took place yesterday? According to press reports, he now believes that there will be no hitch in full nursing home coverage as of April 1.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): I would be delighted to, Mr. Speaker. When I met with the executive of the nursing home association yesterday they assured me that any members who had spoken the day before,

suggesting they were going to opt out of the programme, were not speaking on behalf of the majority of the nursing home operators.

I found them to be most co-operative, as I had expected them to be in the first place. They have assured me that they as a group, as far as they are concerned, will go along with our programme, that the beds will be made available to us as of April 1, as we planned. At the same time, I have arranged to meet on a regular basis with the executive of the nursing home association as I have done with the Ontario Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the Ontario Dental Association, and everybody else involved in the health field in order that we can keep our lines of communication open.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition to a question he asked the other day concerning the detoxification centres programme in the province.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why, sure, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I have to make damn sure I get permission, you understand, or I'll get slapped down again.

Interjections by hon. members.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DETOXIFICATION CENTRES

Hon. Mr. Potter: There are three functioning detoxification units in Toronto at the present time. Two are operated by the Addiction Research Foundation and one operated by the Salvation Army.

The Seaton House unit is operated by the Addiction Research Foundation in association with the city of Toronto welfare department and St. Michael's Hospital. It has a capacity of 14 beds and will receive approximately 1,300 patients during a 12-month period. St. Michael's Hospital provides the backup facilities for those patients requiring more intensive care.

The West Central Detoxification Centre is located on Ossington Avenue and is operated by the Addiction Research Foundation in association with Toronto Western Hospital. This unit has the capacity of 18 beds and will receive approximately 2,500 patients in a 12-month period. The Toronto Western Hospital provides the backup service for those patients requiring more intensive care.

The Salvation Army Harbour Light has a 12-bed detoxification unit and will receive approximately 520 patients in a 12-month period.

The overall plans for the detoxification centres calls for the establishment of special centres with special facilities in the judicial districts of Ontario where the arrests for public intoxication exceed 1,000 per year. The cities included in this plan are Metropolitan Toronto, London, Hamilton, Thunder Bay--

Mr. Sargent: That's no yardstick.

Hon. Mr. Potter: --Kenora, Sudbury, St. Catharines, Windsor, Ottawa, Renfrew and Kitchener. The plan calls for these units to be phased-in over a three-year period. Six units are planned for Metropolitan Toronto and one for each of the other cities.

During 1972-1973 one additional unit is planned for Metropolitan Toronto, plus one each for Kenora, London and Hamilton. In 1973-1974, two more units are planned for Metropolitan Toronto, plus one each in Thunder Bay, Sudbury and St. Catharines. In 1974-1975 an additional unit is planned for Metropolitan Toronto, plus one each in Windsor, Ottawa, Renfrew and Waterloo.

The approximate operating cost for an 18-20 bed detoxification centre is $100,000 per year. A network of backup rehabilitation facilities designed for various kinds of patients' needs are planned to complement the detoxification units--

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How many pages has the minister got there?

Hon. M. Potter: --and to provide the thrust towards recovery. Is that enough?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's enough.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Good.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce has a supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary to the detoxification story. Does this mean that if a man is picked up in Owen Sound he goes to jail, but if he is picked up in Toronto he goes to a detoxification centre?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): There is a difference.

Mr. Sargent: What kind of fair treatment is this for the outlying parts of the province, Mr. Speaker? I would like an answer.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, there is no way we are going to set up 150 detoxification centres across the province all at one time. They are going to be set up on a need basis.

I am sure that the hon. member is aware that with the new federal laws that have been instituted there is no need for a man being picked up on a drunk charge to be thrown into jail. He can be remanded without bail, and they are even escorted home on occasion by officers of the law. So that—

Mr. Sargent: That is not the way it works, though.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would think that the member would be happy that his municipality doesn't fall into this category where in excess of 1,000 drunks are picked up every year.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Maybe it has just been overlooked!

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): A supplementary question of the minister: Is the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the member for High Park have a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, please.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): May I ask of the minister, of the 44 beds that he has outlined that are available in Toronto, how many are available for women, if any?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I never asked that one! To be perfectly honest, I don't see that there would be any difference.

Mr. Shulman: Well, is the minister unaware—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I mean, we have universities now where they have—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Co-educational DTs!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: How does Hansard get that recorded?

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister unaware—

Hon. Mr. Potter: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would think there would be less danger under these circumstances than there would be in some of our universities.

Mr. Shulman: In view of the minister's comments, will he issue instructions then to the detoxification centres that they should admit women who require such treatment but who, at the present time, will not be admitted.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would be delighted to do that, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: I am sure the minister would.

Mr. Breithaupt: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the order in which the minister listed the construction of those facilities is going to be the order as he has set them out in his statement?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The order in which I listed them is going to be the order—

Mr. Breithaupt: Is that going to be the order in which they are to be put into effect?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's right, Mr. Speaker. I have listed here what we are doing in 1972-1973, 1973-1974 and so forth.

Mr. Sargent: An equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to ask of the minister—

Mr. Sargent: The minister knows it is not fair.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask of the minister how long it will be before such facilities are made available to native people, particularly in northern Ontario, who are presently being jailed for the same offence for which people are being rehabilitated in southern Ontario?

Mr. Deans: Good point.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would be delighted to look into that Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the hon. member is aware that at the present time we're a bit hog-tied in trying to come to some kind of an arrangement with the federal authorities as to where they end and where we take over. I'm sure he is aware that the health of the Indians in the northern part of of the province, or in any part of the province, is a federal responsibility. We have offered assistance—

Mr. Stokes: Not in all cases; just those living on reserves.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We have offered assistance in some areas and so far we have found that the Indians themselves are reluctant to receive our assistance because they say if they do they might be cutting themselves off from Ottawa and allowing the people in Ottawa to shirk the responsibility which is truly theirs.

I can only assure the member that we would be delighted to speak with him or with anybody else who is in a position to work with us to help develop facilities wherever they're needed.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): I wonder if the minister is aware that the special medical services unit of St. Joseph's Hospital in Thunder Bay, which handles this kind of problem, is threatened with closure on May 1, and that they have submitted a brief to his department for assistance to tide them over the coming year, so that the detoxification centre which the minister indicates is planned, can work into the whole plan?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure the hon. member is unaware that I was in Port Arthur and Fort William about a year ago at the request of the then Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), and looked into the problems that are up there. I might also assure him that the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) has been after me and we're arranging, through my department, to spend a day or two in Fort William in the very near future to try and solve some of the problems that have been facing them for so long.

One of the problems, of course—and perhaps there's somebody here who could advise me how we handle this—is that we had one heck of a time trying to get the people in Port Arthur and the people in Fort William to get together in some of these programmes. Once we have that settled we'll be well on the way.

Mr. Stokes: If the minister would start calling them by their right name he might get them well on the way to cooperating with one another.

Mr. Foulds: I raised my question for the city of Thunder Bay, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

EDUCATION EXPENDITURES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education:

Can he explain to the House how he is negotiating with the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the Ontario Secondary School Teachers Federation regarding the ceilings on expenditures for education in this jurisdiction, particularly in view of the possibility of a rotating strike affecting the schools here?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, first I think we should get it very clear that we are not negotiating with anybody on this particular matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought the minister was taking another look at it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are sitting down, as we do with many groups all the time, to take a look at anything that happens to present a problem.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, educational expenditure ceilings were brought in and made public to the boards last November. They were devised, after much thought and study and review of budget. They weren't figures pulled out of the air. They were felt to provide enough financing for an adequate, high quality educational programme. They were also geared so that no lesser amount would be spent per pupil in this year than was spent last year. In other words, they provide for an increase in the amount spent per pupil for every board in Ontario, except for two boards in the northern section of the province.

The boards themselves have worked out their own particular budgets, and the setting of priorities within these fiscal ceilings is the prerogative of the boards. They work these out.

They have indicated to me that they have certain difficulties. The Metro Toronto board has indicated it has difficulties. Until last Tuesday, when I had a meeting with them, we didn't really know what the difficulties were. All we knew was what we had read in the paper and what, I'm sure, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has also read in the paper.

They came in and presented some figures and some statistics to us. I suggested our officials should work with their officials to see if, in fact, what they presented really

does present problems. I'm not so sure that they present some of the severe problems that they have indicated they do, but this was the first time we'd had a chance to really take a look at them.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): They only have to look.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are now taking a look at these and we're having another meeting next Tuesday. As far the secondary school teachers, as I understand it, some of the more extreme pronouncements that we've read in the paper were just not the majority opinion of the teachers in this area.

I certainly think that, as in all these matters, we'll be able to work them out in goodwill and still keep an adequate ceiling on the costs of education, which I think is our job and the job that we've been given to do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But to work it out in goodwill, of course, is commendable and supported on all sides.

Has the minister met with either the provincial executive or the Toronto district executive of the secondary school teachers, so that they are aware of the justification that he, as the responsible minister, attempts to put on this programme?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I haven't met officially with them in an across-the-table meeting to discuss this specifically, but I was invited to speak at their professional development day a couple of weeks ago. At this time, I spoke and answered questions about this matter and then had lunch with the Toronto secondary school teachers, where we had informal discussions about this whole matter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Has the minister any comment on the threat that there may be disruptive rotating strikes? Surely we are concerned about the continuing education of the kids in the system. The minister has indicated he will not negotiate—he doesn't like to use that word and I can understand why not—but surely there must have been a breakdown in communications if he feels the position is so readily justified?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course, we certainly all are primarily concerned about the children in the classroom and the educational process for them, but the teachers' position to work within the guidelines set by their local school boards. This is what they are doing, as I say.

We have set broad financial guidelines and given these to the boards. It is within their prerogative and their power—and, indeed many of them very jealously guard this—to set the priorities that go on within their own educational jurisdiction. What we have suggested—and the boards have said that they support this—is that the teachers and the boards should all be working together in concert to plan how they can come within these ceilings and still keep a viable educational programme. This they are doing, and the process is going on. As I say, I think that we still have a spirit of goodwill, notwithstanding some of the screaming headlines that we have read over the last few days. I think that this can all be worked out in this spirit.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: May I ask of the minister when grant regulations will be made available to various boards so that they can strike their budgets?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sorry, did the hon. member say when will grant regulations—

Mr. B. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Grant regulations, Mr. Speaker, were mailed to the boards last Friday.

Mr. Cassidy: I had hoped to have seen more than goodwill from the government.

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister made an assessment of the reduction in quality of education which will be imposed by the grant ceilings which he is proposing? What does he propose to do with the experienced teachers who will become unemployed as a result of the government's spending freeze?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I have seen no concrete evidence that the ceilings that we have imposed will indeed bring about a lessening in the quality of education in this province.

Mr. Cassidy: I can give him evidence in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have talked with the Ottawa board. I think that we are in general agreement and that we know their problem. I don't think that the hon. member can support his assumption.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the government's declared intention to encourage greater community use

of schools, could the minister explain how the spending freeze is going to help that, given that boards are naturally cutting down on non-educational expenses first before they try to cut back on teachers?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): It is not a freeze.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, and as the Premier has also just said, this isn't a freeze, it is a deceleration in the expenditure increase that has been going on. We are not reducing any costs now—

Mr. Shulman: What is he going to do when the Premier is not here to help him?

Mr. Cassidy: Just a dollar a student more in the Ottawa area.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and it is laying right on the boards of education the opportunity to live within these ceilings which, I think, they can do. In the whole area of community use of schools we are going to have some changes in legislation that will perhaps allow a greater sharing of the costs here by the total community which, I think, will add impetus to this programme. Indeed community use of schools won't be hampered under the kind of ceilings that we have entered.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister prepared to provide any compensation or make any new arrangements for school boards which are being hit by declining enrolments at the elementary level and which, therefore, are being hit in a double fashion by the freeze, or whatever it is the government cares to call the one or two dollar increase on spending in some jurisdictions, such as Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to several boards who have come in that it will not be possible this year for us to make any adjustments in weighting factors to take this into consideration, but we are certainly going to look at it for next year. We have had certain statistics put before us that there could be a problem in this particular area—decreasing enrolments in elementary schools—and this will be given active study for the studying of weighting factors for next year's budgets.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it the thinking within the department now then, that the increase in class size which will result because of the fiats, in fact leads to a better learning situation for the children involved?

Mr. Cassidy: Explain that one away.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, the hon. member wants to start into what could be a three-day seminar on what is the ideal class size, and I haven't—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It is a question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I haven't seen any indication anywhere of what is the ideal size. All I know is that I can tell you the public-teacher ratio in this province has been decreasing—decreasing for the last eight years in both elementary and secondary schools.

I've been at several meetings where a Columbia University study has been quoted to me. I have some information on this study and while it does make certain subjective assumptions about class size and so forth, it also says that there are many more important things than class size, and they are the type of teacher and the dedication of the teacher and the quality of the teacher. So we are really trying to debate something which no one has any answers to, and I do not pretend to have the answers.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: Has the department defined the optimum class size in various areas, whether that be motor mechanics, academic class, science class, elementary school class? Are there optimum class sizes? If the department has not defined that, are they working on defining that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I could not tell the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. There may be people in our department working on that. I certainly am not aware of any optimum class sizes because, as I say, I think is is very difficult to set figures like that and I am not sure that we ever can.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, I said the last question was the last supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Speaker: I think it might be well to take a few moments at this point for the benefit, particularly of some of the new members, to explain just how this question period does proceed. I notice that some of them are attempting to gain the floor before it is properly their turn.

The Leader of the Opposition, of course, has the first opportunity to ask questions. Supplementaries may arise to a reasonable degree from those questions asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Then it is the turn of the leader of the New Democratic Party to do exactly the same thing. We then adopt the process of alternating from the three parties.

I do have a large number of notes from members, many of whom are new members, who want to get in on the question period before either of the leaders of the two opposition parties has had his opportunity. I simply point this out to the new members that as soon as the two leaders of the two opposition parties have finished their question period then I will call upon the other members in turn.

Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Just one point on clarification. One must send you a note to be heard then, for a question?

Mr. Speaker: I'd prefer that members wouldn't, but I am glad to accept them from the new members, temporarily.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

An hon. member: Does that mean you won't take notes from an old member?

Mr. Speaker: No.

POLICE PROTECTION AT GULL BAY

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Justice. Can the minister explain why the Ontario Provincial Police have refused to provide adequate police protection for the Gull Bay area of northern Ontario on the west shore of Lake Nipigon, in spite of the request being made by the chief of the band and by the member for Thunder Bay?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this question should really be directed to the Provincial Secretary, the Solicitor General-designate (Mr. Yaremko). I have information and I'd be glad to deal with this question. On the other hand, the Solicitor General-designate is here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The policy minister.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister answer the question please?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very pleased to take the question as notice and report back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, since the Solicitor General-designate doesn't have the answer and since the Minister of Justice indicates that he does have some information, could we perhaps hear the information the Minister of Justice has?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, that is policy.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question—

Mr. Deans: How can he answer?

Mr. Cassidy: He said he can't.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say this, having taken questions through the years from members of the opposition, the NDP and especially in many cases from the member for Thunder Bay, I will invariably take them as notice in order to find out exactly what the matter is and not take any preambles from the two hon. members at all.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer of Ontario, Minister of Economics and Minister of Municipal Affairs): The member doesn't know what is going on.

Mr. Stokes: What does the minister mean by that?

Mr. Shulman: He means he is not going to answer any of the member's questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: The minister would be the last one I would direct a question to if there were any alternative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Ignoring the editorial comment, could I then ask the Minister of Justice whether he might be able to tell us what it is he knows, since the Solicitor General is reluctant to enter the debate?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I have some information but it only came to me in the space of the 10 minutes or so before the question period began. I am sure that my colleague would want to look into it and have all of the information for the hon. member opposite.

Mr. Cassidy: I hope the minister does better next time.

An. hon. member: Is this a standing joke?

Mr. Deans: May I ask the next question?

Mr. Singer: How about the Provincial Secretary—shouldn't he get into the act?

SAVINGS IN HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. Deans: Can I ask the Minister of Education—does he feel inclined to answer questions? Can I ask the minister whether he intends to make the necessary amendments to the Schools Administration Act to allow those persons employed by the boards of education to enjoy the same benefits from the changes in the OHSIP and Ontario Hospital regulations which permit any savings in premium to be passed on to the employees?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me to comment on the kind of legislation that we might bring in here in the near future, as amendments to the various educational acts. The hon. member will see what the government's policy is in this regard when we introduce that legislation.

Mr. Deans: May I ask the Minister of Health whether he considers that the municipal school board employees are somewhat lower citizens than those other citizens in the province, since he doesn't see fit to introduce companion legislation to ensure their rights?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, they are certainly equal with all citizens in this province. As I indicated—

Mr. Deans: Not according to the minister's legislation.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —to the hon. member, let him wait and see. When I introduce the amendments to the Schools Administration Act he will see what is in them.

BOOKBINDERS DISPUTE WITH QUEEN'S PRINTER

Mr. Deans: They are not equal according to the legislation.

Can I ask the Minister of Public Works a question? Has the Minister of Public Works had representation made to him by local 28 of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders in regard to their dispute with the Queen's Printer over the use of non-union help?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): No, Mr. Speaker, I have had no representation made to me.

An hon. member: They are at the front door.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister not aware that there was a demonstration this morning at the front door dealing with this very matter, and that they were seeking to bring this to his attention and to the attention of the Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any demonstration. I was in my office and the adjoining boardroom in meetings with my staff all morning and I heard nothing of it.

Mr. Cassidy: What do the ministers do in there?

Mr. Deans: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Work! The member doesn't know what that means.

Mr. Cassidy: Work includes listening to the public.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister therefore not aware—and the office of the Queen's Printer not aware—that the binding of some 200,000 copies of the accommodation guide publication of the Department of Tourism and Information is being done by strike breakers at Brooker Trade Bindery, the company where the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders is legally on strike? Now that he is aware, will he take steps to ensure that this binding ceases until the legal strike is settled?

Hon. Mr. Snow: First of all; no, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Take it as notice.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —I was not aware. I will not say that I will take steps, but I will look into the matter and familiarize myself with the situation.

CIVIL SERVICE BARGAINING

Mr. Deans: A question for the—just exactly what is he?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That will get me on my feet.

Mr. Deans: I am trying to remember what he is. He is the Chairman of the Management Board. Is this the right name? Fine. In regard to his statement about—

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member please indicate to the House the minister to whom his question is being directed?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I think I am asking the—

Mr. Stokes: The Chairman of the Board.

Mr. Deans: The Chairman of the Management Board, but I am not absolutely sure.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why doesn't the member read the book?

Mr. Deans: It is the minister who made the statement today before the question period in regard to the Civil Service award.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Oh, the member means our Charlie.

Mr. Deans: Our Charlie—that's the guy! I could have told the minister who I wanted, but I couldn't remember his name.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have trouble with the member's name some days.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member should hear what the minister calls him.

Mr. Deans: I wonder if the minister might be able to tell me whether, as a result of this award, those employees who fall into the categories higher than the categories to which the award is applicable will be receiving similar kinds of benefit increases, or whether the government intends to follow the policy that it has in the past of reducing the difference between the highest association classification and those others who fall into the category of the supervisory personnel?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. leader—wasn't he described a few moments ago the new—the leader,

Well yes. I know who he is now, you see, and he doesn't know who I am. I know who he is.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We do our homework.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the hon. member wants to find out, I will give him a simple expedient. Turn his desk chart over and he will see it on the back.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the matter with the minister this session?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am having fun.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I never look as unhappy as the Leader of the Opposition does anyway.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just wait until the Premier cancels the MacNaughton expressway, then we will see.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now to get back to the member's question. I don't know that I understand his question from the point of view of the division. What division is he talking about there? Is he talking about the so-called senior list, the management levels; or would he like to try that again please?

Mr. Deans: I would be pleased to.

Mr. Renwick: Ask somebody else.

Mr. Deans: Perhaps I should ask somebody else. My understanding of the classifications is that above classification number four, I believe—five, six and beyond—that those classifications are considered supervisory classifications and do not fall within the bargaining powers of the association.

An hon. member: Exactly!

Mr. Deans: It has been the practice of the government not to grant increases similar to those granted to the employees within the association at the time that awards are handed down, and I am asking whether the minister is going to continue to allow the erosion of the economic position which drastically affects the pensions of those people who are nearing retirement age.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh no Mr. Speaker; just the opposite really. This fringe benefit award covers all the bargaining groups, all those groups that bargain within the public service—

Mr. Deans: How about non-bargaining groups?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was coming to that.

There are certain management classes that are excluded, but this type of benefit applies and accrues to them in the same way that it does to other levels.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have further questions?

WCB DEFINITION OF LIGHT WORK

Mr. Deans: One final question: I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he would be in a position to define for the House what light work is as applied by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Well Mr. Speaker, the definition of light work?

Mr. Ferrier: It is what members do over there in the mornings?

Hon. Mr. Snow: NDP members.

Mr. Renwick: Maybe the policy Minister for Justice could tell the member about those things.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well I suppose I could give the member a definition, but it certainly perhaps won't be according to the Act. I would sooner look at the Act first if there is a definition there.

Mr. Deans: There is no such thing.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, it is a very grey area, I would think.

Mr. Deans: The minister just isn't able to give the definition at the moment.

Would he be able to give the definition; and perhaps indicate to the House where one might find light work in order that some of these people who are seeking it can get to work?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well Mr. Speaker, there are a number of areas where people are able to get light work, particularly in the case of maintenance for many industries—

Mr. Ferrier: What about the mining industry?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Elevator operators I think could be considered as performing light work, and there are many more.

Mr. Renwick: Can we refer constituents to the minister?

ESTABLISHMENT OF DETOXIFICATION CENTRE

Mr. Deans: I have one final question; I am sorry.

Might I ask the Minister of Health, since the detoxification legislation has not yet been proclaimed and since there are no regulations for it since it has not been proclaimed, how then does the minister outline the programme that he intends to follow?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Did the member want me to sit back, Mr. Speaker? I wonder if the hon. member felt I should sit back for a couple of years and wait until we get some legislation through? We want to get the thing on the road; and we are getting our plans on the road. We are prepared to get them on the road.

We'll bring in the legislation. Don't worry about it, it will be coming.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister then explain why, since the far-reaching programme he has outlined is so necessary, it has not yet been proclaimed?

Mr. Renwick: There was an Act passed in the last session.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, there really isn't very much—I don't see the problem.

Mr. Deans: Not very much has been done. I think that is pretty much the problem.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You know, we can't win. We try to do it and they are not happy. If we don't do it, they are not happy. We have the programme on the way. We're going to have the detoxification centres set up; they're going to be in operation. We'll have the legislation; we'll have the regulations. Now, is there anything else they would like to have?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works has answers to previous questions.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): They are not batting very good today.

LAND PURCHASE IN TORONTO

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have answers to questions placed on Monday by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and which I took as notice.

The hon. member inquired as to the directors of the company from whom the government leased the OISE building and

also the directors of the company from whom we purchased the property next door.

The directors of Swiss-Granada Holdings Ltd., which is the owner of the OISE building, are Mr. W. G. Moog, president; Mr. J. A. Broadshaw, secretary; and Mr. J. A. Wright as a director. Those were the same officers during 1970 and 1971 and are still in existence, as far as I know.

The directors of 246 Bloor Street West Ltd. are, Mr. Sam Orenstein, president; Mr. Jacob Hendelas, secretary-treasurer; Mr. Walter Zwig, director; Mr. Benson Orenstein, director. The name of this company was changed on June 30, 1970, to All Toronto Investments Ltd., but the principals remain the same.

A further question, Mr. Speaker, asked to what use the site could be put, considering the zoning. It can be used for the construction of commercial, university, governmental or institutional buildings, or other university or governmental or quasi-university or quasi-governmental use, and I believe the zoning allows for a density of seven times the area of the property.

To the question, "Is the University of Toronto easement for parking in perpetuity?" the answer is yes. "Does it inhibit the use of the property?" The answer is yes. This was taken into consideration in the valuation of the land.

Mr. Shulman: No, it wasn't.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Arrangements can be made with the city which would give relief from this requirement upon payment. In this instance, the spaces have been allocated in the 252 Bloor Street basement parking lot.

The hon. member asked for a copy of the appraisal report and the title search documents, and that these be tabled; I now would like to table these documents.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the minister stated that the easement is in perpetuity and limits the use of the property. Could he then explain why, by instrument No. 82599 EM, the easement was apparently given up by 246 Bloor Street West Ltd. to the governors of the University of Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the easement is in existence and that this was taken into consideration, as I stated.

Mr. Shulman: Why buy useless property then?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I refuse to answer that question. It is not relevant.

Mr. Singer: I would ask the minister, if he would, to get an opinion on the effect of instrument No. 82599 EM, which as I am advised abandons or gives up or releases that right of way for the parking of 31 cars.

Let me ask the minister a second supplementary. Is the minister aware that in 1969 the legal firm of Arnup Foulds applied to the Toronto Planning Board for permission to pay cash in lieu of providing the parking spaces and that the recommendation of the Toronto Planning Board be that that application be refused; and if, in fact, the minister is aware of that, how can he now tell us that cash could be put up in lieu of the easement?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am not familiar with that case, of course, Mr. Speaker, but the officials in my department tell me that the easement can be settled with a cash settlement as, I think, any easement can. Or, the requirements of the easement, as I stated a few days ago in this House, can be met by supplying the 31 parking spaces within a building or a basement parking area of a building to be erected on the site.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister if he would refer to a report of the Toronto Planning Board herein the recommendation was made that the easement not be given up, and, in view of that, if he would reconsider the answers that he gave us today?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I will certainly look into that report.

Mr. Singer: Yes, the minister had better because his information is quite wrong.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't believe it is.

Mr. Singer: Well, he is going to hear about it at great length.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: How great?

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Stokes: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want your guidance. I take the strongest possible exception to a remark that was made by the Solicitor General-designate a few moments ago during the question period, when he imputed motives, or he indicated that he wouldn't even take into consideration answering a question from either the member for Wentworth or myself

unless he fully investigated to see whether the facts were as we have stated them.

Mr. Deans: Maybe the minister should keep up with his department.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is right.

Mr. Stokes: In the particular instance, I would like to call to the attention of the members of this House and to you, Mr. Speaker, the information that I have about the subject matter. I have been dealing with it for the past five weeks with the Ontario Provincial Police and, as a result of this matter, a school in my riding closed for lack of police protection today.

I phoned the OPP today—the minister is supposed to be responsible for it—and I phoned the Attorney General's office and made him aware of it. And I think that in view of the statement made by the Solicitor General-designate he should either apologize, back up his statement, or resign from the position he is holding.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: Preferably the latter.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that what I have said is that my experience with questions from the members of the NDP in general—

Mr. Deans: The minister said "these two members."

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and from the member for Thunder Bay in particular, have led me to believe—

Mr. Deans: Nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —that often—I do not say in this particular case—I said they have often been based on hearsay.

Mr. Ferrier: That is nonsense.

Mr. Shulman: Substantiate that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is imputing motives.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member says it is nonsense. I disagree with him.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister will wreck this.

Mr. Deans: The minister is a scrupulous member in terms of providing backup material.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member and I differ on that point. I would say that I have no intention of apologizing and I have no intention of resigning a post that I have yet to attain in full.

Mr. Deans: And if the minister carries on the way he is doing he may not get it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The one thing that the hon. member for Thunder Bay does know is that I have always checked out very thoroughly every single matter that he has ever brought to my attention, and very often with very satisfactory results, and I intend to do so now. But I still take the question as notice, which is my prerogative, in order that I may be able to give an intelligent answer based on the facts.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, would the Speaker draw to the attention of the Solicitor General-designate that a blanket refusal to accept oral questions from any member of the House is a contravention of not only the explicit wording of standing order 27, but certainly its intent and meaning.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The minister said he would take it as notice.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I did not make a blanket refusal and the hon. member knows that.

Mr. Deans: The minister did.

Mr. MacDonald: We will look at the record.

Mr. Stokes: In speaking further to the point of order, I think that the minister, if he was doing his job, would know that this question was before his department for the last five weeks, and he is incompetent if it hadn't been brought to his attention before now. My second alternative is—

Mr. Martel: Give it to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may speak only once to a point of order if, in fact, it is a point of order.

Mr. Deans: He was interrupted by the minister.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, that is what is known as light work.

Mr. Deans: The minister should know. He has done a lot of it.

Mr. Renwick: May I ask the Speaker if he would advise the House, and the Solicitor General-designate, on the question that I raised with respect to standing order 27, because the intent of that is that oral questions, if placed to the ministry, provide an opportunity for the ministry to take a certain, specific course of action on any question, but not in advance of the question to state that it will take all questions of a particular member as notice. It is a matter that should be cleared up because the statement of the Solicitor General, if that is his designated title, was impertinent, to say the least.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the hon. member's point of order, I again reiterate that no such blanket statement was made by me.

Mr. Deans: The minister is being repetitive. He did.

Mr. Speaker: Standing order 27 states quite clearly that a minister may, in his discretion, decline to answer any question.

Mr. Renwick: Not in advance.

Mr. Speaker: He need not answer any question at any time. How can he answer a question in advance, before the question is given or placed before the minister? It's perfectly within the rights of the hon. minister to decline to answer any question.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is any question.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order again, I may say that I will try to state the problem much more clearly than I have succeeded in doing so far. The question, specifically, is that the Solicitor General-designate indicated quite clearly that under no circumstances would he answer orally a question put to him by the hon. member for Wentworth or the hon. member for Thunder Bay, and that he would take all such questions as notice. I suggest that that is a decision made by that minister in advance of the particular question being put to him and is a contravention of the intent and meaning and clear phraseology of standing order 27.

Mr. Speaker: Without referring to the actual transcript of the proceedings I cannot, of course, recall whether or not the hon. minister did, in fact, say the words as purported by the hon. member for Riverdale. I shall examine the transcript and determine just what the hon. minister did say, discuss it with him and if, in fact, there is a misunderstanding or any need for any withdrawal, I'm sure it will be taken care of.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Mr. Germa: Further to the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The point of order has been disposed of at the moment.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Henderson from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted: Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for Private Acts and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient.

The city of Waterloo.

The county of Simcoe.

St. Peter's Seminary Corp. of London.

University of Waterloo.

Esbeco Ltd.

Sue-Carib Industries Ltd.

The City of St. Catharines (No. 2).

Your committee recommends the application of the city of St. Catharines (No. 1) be not reported and that the filing fees be remitted.

Your committee further recommends that copies of the "Canadian Parliamentary Guide" be purchased for distribution to the members of the assembly and that the stationery and publications allowance to members for the current session of the assembly be fixed at $600.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

SURROGATE COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bales moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Surrogate Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the amendment permits the surrogate court judges to perform their duties in other counties without the express order of the chief judge.

EDIBLE OIL PRODUCTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Edible Oil Products Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to permit the blending of certain dairy products with edible oil products and also enlarges the authority of the Act to make certain regulations having to do with places where the product is manufactured and processed.

DOG TAX AND LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the bill removes the obligation of a local municipality to collect a dog tax but retains the power in the municipality to pass a bylaw providing for the collection of licence fees on dogs. That is really what the Act does.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Mr. Givens moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change the title of the chairman of the metropolitan council to mayor of Metropolitan Toronto and to provide that the holder of that office shall be elected at large by the voters of Metropolitan Toronto.

An hon. member: Is the member for York-Forest Hill going to run?

Mr. Givens: I'm going to be around here for a long time.

COUNTY OF SIMCOE

Mr. Drea, in the absence of Mr. Evans, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Simcoe.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): The intent, Mr. Speaker, is obvious. I would draw to the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member who was to introduce it is unfortunately away from the chamber—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I must point out this is not necessary on the introduction of private bills.

The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, this amendment extends the definition of the word "highway" to include privately owned parking lots where no fee is charged for parking, such as shopping centres.

SUE-CARIB INDUSTRIES LTD.

Mr. Timbrell moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Sue-Carib Industries Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. E. R. Good moves first reading of bill intituled, an Act respecting the City of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Good: This bill, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Explanations are not given on introduction of private bills.

ESBECO LIMITED

Mr. Edighoffer moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Esbeco Limited.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill—

Mr. Speaker: No explanation is necessary. Was this a private bill?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes.

Clerk of the House: No, it is a public bill.

Mr. Speaker: If it is a public bill, proceed.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you. The purpose of this bill is to limit the leases of public lands to 10-year terms; prevent leasing of public lands that will interfere with waterfront usage of public lands by the immediate community; and prevent the leasing of public lands to persons who are not Canadian citizens or corporations which are not Canadian controlled.

An hon. member: Very good.

ST. PETER'S SEMINARY CORPORATION OF LONDON, ONTARIO.

Mr. Wiseman, in the absence of Mr. Walker, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting St. Peter's Seminary Corporation of London, Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATER ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: The purpose of this bill is to provide a uniform interpretation of deeds of property bounded by navigable waters so that high-water marks shall be deemed to be the boundary of such property.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, even on a technicality, I hate to invoke the courtesy twice. I was very grateful the other day that even though all the members knew precisely what I was going to say, they extended me that courtesy, so I thank them for the second time.

Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate you upon your election, if for no other reason than I can assure you that you will have many more grey hairs from my lack of procedural ability. In fact I think I gave you some today.

Mr. Speaker: I don't want any more.

An hon. member: I don't think that's possible.

Mr. Drea: Oh, It's possible, but I would hope that in the ensuing time that at least I will not cost you too many of those hairs, because I would hate that at the end of a parliament I might be accountable for both, and so I extend my sympathy to you. I, unfortunately, know what you are up against; you may not.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Drea: Well, if you are going to say it, say it a little bit louder so I can hear it. You've been complaining about me.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing to me, and I am sure it is incumbent upon the brow of everyone in the House, is that today we face a very distinct challenge. We face a challenge because not only in this country but in other jurisdictions we are in a period of turmoil and a period of change.

An hon. member: Brought on by the Conservative government.

Mr. Drea: Are you through?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yes.

Mr. Drea: If it was brought on by a Conservative government then you are obviously being misled by certain figures.

But, indeed, we are in a period of turmoil and a period of change. We are in a period of time when I think that we have to decide between two very fundamental objectives: Either we are going to be as fools, and I underline "fools," and we are going to attempt to run government as business; or we are going to be realists and we are going to try to operate government, at least the segment of government that we are in, as it should be run, and that is as a service.

I for one am very proud to be on this side of the House where the very first words uttered by the government leader, the Pre-

mier (Mr. Davis), were on behalf of people because I think that is the fundamental objective. We are either going to have a government for people or we are going to have a government for programmes, and there is a mile of difference between the two. I think it is extremely significant that not only were the first words uttered after the mandate of October 21 on behalf of people, but those very words were echoed over and over again in the Speech from the Throne delivered by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor. If there is anything certain in the Speech from the Throne it is that we have embarked upon a course that is for the benefit of people, and not for that awesome thing mentioned so often by the academics, the pundits and the others—programmes.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe in programmes; I don't believe in them at all. A programme isn't worth anything unless it means something to an individual. I am sure that the hon. members of this House believe with me that the fundamental objective of the work that we do here, the deliberations that we do here, and finally the decision-making process that we do here, has to be on behalf of people.

Therefore, I am very pleased, as I said a moment ago, that the very first utterances, and carried on through such a significant document as the speech by the Lieutenant Governor, were for people.

However, I may say to the hon. members that I am somewhat disturbed by the very many criticisms of that very document; that it was too brief; it was carried on in such a short period of time; that surely if we are going to do things for people, then we must make the documents and whatever mechanisms, simple. It hardly behoves us as members of this House to stride upon the platform every four years, or indeed sooner or later whatever the case may be, and say to people: "I promise you over and over again that I will make government simple. I will make it meaningful to you." It disturbs me a very great deal that when there are attemps to make government simple the reaction instead of desk thumping is catcalls.

And now, I would like to move into a particular area in this province that is of great concern to me and I am sure it is of great concern to members of this House. I think incumbent upon all of us is—and regardless of where we sit—I think incumbent upon us is the realization that indeed, in this province and in this House, we are the cornerstone of Confederation. We may disagree in degree, we may disagree in programming, but I think all of us know this. And I say to you that I welcome particularly the particular section of the Speech from the Throne that dealt with the fact that we are going to extend bilingual services into areas that have not been serviced before.

I say to you, in all candor, je me réjouis tout particulièrement de la décision qui permettra l'accroissement des services bilingues dans cette province. J'espère que nous servirons d'exemple à la réalisation d'un "Canada Rêvé"—toutefois, en réalité, pour les franco-ontariens, il ne s'agit sûrement pas d'un "Moncton."

And I would ask everybody in this House to join me in ensuring that in this province and for the franco-ontariens there will never be a Moncton; and I think we can agree on that without partisan belief.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: About what?

Mr. Drea: Moncton! Do you want me to explain it?

An hon. member: You are talking about my home province.

Mr. Drea: Would the Leader of the Opposition like me to explain it?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Drea: It would seem in this particular country that when bilingual services are available to people who deserve bilingual services, by a simple vote of somebody on a municipal council they are denied, and I would hate to see that in this province and I am sure he would too.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But you said in this country.

Mr. Drea: I said in this province. Are you satisfied?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, please proceed.

Mr. Drea: Thank you. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to a particular area of the Speech from the Throne that I think affects all of us in this province, and that is the particular area—and I am very glad to see it—where we have begun to cope with the problem of recycling. The particular aspect that I would like to deal with is that we have adopted a financing method for a particular piece of technology that will take the abandoned automobile hulk off the roads or off the side roads, or most particularly—and most peculiarly to me—from the more scenic parts

of this province, because for many years the auto wrecker's yard has been a blight on the landscape.

For many years too, I think we have all been somewhat apprehensive about some impacts of technology. After all, it was technology in the basic steel mills that put the abandoned automobile hulk on our highways or in the wrecker's yard. The simple fact is that prior to the introduction of the oxygen lance into the open hearth furnace, the scrap from abandoned automobiles was economically viable and therefore they were all collected. We didn't need the introduction of the oxygen lance. The particular things that came into the flux of the steel flow, and therefore more and more these hulks, these wrecks, whatever you want to call them, were left—an economic piece of obsolescence, but far more, a deliberate blight on the countryside.

The fact that this government has decided to do something about it—to compact them by machine—serves indication upon two things. One, we are very serious about coming to the long-term impact of something that I think we have to realize will be with us for the rest of our lives, and certainly on to our grandchildren, and that is the problem of solid wastes. They are going to be compacted. Probably most of them will be exported where the technology in the basic steel mills is not of the degree whereby they are not needed.

That leads me into something else, and the something else is that all of us—and I emphasize all of us—are probably guilty of the same thing: We are very emotional about the question of pollution. Because of our emotion I think we try to seize upon instant ideas, instant cures, without looking at the long-term affects. I say to you—and I probably will say to you more than once today—this problem is going to be with us as long as we are here. And so when we get a commodity that appears to be some form of disaster upon our society, or even something as relatively slight as a brief disfigurement upon the landscape, we seize upon these instant solutions without thought to the future.

We have a litter problem in this province; and whether the litter is paper, or whether the litter is metal, or whether the litter is glass, we have that problem. But it is not something just found on the highways and byways; it is something that is found indeed very close to our homes, because it is found within the municipal garbage system. How many of us this year, since this appears to be a year of rising mill rates in municipalities, are going to complain about those rising costs, even though we know deep down that those costs are based upon the removal of solid waste from our very affluent households? How many times in the next few months are all of us going to seize upon the kind of instant solution about ban this, ban that, charge this, charge that?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it plain to you that I am always in favour of instant solutions. But I think that we have to take a long look ahead. We have to decide what we are eventually or inevitably going to do with those solutions.

Another jurisdiction, far out to the west in British Columbia, seized upon emotions and passed certain legislation. The legislation was to clean up the countryside; it was to eliminate litter; it was to stop pollution; it was to do a lot of things. For those intentions, I give that Legislature great credit. But—and I would like to state it for the record—the reality is that those intentions just did not suffice, because the culmination of all that instant legislation—and it was very well-meaning, and I would hope that nobody gets me wrong—the culmination was a $2 million payroll lost in British Columbia.

If that was all, then, maybe a $2 million payroll is worthwhile. But it's not all. In effect, for plunging into an instant decision, an emotional reaction to what has to be a long-term problem, the Province of British Columbia is now faced with the fact that it has lost that $2 million payroll. Their solid waste is as much as ever. Their solid waste is costing them more to dispose of. Their solid waste is going nowhere, which is the real threat—and I will come to that in a moment. They have already been forced to change that kind of legislation to set up another kind of recycling depot, and it is going to cost them more money.

Again, I say to you, since I see some snickers from across the floor, I am not arguing the fact that they acted in very good intent. But I am saying to you that time is of some meaning, and some thought has to be given to a great many of these things.

First of all, were we to move into the area of metal cans, what would we be accomplishing? I think that we should have to keep in mind that in this province—and this province is the very heartland and the very capital of the packaging industry in this country, regardless of the particular product that is being packaged, whether it is metal

or whether it is paper—we are talking in term of $1 billion a year.

I don't particularly care about $1 billion a year. I care about jobs and I care about the people who work at those jobs. Were we to listen to some of the frantic pleas and were we to ban the metal can for soft drinks tomorrow, we would be talking in terms of eliminating 1,100 jobs. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad, in regard to some of my past performances or my past career, that those 1,100 jobs in the can industry are the highest paid in this country. We would be talking about eliminating $50 million worth of capital investment.

If it would serve a purpose, then I am not against $1 million or $50 million. But, I suggest to you, the purpose here is that we are not even getting down to the reality, because the reality of the situation is that by banning or prohibiting, we are back in the Middle Ages where the Pope said not to use the crossbow because it was too dangerous. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the crossbow went on and developed into infinitely more dangerous arrangements. What I would suggest to you is, based upon the Speech from the Throne, this government has moved into the very vital area of making a very great distinction—and it is a very great distinction. On the one hand, we have in this province the most affluent society that has yet been known to man. On the other hand, we have this enormous waste problem which, as I mentioned the other day, is even destroying the Ontario dream that we could go on forever with fresh new lands.

What this government is doing is rationalizing and bringing the two together to the point where we will use the very affluent waste—if you will pardon me—from a very affluent society and recycle and rechannel it back into the very processes of production to make an even more affluent society and even more jobs.

And I say, based upon the British Columbia experiment, after all was said and done with all of this legislation, what did it matter in terms of the solid waste disposal—less than one per cent, or 0.8 per cent to be exact.

There is a survey—and before anybody asks me, it was done by a Canadian company, a 100 per cent all-Canadian company—which shows that prior to the legislation which banned a number of these commodities and following the legislation there was no improvement in the litter.

Again I come back to what I said five minutes ago: there was $2 million in lost payroll at a time in this country when 600,000 people were unemployed. I suggest this is not the kind of pilot project or other experiment that I, for one, would want to get mixed up in at this time.

On the other hand, I suggest that while recycling may be as old as man—and indeed the recycling of waste products is as old as man, because up until the last century or so the growing of the food that kept the population alive was based upon the utilization of waste from animals—we are now upon a new threshhold. We are also upon something new in this province. We have the opportunity to be the glowing example, not only for this province but for the rest of Canada, but we are indeed in the fortunate position where we can introduce the kind of technology that can take the very worst out of our existence, which is our waste, and channel it back into what should be the very best of our existence, which are new products that will raise not only the material standard of living, but the personal dignity of all the residents of this province and, indeed, this country.

For instance, we hear some criticism now about the fact that in the future we are going to have to harness more and more artificial sources to produce electricity. It may be of interest to the House that to produce one ton of aluminum from its natural state—from bauxite right on up into the ladle that pours it out—takes 17,000 kilowatts of hydro power. To recycle aluminum—that is the tear-top tin, that little lever on a beer can or on a soft drink can—takes but 186 kilowatts. And here we are in this province talking about the fact that in the year 2000 we may be getting short of electricity.

Again in terms of basic steel production—and basic steel is tin cans—we are talking in terms of 2,700 kilowatts to produce a ton of plate steel. To recycle it—that is, to pluck a tin can out of the garbage and put it through again—only costs us 700 kilowatts.

I think these are the things that this government, by the fact that we are going into areas that are perhaps not the most obnoxious, perhaps not the most dangerous —because an old hulk and an old road never really poisoned or killed anybody—but we are going into an area to show it can be done and this is a measure of intention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another area which I find most significant. That particular area is the fact that sometime within the near future we are going to have offtrack betting. I will not attempt to

mislead the House. I like to play the horses provided I pay my admission. I like to see them run. But I must say that I have some very, very serious misgivings about government going into the gambling business as such. I have some very, very, very serious misgivings.

If government is going in solely as a regulatory body that is one thing; but I would hate to see the day when the government of Ontario is so far into the gambling business, especially with the thing on credit, that when we drink our morning coffee we see a nice little headline, "Government garnishees wage; no milk for kids." I think that is somethink that we all have to think about.

When we went into another area of so-called social enlightenment—and that was the fundamental question of how we would distribute liquor—we made one very firm commitment. You didn't buy the liquor on credit. We weren't telling you what to drink or how much to drink but you had to have it in your back pocket to do it. We still have that today despite our permissive society. I would very much hate to see the day when somebody could make a very routine phone call and say, "Give me an if come and reverse in a nine-horse parlay and a double quinella."

Five or six months later, we go down before the division court referee—and remember when government does down there so do all of us because we passed it. I would very much hate to have my name associated with the fact we were going to garnishee someone's wages because of a moment of social weakness—especially so since we have already in this province regardless of the area in which we're in more than adequate private mechanisms to record and take bets.

I am not talking about the glorified bookmakers who have masqueraded for more than two years because of the ineptitude of the federal government with this little sign outside—the neon sign saying, "Offtrack betting." I am disregarding them totally. We have already in this province more than enough mechanisms to take bets, to record bets, to set up a pool.

Our function, I say to you—and I sincerely wish the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) was here because I would say to him—our function should only be to regulate and our function should only be to redistribute the particular tax on the tote board. That should be the function of the government of Ontario. I say to you, woe unto us if we ever get into running under "government of Ontario" a place to bet. I am a betting man and I say that in all sincerity.

One last thing. Ever since I have entered the House—and it has been very brief—I know my presence here has been the cause of much derision by some. It has concerned me a very great deal that this government is constantly accused on this side of the House with trying to run government as business.

I have already said, and probably far too long ago, I don't believe the business of government is "business". The "business" of government is service! The "business" of government is people! And I am very proud to see in the Speech from the Throne that we are going to continue on in that function.

For, despite the pious academics—and I take it by now that everybody has a pretty good insight that I have very little use for academics, with all due respect; and I have equally less use for pundits—it is about time that some government in this country of ours restructured itself so people could understand it. This is the first time that anybody has ever tried it, because we have gone back to the time of Confederation and we have put basics where they belong; we are right back to the basics. We are right back to point number one, to personal health and welfare. That was something very important in 1867. We are right back to personal liberty, or justice; and that was very important then. We are right back to developing the resources of this province; and that was very important then. And, finally, we are right back to trying to administer the things that we do for people in the most efficient way possible.

And I suggest to you that the reorganization of government in this province is far more than the little bit of jest between us. Maybe it is funny to us here, as to whom the question is asked, but I suggest to you, out in the riding, the question to whom the question is asked is not very meaningful. In the riding they want some action. In the riding they want to know where they have to go when they have a particular problem.

In the past my career has been devoted to the particular thing of finding out where people had to go. And I can tell you that in governments previous to this it was very difficult. In governments previous to this I didn't know.

I am very glad to say now that there are only three general spheres. If you do have a problem, if you are interested in the particular kinds of legislation that are going to be adopted, if you have ideas, if you have inquiries, we have transmitted, on this side of the House, what has been the election

promise of every single party that has run in this country since 1935—and I looked it up last night—and that is to make government simple. And we have made government very simple. There are only four places to go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Drea: We have made government very simple; does that satisfy the members? There are only four places to go.

Over the past we have built up artificial barriers; not through any fault of anybody in this House. And, to the members of the opposition, they have had governments in this province, they have established those artificial barriers too. We have tried to formulate departments of government that met with the needs of the day.

Now that we are in the 1970s, and we are planning for the 1980s, those artificial things, those artificial barriers are no longer meaningful, because, as fast as they are erected, they are torn down by progress in our society. So this reorganization of government has been done, rather than being something that has just been considered. I think I have seen the thing about somebody from General Motors, but General Motors couldn't do this.

In the reorganization of government I say to you on this side of the House, and with all due deference to the Provincial Secretary for Justice who loaned me these words, many of us have been too busy attempting to solve yesterday's problems instead of planning to avert tomorrow's. We are averting tomorrow's problems by planning for tomorrow. On that note I conclude my speech.

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, we came in today expecting great things from the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea). In fact his reputation had preceded him with such ferocity that we were all warned before his speech began that we mustn't criticize him because it was his maiden speech and as a courtesy, we mustn't heckle, no matter how we were provoked.

But that warning was unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. For the first time in this House I have seen a phenomenon which I didn't think was possible. Sitting up behind me in the gallery, there were some 100 members of the Conservative association from one of the ridings, and in the middle of the speech they walked out. Never have I known a Conservative group to get bored so easily before.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): They are walking out now. They knew the member for High Park was coming.

Mr. Shulman: Apparently I have the same effect on Conservatives as the previous speaker.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They are all leaving now.

Mr. Shulman: Don't go away, the fun is just beginning.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate with some regret that you are not in your chair and are listening to the loudspeaker somewhere in the bowels of this building, because you and I must have words. Everyone else has congratulated you on your elevation, and I give you my personal congratulations. You are a very fine, kindly gentleman. However, I am not completely satisfied with your conduct since you have been in the chair.

This is a matter that is really terribly important to me and, I am sure, to every member of the House. It relates first of all to the speech which I am beginning in this Throne debate.

Some indication has been given by the government that we must all be finished within some six sessions, by the end of next week. I reject that, sir. As I suggested to you yesterday, there is an absolute right for every member of this House who wishes to participate in this debate, to do so and to bring up the matters he will.

At the present time there are only two occasions on which a private member of this House can bring up any matter of importance to himself or his constituency. It is this debate and the budget debate.

We used to have a question period. Remember the question period? The private members used to be able to come in here and ask ministers of the Crown questions. They had to submit them ahead of time because the ministers of the Crown are not too bright and they like to submit them to their deputies to get the answers. We didn't mind that too much. At least we got a chance to get our questions in and get an answer.

That is no more. They have changed the name of the question period. Now they call it the leaders' period.

Every day we have a lovely debate between the cabinet ministers on the one side, and the two leaders on the other; which is very, very nice for them but not so nice for the members who sit behind them.

I say to you, sir, that part of the responsibility is yours. If the leaders have preempted all this time, it is up to you as the guardian of our rights to set up two question periods. We'll have the leaders' period and they can have their daily debate. Then we should have the private members' question hour which is what the original idea of the question period was.

I have a list of the questions that have been asked here since we began sitting.

Each day, on average, there have been five minutes of the 45 given to all the private members of this House, from all three parties. It works out so that we all get one minute a month, one question a month, if we keep it nice and short.

That is not the purpose of the question period. That is why my speech today—and in coming weeks because it may take some time—is going to take some of your patience, sir, because I haven't been able to bring up many of the questions which should have been settled in the question period. We are going to have to look after it here. I am sure this applies to many of the other members.

I strongly suggest to you, sir, that it is time something was done. Let's go back, if we must, to the other system. It had its inequities. The ministers had an advantage, they were given notice ahead of time. All well and good, at least we had our chance and we don't have it now.

I've been trying since the beginning of this week to ask a question which I felt to be of urgent public importance. I was only third or fourth on the list and it was impossible to get in.

Today was typical. Not one of our members got a chance. Not one of the Conservatives got a chance; not one of the Liberals got a chance. We didn't get a single question in today from the private members. The purpose of the private members' hour is not a debate, it's a private members' hour. It is a question period, supposed to be. Let's get back to it.

I think I would like to begin my comments that I would like to make in this debate by giving some passing reference to the Conservative Party and to the Edmund Burke Society. I have a letter here from J. Paul Fromm, president of the Edmund Burke Society. I think that might be words worth reading to the members of this House because of those members who are not aware of the political stand of the Edmund Burke Society. A lot of people think they are mixed up with Social Credit and Mr. Fromm wants to set that straight. I would like to read his quotation into the record so we will all know.

> The Edmund Burke Society does not dominate Ontario Social Credit. Perhaps only 20 per cent of our party has membership in the Edmund Burke Society. As a person who holds membership in both organizations I can say that many members of the Edmund Burke Society are not supporters of Social Credit and in fact prefer the Progressive Conservative Party.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It is their privilege.

Mr. Shulman: This is from J. F. Paul Fromm, the president of the Edmund Burke Society. I have always had my suspicions of where this great support comes from, but it is nice to see that the right people are supporting the Conservatives.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The right people on the right.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: A few others too, I might add.

Mr. Shulman: And a few others we note to our dismay. Perhaps I shouldn't go into that!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is right.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make comments about some of the new members of the House and perhaps some of the ministers. The minister I worry about most is our former minister in charge of the environment.

There have been various comments made here about his demotion; how he was sort of kicked upstairs to the universities. There have been snarky comments from the opposition. We can understand the opposition making snarky comments. It is always interesting for me, sir, to read the hometown newspapers that come from the various cabinet ministers' areas, to see what is being thought back at the grass roots; what they think their boys are doing. It was with some—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): This is good old George?

Mr. Shulman: This is good old George.

With some interest, I noticed an editorial that came from his hometown which explained why he had been kicked upstairs. I have been wondering about it. You know there have been rude accusations made that this had been done to him because he had started taking his job seriously—he really believed the environment was to be cleaned up and the polluters had to be treated in the way polluters should be—and that the Premier (Mr. Davis) was a little upset that he took his job seriously. That was one of them, but I didn't believe that because I didn't think the minister would allow himself to be kicked upstairs if that were the situation.

I was glad to find the real reason as it appeared on February 3 of this year in his hometown newspaper. I would like to quote it, it is very brief.

> George Kerr was put down by Bill Davis because the Premier considers the Halton West MPP one of his more serious threats as a future candidate for the Premier's job. Kerr was a John Robarts appointment and his entry to the cabinet came at a time when the Tories of Queen's Park were in bad need of new blood and more life to perk up the deadwood on the front benches.

If I may digress for a moment. The deadwood on the front benches has died; we don't seem to have anybody on the front benches at all. But this is par for the course. The House leader has to stay here; he is trapped. I am glad, because I will be getting to him in due course. But the others have all fled.

Anyway to continue with the quotations.

Mr. Renwick: The leader and the whip, that is all.

Mr. Shulman: To continue.

> Robarts turned Kerr loose to build himself a political future as the cabinet's chief newsmaker. As the Minister of Energy and Resources Kerr established himself as Ontario's Mr. Clean, as he talked up tough legislation to fight pollution and clean up the environment.
>
> Remember those early days? Kerr was front page material, top newsmaker, and he was developing an army of followers around the province; people who liked his style, his candid manner and his easy-going nature.
>
> During the last leadership campaign, Kerr was mentioned as a dark horse to succeed Robarts. He wasn't a Davis fan. He remained Robarts' boy wonder. He continued to rate headlines.
>
> It all added up to less than a senior cabinet post. Suffer the war against pollution; nuts on the environment; politics first. So Kerr is sent to a job where he will be less visible and probably less affective in terms of public service to Ontario.
>
> Of course, replacing Kerr with Jimmy Auld may tell us something about what rating the environment is going to receive by the new, new Davis government. Auld is more tabby than tiger—Mr. Invisible, not an aggressive Conservative.

And that's the end of the quote.

Well, I thought perhaps the members of this House would like to know what happened to good old George; and there we have it straight from the horse's mouth. I hope all members will be kind to him in the question period, because he is suffering, he really is.

He really got hepped on this whole pollution thing and he really wanted to do something about it. And he's so upset to see the minister who is taking his place—Mr. Do-Nothing there—because now he knows as well as we know—but we won't discuss it. Goodbye pollution, up you know what!

Well, we have some backbenchers here, and I'd like to welcome them all. I'm sorry they're all from the wrong party. There are a few, a very few, who came into the opposition, but something went wrong in our campaign. We haven't quite figured out what it was. We hope to get it figured out before the next election.

Practically all of the backbenchers—they're enveloping us—are from the wrong area. I sat over there a few moments earlier today and I looked across at the opposition benches. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you I was shocked. I didn't realize there were so few of us. It seems like a very tiny group. And so I have to make up with volubility what we lack in numbers.

Well I was delighted to see that in today's Toronto Star one of the Conservative backbenchers has made a speech and he's really got big publicity. It's the member for Humber (Mr. Leluk), and he's got a great spread in the Star; I was very impressed by it. He was discussing the drug problem, and that's a very serious problem.

He was explaining how you can spot someone who's taking drugs if he happens to work in your firm. The points were outlined there and I read them with great interest.

The first point was watch out for someone who's wearing sunglasses inside. That was very interesting, and I was wondering why, you know, people wearing sunglasses inside might be taking drugs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: He went on to explain that they're wearing them so that you can't see their pupils.

An hon. member: I see one member over there!

Mr. Shulman: Well, I looked around the House today and the only person wearing sunglasses, unfortunately, was on the Conservative side. I went over very close to him and I pretended to ask him a question. I studied his pupils very carefully. They look like the same pupils as everyone else, but perhaps the member for Humber knows something that we don't.

The other thing he said, the second point, was look out for someone who's getting people visiting him from other departments.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: I thought that was rather strange. But I presume he's an expert in the field, he must know what he's doing. So I went down and I stood in the Conservative corridors this morning. I watched—people were rushing in and out—and I found that the man who was getting the most visitors was the former Minister of Labour, he's now the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton).

I went and studied his pupils too. I'm afraid I didn't learn anything from that either. I'm not sure what you're supposed to look for in the pupils.

But the third point, and this is the one, this is the one that I really like, this is the tipoff. Watch out for people in your office who are making a lot of phone calls! The reason they're making a lot of phone calls, they're setting up connections to pick up the stuff.

Well, I alerted my caucus and we went down and we watched carefully. And of course we found that all the secretaries were making a lot of phone calls. So now we know who the pushers are and who the takers are in this building—it's the secretaries.

Anyway, I'm glad to see that the new member for Humber—I'm sorry he has just left—has got his eye on the ball, he's thinking straight and he's obviously cabinet material. I'm looking forward to seeing him move up in the cabinet because he will obviously be excellent front bench material.

An hon. member: Especially in his dark glasses!

Mr. Shulman: Well I have something more to say about the hon. member for Humber, but perhaps I'll wait and hope he returns. I'd like to say this to his face.

I have another editorial here which I am not going to read—it is rather lengthy—but it rather intrigues me, because you all remember that leak that appeared in the Toronto Sun a few weeks ago where our great Prime Minister sent out a letter to all of his backbenchers saying: "For goodness sake, don't get caught if you are having any conflict of interest. We don't want to have any embarrassing situations."

And so on February 10 the Journal-Record, which is out in Oakville, somewhere near where our Prime Minister comes from, wrote an editorial which is headed: "If Bill Davis is serious, let him reveal the bagmen."

What they are saying is: "Come on, old Bill, the trouble isn't with your backbenchers who may be voting on things on which they have a little interest, that isn't going to matter, it is going to pass regardless. The trouble is, who is giving you all that money? We really want to know who is giving you all that money to finance the party."

I mention this with some interest, because I have a rather intriguing story to tell you about the financing that took place in High Park. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will find it of some interest and I will come to it very shortly.

So I am just going to put this editorial aside for a moment. We may have to come back to it, because it is of some interest as to who puts up the money to finance the candidates.

It is of special interest to me because of the situation that developed in High Park, but I will tell you about that. In fact, since we have come to that, I think you might be interested in hearing of some of the things that happened during my election campaign. The others may not be interested, Mr. Speaker, but I know you'd be interested so I'll tell you.

You may be aware, Mr. Speaker, that the insurance companies took some minor interest in the campaign that just went by; they felt that they had something to lose if the wrong party got in.

They did all sorts of things. They set up organizations and pumped in money, but they did one great thing for which I want to thank them publicly today, because I don't think anyone really has thanked them publicly. I know a lot of people over there have thanked them privately, but I want to thank them publicly.

They told all of their employees that they could have all the free time off they wanted to work for the candidate of their choice to make sure that democracy prevailed in this province and socialism was beaten back. Now one of those insurance companies is Shaw and Begg Ltd. of this city, at 350 Bloor St. East, and they sent a letter to all their employees saying:

"Look, it is important you know, that the right party gets in here. We want you to get out and work and we are going to give you time off. You are still going to get your pay and the supervisor will do everything possible to let you have the necessary time away from your work. If you have got a company car in your possession, you can use it on behalf of your candidate on election day, and if you want to use your own car we will pay you 10 cents a mile."

At any rate, some of the employees didn't quite understand the message and they went in and said: "Gee, that's great. We are going to go out to work for Shulman." The president of Shaw and Begg swallowed hard—I haven't got the letter here—and to his credit he didn't disallow me. He said: "Well, we have got 8,443 going out for those other guys; I guess you four can't do any harm." He sent them out and he paid them the 10 cents a mile.

So for my help in being re-elected I want to thank the insurance companies, because I do appreciate it. It helped. I am sure it helped. It was a narrow vote.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Things are tough all over!

Mr. Shulman: Well it was an interesting election campaign, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal candidate was especially interesting. She was a beautiful young lady. Her name was Laima Svegzda.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): When I saw her, I thought you were in trouble.

Mr. Shulman: Well when I saw her I knew I was not in trouble, because it was going to be a delightful campaign and it was. And I will campaign with her, for her or against her at any time.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Would the member say it was a bust?

Mr. Shulman: She was a delight, let me say. This is the way politics should be.

In a way I was hoping she would be elected so I could converse with her across the floor, but there were difficulties in arranging that. It was a pleasure campaigning with Miss Svegzda.

I am afraid the Liberals didn't take her campaign quite as seriously as I did unfortunately. They gave her only $1,000 for the campaign, and when they gave her this sum they said: "Miss Svegzda, we have great news for you. We have got $1,000 for you, and not only that we have got a promise from the Toronto Star of a full front-page spread with your picture on it, which is good for thousands of votes." And they delivered on both their promises. They got the full front-page spread; they gave her the $1,000. When that was gone, on the second day, she called them up and said: "What do I do now?" And they said: "Well, that's it. You spent all there is. That's your problem."

So her campaign didn't go too well, although it was of some advantage, let's say.

Mr. Givens: Would the member say it was a bust?

Mr. Shulman: I thank the member for York-Forest Hill. Her campaign was a magnificent bust. It didn't go too well, but it got great crowds out for our all-candidate meetings.

There were two other candidates. One was a gentleman named Geza Matrai from the Edmund Burke Society; he based his campaign on attacking Mr. Kosygin when he arrived—he threw his arms around him—but unfortunately that didn't quite go well because he ended up in jail and spent the whole campaign period in jail, including election day. He couldn't even get to vote for himself—which is why he missed that vote but he got three others.

Anyway, there was another candidate. The Conservatives also nominated a candidate. The Conservatives, let me say, were in some difficulty. They have been in some difficulty in west Toronto in recent years—not just in High Park but in Parkdale, Dovercourt and

Humber. They lost their base of support there as the 1960s rolled along, and they felt this time they had to make a massive effort to re-elect Conservative members from the west end.

They did all sorts of interesting things. In Dovercourt they chose a member they felt would get traditional support plus a little extra support. His name was Nixon, and he did very well in that traditionally Liberal area. There might have been some slight confusion there, but we are glad to see him here. It shortens the debate and makes it a little less excitable with that particular change.

The same thing happened in Humber. With the greatest of regret, I am sorry to see that George Ben has gone because we always sort of sat here watching the Leader of the Opposition in trepidation and sympathy wondering, "What is that guy going to do to him next?"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: The leader would get up and make his speech and then George would get up and say: "That's not where the Liberals stand." One day I said: "Bob, you should carry a dart gun; when that guy gets up, you should give it to him." And I hope he won't mind me repeating his comments; he said: "I need a scatter gun."

Anyway, I am very sorry we lost George Ben because he added a little touch of uncertainty to this House. Everything is so predictable here. We know what everybody is going to do. We know the Lieutenant Governor is going to get up and give his great speech, saying that everything is wonderful in the province. The Leader of the Opposition and the members of the other parties get up and say everything is awful—"How can you give such an awful speech?" It is so predictable.

But George was great, because whatever you expected him to say he said the opposite. If you got up and said something outrageous on this side, he would get up and support you. Then you would say something that was really quite common sense and he would say, "How can you say such a horrible thing?" There would be a great hour's diatribe on the terrible things that you had said.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We miss him too.

Mr. Shulman: I really miss him, I really do. While I am speaking of the Leader of the Opposition, I must pay him a tribute, and I mean this from my heart, I really do.

Mr. Givens: What heart?

Mr. Shulman: I really think the Leader of the Opposition would have made a great Prime Minister of this province—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: —and it is with some mixed regret that I am sorry he never had that opportunity. Unfortunately, as Leader of the Opposition, he had something lacking, something—we are not even sure what it is.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Fifty members!

Mr. Shulman: Yes, perhaps it's 50 members. But I was sorry to see him go—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What was it the member said at Guelph about me being "that" farmer"?

Mr. Shulman: I'm getting to that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He can repeat what he said about his leader if he cares to.

Mr. Shulman: I was asked what the results of the two leaders had been during the election, and I said they both had rather disastrous results. I said: "On one hand, one was too much from the city and other was too much from the farm." But since the Leader of the Opposition has reminded me of that—

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): As a matter of fact, one of the editorial writers said the member for High Park might join the Liberal Party as leader.

Mr. Shulman: The Liberal Party? As leader?

Mr. Worton: Yes.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I think I might have the same problem their present leader has.

However, to come back to High Park—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Too bad about his problem.

Mr. Shulman: There was a Conservative candidate running in High Park. He didn't have the financial problems that the Liberals had. His name was Yuri Shymko. He was a very personable young man. He was a high school teacher.

He had lots of money. He had lots of supporters helping him and had a great deal of help from various ethnic groups. He did something which all of us try to do, but not nearly as successfully. He attempted to be all things to all men in High Park.

Now there are various issues in High Park, but I suppose one of the issues, or one of the problems, is that there are many ethnic groups in High Park—and if you can run as the favourite son of one or more of those ethnic groups you presumably have some advantage.

And I think quite legitimately he decided he should exploit whatever chance he had there. So he appealed to the various Ukrainian organizations in the riding, saying: "It is unfortunate that the one person who is of Ukrainian extraction in the House has been of great disappointment to us—the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. Yaremko)—and we really should have someone there with a modicum of intelligence. And so if you will support me we will have someone of our extraction there whom we don't have to be embarrassed about."

I think this is a legitimate comment and a legitimate plea for help. And as a result, these organizations did pledge help and sent him a lot of supporters.

This is fine, but there are other ethnic groups in the area and he didn't want to neglect them either. So I was a little surprised to when over the Polish radio, which we listen to, there came early in the campaign: "Vote Polish, vote for your Polish representative, your Polish candidate. Yuri Shymko's father was a Polish miner."

Let me say the Polish miners—those are the real tough guys in the mines in Poland—they are not like our miners here. They don't have ministers of northern affairs looking after the miners there. Now when you say someone is a Polish miner, he is really tough. I thought maybe there was a mistake, you know, the areas are fairly close there might have been a misunderstanding.

However, I did get a little upset when his Maltese pamphlet came out. Now, there are a lot of Maltese in my riding and his Maltese pamphlet, which is printed in Maltese, was exactly the same as the pamphlet that was printed in English—with one little exception. Where it came down to his nationality that was left out. And when it came to his language, it said: "Only candidate who speaks Maltese." Now it didn't actually say he was Maltese, so I couldn't get too upset about that.

However, the very same day the German paper came out—and I have the German paper here and it is called the Courier. And here is this very great ad—and he is a very handsome man; I really must show you, Mr. Speaker. He is such a young, handsome boy, and I think maybe he got bad advice. And this ad translates: "Vote for your German candidate. Yuri Shymko is a German university professor."

Well he is not German; he is not a university professor. And I finally became a little upset. After all, how could he be so many things at once. I knew he was very talented, but I did not realize he had all these talents.

So we had a public meeting and I brought this paper to the meeting and it came my turn to speak. And I said—

Mr. Sargent: Are you paid $18,000 for a speech like this?

Mr. Shulman: Well, it should be more, but what can we do? We have to take it. They give everybody the same. If things were equal the hon. member would get $8,000 and I would get $28,000; but they average it out regardless of ability.

Anyway, to continue—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member would win the modesty prize, too.

Mr. Shulman: I said to the candidate as he stood there: "Is it true you're really a German university professor?" I brought this paper out and I said: "Could you say something in German just for the benefit of all the German people in the audience?" And he became very upset with me, and quite rightly so. And he said: "It is a plot." And he said: "I did not put that ad in the paper." And he pointed at me: "I know who put that ad in the paper." He didn't say who it was but he said: "I know who put that ad in the paper, and it is a plot against me, to discredit me. Of course I am not German, of course I am not a university professor, and it is a plot and we are going to find out who put it in."

"Well, I thought that if someone is plotting against him we should expose that person. So the next day I went down with my campaign manager to the Courier to find out who was this dastardly person that had placed the ad and we found out it was a certain Dr. B. Brown of the George Brown College who, by coincidence, was the Conservative candidate's official agent.

So when I found that his own agent was plotting against him I was worried for him. You know campaigns can't go well when your agent is against you.

Well, the campaign went along, but we had problems. I must tell you we had a problem out in High Park. The major issue

as it turned out was aid to separate schools, and the riding is divided exactly 50-50 between Roman Catholics and Protestants. So this became a very burning issue as to what stand you were going to take.

The Liberal candidate came out forthrightly and said: "I am for aid to separate schools." And with some trepidation I came out forthrightly and said: "I am for aid to separate schools"; but I said it as quietly as I could.

The Conservative candidate showed imagination. Now I must admit we weren't very bright, the Liberal and myself. The Conservative showed imagination, he came to the various audiences—and first of all we had to speak at St. Joseph's Hospital, in front of all the nurses, and it is a very large Catholic group. The Liberal said: "I am for aid to separate schools"; and there was a great cheer. And then I said: "I am for aid to separate schools"; and there was a great cheer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A little louder that time!

Mr. Shulman: A little louder!

And then the Conservative got up and said—and there was a little booing when he stood up, because this was a solid Roman Catholic audience—and he said:

"Elect me! They have chosen the wrong programme; but I am a Roman Catholic, I have gone to a Roman Catholic separate school, my children go to the separate school, let me be your voice.

"Elect me; let me go in there and change their minds. The opposition can't change their minds but I can work from within, I can change their minds."

And he got a very big hand. Well that was very nice.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): J. W. Spooner did the same thing.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): It was done in Yorkview too.

Mr. Shulman: Ah, but there was a little difference here.

The next night we went to the Baptist church; and the Baptists weren't exactly in favour of aid to separate schools, let us say they weren't enthusiastic for aid to separate schools. And something had made me suspect that perhaps the Conservative wasn't going to say exactly the same thing; so we brought along a tape recorder and we put it in the back of the pews, for which I was very severely criticized by the Conservatives afterwards, for secretly taping this speech.

But anyway, I confess I did it secretly, and I apologize; it was a terrible thing to go into a church with a tape recorder. But let me read it; it is very brief but it speaks from the heart, and we know how Conservatives speak from the heart. And I quote:

> We must remember that 75 per cent of all the Catholic students from grade 8 go to public high schools. Only 25 per cent go to separate schools. If the other 75 per cent receive aid and move to a separate system, you will have to build schools for the separate system.
>
> A separate system. The next thing they will ask for is a separate curriculum, a separate teachers' college, even a separate Department of Education.
>
> They won't be content with up to grade 13; they will want it from kindergarten until you get your BA.

End of quote.

Now this is the way to be a politician. All these amateurs sitting around here not knowing how to talk to the people. No wonder we don't get elected, no wonder we can't form a majority, you have to tell people the right thing.

Mr. Worton: At the right time!

Mr. Shulman: At the right time!

Now obviously, by the hosts of Conservatives surrounding us, they have learned their lesson.

Now, I did something very unsporting, and I apologize to the candidate and to the Conservative Party for doing this, it really was very mean of me and I should not have.

The day after that we were due to speak at St. Michael's College. I went down and I spoke first, then the Liberal spoke; and then Mr. Shymko made his "I am a Catholic" speech. I had brought along my little tape recorder, and I couldn't resist—the devil had hold of me—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Where was the member's camera?

Mr. Deans: Is the member's name Flip Wilson?

Mr. Shulman: I couldn't resist—and I apologize, I really do—I played his speech back. And the riotous scene that ensued—you should have seen it, Mr. Speaker, because it would have warmed your heart.

Before the candidate fled from the vengeful students who were converging on him he accused me of being—well I can't remember all the great adjectives; unethical, improper, unfair, dishonest—for deigning to take, in a sacred place of worship, a speech that was just meant for that sacred place of worship.

Well he didn't just appeal to all people, he had a platform; and I was glad, he had an interesting platform. He had a platform which in some cases I found unanswerable.

We went to Humberside School and there were 1,000 people in the audience and we all had to present our platform. When the Conservative got up to speak he said: "Elect an independent group. We Conservatives don't depend on receiving money from anyone. We speak for the people. Now the socialist candidate—some people call him socialist; some have a worse word—now the socialist candidate in this riding is a tool of the labour union. Did you know that the AFL-CIO sent $194 million up to the NDP in 1969?"

You know, if $194 million was sent up, I sure didn't see it! I didn't get my piece. I was paying for my own election campaign and I was a little upset to realize that somewhere hidden away we had $194 million. We could have used a little of it for the election.

Mr. Bullbrook: Where is the member's leader today?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Spending the $194 million.

Mr. Shulman: He is a little worried because I am speaking so he is speaking to a university student group!

In any case, I was a little upset, so I asked him: "What is this $194 million. Where did you get that information." He said: "It was in all the newspapers." I said, "Well, can I see that newspaper?" He said, "Well, it was back in 1969 and I didn't save it, but everybody knows; it is in the congressional records, they sent $194 million!"

As I sit here this past week, I only wish that Mr. Shymko, the Conservative in High Park, would let the member for Scarborough Centre know about that $194 million because the member for Scarborough Centre has a bill to stop us sending money to the unions in the States. Apparently, the member for Scarborough Centre thinks that the unions in the States are living on our funds, on the funds of the unions here in Canada. Apparently, the Conservatives in west Toronto think we are living on the funds from the unions in the United States.

I am not sure which one is right, but I do wish the two would get together and inform me which is correct so I would know which position I have to defend. It is very confusing. On one hand, I was standing up there defending our receiving $194 million; now I have to say it is perfectly proper for us to send money down to the unions in the States. You know something? They are both full of—something or other. Anyway, I don't really think that $194 million figure was quite accurate.

Actually, after I got back, I got in touch with the headquarters in Saskatchewan—the money was supposed to have been sent to Saskatchewan—and there had been a cheque received as it turned out. I had said there was no money received; it turned out I was wrong and the Conservative was right or at least partially right. A cheque had come up during the campaign. Unfortunately it was for $194, not $194 million! It had grown a little as the news had been transmitted from Saskatchewan.

There were other intriguing things that happened during the campaign. The major point on which the Conservative based his campaign to be elected was that they had a non-active member, someone who didn't do anything, who was never in the House. He based this on an article written by that terrible reporter from that terrible paper, the Toronto Telegram. The reporter is Eric Dowd; he had written an article saying I was never here.

By the way, that terrible reporter is now that wonderful reporter, Eric Dowd, who works for that wonderful paper, the Toronto Sun. My colleague! Things change; politics change; people, situations.

In any case, he had this little piece of paper which he copied—I think he had made 40,000 copies—about how I am never in the riding. "Do you want a member who is never there? Elect an active full-time Conservative."

As we look across at the active full-time Conservatives, we can see what he meant. He knew what he was talking about!

There are one, two, three, four, five—there is almost a 10th of the seats filled. So he knew. I compliment him. He knew what he was doing.

I had one embarrassing situation occur. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, I am still embarrassed about it. I was having some problems with the ethnics. My ethnic background,

unfortunately, is not the same as 99.99 per cent of the people in the riding which elected me, and the Conservative candidate who was running against me was basing his appeal on his ethnic background. He appealed to the 20,000 persons of his own ethnic background living in the riding to support him, which is quite legititmate; I don't criticize that at all.

However, what bothered me in the middle of all this excitement was I received a letter from the Canadian Jewish Congress and they said: "We demand that you not use your Jewish background to solidify the Jewish vote." There are only two Jewish voters in High Park and I didn't answer that letter. I think I became a little apoplectic. I didn't know quite what to say.

However, after the campaign was over, I got another letter from them. It was a very nice letter. It is very brief and I would like to read it to you. I am glad the member for Downsview is here; he will enjoy this letter especially. I am not familiar with the name but it is a Jewish organization which apparently represents the Jewish people, or some of them in this city. They congratulated me on being elected and said:

> We are indeed most mindful of the fine contribution you are making on the Ontario scene and we are very proud to claim you as one of our own. May you go on to even greater heights.
>
> Yours sincerely.

I was very proud and very pleased until I happened to notice the salutation and it said "Dear Mr. Singer"!

Mr. Bullbrook: Now you are sending it to him!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Will you send Shulman his now?

Mr. Shulman: Well, that was the lighter side of the campaign, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately there was a more serious side to the campaign, and it is something I have hesitated for some lengthy time before bringing to this House, but I think it is important and serious enough that I should bring it here. Some of the people who sit here are aware of it already.

It was a dirty, unprincipled campaign run by the Conservative Party, the facts of which I wish to present to you today, because I hope they—or some of them—will dissociate themselves from the things that occurred in High Park during the last provincial election. I would be ashamed to be a member of a party that did the things that your party did, and I am going to detail it, date by date.

On Wednesday, September 15, one of the Conservative workers came to my office and said he was very upset at what was happening at Conservative headquarters. Instructions were being given to all the campaign workers that in their work in going door to door they were to stress my Communist background and my racial background. Quite frankly, I did not believe it. But I felt the man—I have known him for some years; he is a patient—was reliable enough that we should check this out. So I hired a detective agency and we sent in two volunteers to Conservative headquarters to see what, in fact, they were saying.

On Wednesday, September 22, the two volunteers were instructed to come to a briefing session which took place at Conservative headquarters. There were some 20 persons sitting about the room. The campaign manager said: "You are now going to get your campaign instructions. They will be given to you by Miss Irma Patterson who is going to handle this aspect of the campaign." Miss Patterson was introduced. She then said: "We are going to win this campaign. We are going to beat Shulman. By the time this campaign is over, no one will vote for him. We are going to pin the Commie label on him."

She went on to tell them things they were to say door to door. She started off with why I was fired as chief coroner. Her explanation was that there had been a fire at the Workmen's Compensation Hospital and there were bodies lying everywhere. I was called on a Saturday but didn't show up. They called me again on the Sunday; I didn't show up. I finally appeared on the Monday with my family and, with the bodies lying all about, held a press conference with my picture being taken for the use of the Toronto papers.

She went on to say: "He is dishonest. He bought stock and didn't pay for it. The police are still trying to get the proof so that they can send him to jail, because they haven't been able to tag him yet. He is a terrible doctor; he is incompetent; he doesn't know what he is doing. He is a bad Jew. He puts up Christmas lights."

It does sound ludicrous, doesn't it?

Mr. Johnston: That dame is about as weird as the member is.

Mr. Shulman: If it had stopped there it would not have been so bad. Unfortunately, this type of instruction was given to people, many of whom are not Canadians; as it turned out many of whom come from a Middle Eastern background where this type of hate campaign can whip up. They became whipped up, and within days we began to run into very serious difficulties.

The first thing that happened was on Thursday, September 30, when Mr. James Nugent and Mrs. Lillian Miller were going door to door in the north end of the riding on Maria Street. A call came in—and let me say at this time we cannot prove who made this call, but you will see it fitting in with other evidence later on, where we do know who did it—and we were told that unless they were taken off Maria Street and taken off the ethnic homes there they would be killed. They were quite frightened. Everybody gets crank calls and we did not pay much attention to that We reassured them and sent them back out.

That was on the Thursday. On the Saturday, I was campaigning personally on Bloor Street West. I parked my car on Dorval Road and when I came back an hour later a brick had been thrown through the window, the car had been filled with mud and there was a Conservative sign under the brick. That was Saturday, October 2. We complained to the police, but of course there was nothing they could do.

On Wednesday, October 6, a pamphlet was distributed through the riding, supposedly by the NDP. Let me read you—it's a phoney, of course—some of the things in this pamphlet:

> We recommend the provision to relevant nations, such as some in the Caribbean, of financial aid to enable them to expropriate private Canadian property on their soil.
>
> Universities—We recommend the tuition fees be abolished to free the student from dependence on his family.
>
> We recommend the cessation of sales of strategic resources, such as nickel and uranium, to the USA and governmental allies of the USA, whether in Europe, Asia or Latin America.

And it goes on—reportedly an NDP pamphlet but completely phoney. It was distributed in a blitz. They went to the apartment houses, starting on the top floor. A group of men quickly descended to the bottom, ran out into cars and disappeared. We couldn't prove who did it. But by this time I was sufficiently disturbed.

This was Wednesday, October 6. On Thursday, October 7, I phoned the Prime Minister of this province and I told him what was happening in High Park riding and he was upset. He said he was upset. He said to me: "I hope you realize I have nothing to do with this and would not, in any way, condone such actions." Then he went on: "I give you my word, it will be stopped within the hour."

I couldn't have asked for anything more, because I had the word of a man whom I trust, whom I believe in and who, I believe, is a sincere, honest human being. But unfortunately, whatever he did had no effect whatsoever.

In fact the campaign immediately quickened. The next day, Friday, October 8, a man was going door to door saying that I had to be beaten because, if I wasn't beaten, the Communists were going to come into power. Fortunately, one of the people was so upset, when he heard this, that he followed the man, and we got his name. They followed him back to Conservative headquarters. His name is Danich Ziokovic. He lives at 165 Maria Street. He had been given these instructions at Conservative headquarters. He was doing what he had been told to do.

The very next day, Saturday, October 9, occurred one of the most unpleasant and distasteful episodes in this election campaign. The day before, Mr. Ray Zarbelny, who lives a 440 Willard Avenue—he is the personnel manager of the separate school board—had come to my office and volunteered to help. He said: "What can I do?" I said: "Great, take a poll and go door to door in your own neighbourhood and put up a sign in front of your house. It'll help convince the people in your area."

The next day, Saturday, October 9, a man whom he recognized, came to his door, called him a traitor because of the "Communist" sign in front, ordered him to take the sign down immediately and stop working for me or he would come back with a gang to "fix him." I'm quoting. The man was recognized as one of the Conservative workers.

I can't blame Mr. Zarebelny. He phoned me up; he said: "I have a family; I can't afford to take a chance." He took down the sign. He stopped working for us. He said: "I can't go door to door for you. They won't know how I vote, I'll still vote for you but I'm afraid to work for you.

So we lost that worker. We called the police. PC Schroeder investigated, but, again, he said: 'What can we do? There were no

witnesses. It was one man saying it to another. How do we prove it?"

That was Saturday, October 9. On Monday, October 11, we received a complaint from Colbeck Street that a man was going door to door distributing Conservative literature saying: "We have to beat Shulman, the Communist Jew. They took the licence number of his car. It was a blue Rambler, licence number 522-588. We followed him back to Conservative headquarters. His name is Peter Sanavyn. He had been given instructions at Conservative headquarters what he was to say going door to door.

That very same day I received a complaint that the Ivan Franco Home, which is an old persons' home on High Park Gardens, had refused entry to NDP canvassers. You may recall there is also an Ivan Franco Home out on Royal York Road, which is in Humber riding, and at that particular establishment you may recall that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Brant, and the then sitting member for Humber, were refused admission, as was the NDP candidate. They would only allow admission of the Conservative candidate in the riding.

That was out of my area and I wasn't too worried about that, but when I received information that my people had been refused admission to the home on High Park Gardens, I phoned up and said I personally wanted to come. I spoke to the woman in charge, a Mrs. Pasternak, and she said: "Well, we are very busy here. The only time that's free would be at 10:30 Thanksgiving morning." I said: "Fine, I'll be there at 10:30 Thanksgiving morning."

Because most of the people in the home are very elderly and do not speak English, I took two interpreters with me, two of my workers of Ukrainian and Polish extraction who speak those languages fluently. And we were welcomed—or at least we were allowed in. The old persons were brought down from their rooms into the central area and I began by saying: "My name is Morton Shulman. I am the NDP candidate in this area, and I am asking that you vote for me for re-election."

Mrs. Pasternak, the lady in charge, said: "I will translate for you." She then spoke to them in Ukrainian and said: "I have just translated what you said." The gentleman who was with me, the one of Ukrainian origin, said: "That isn't exactly what she said. What she said. was, There are three parties in this province. There is the Conservative Party, which helps us and gives us money for this home; there is the Liberal party, which does nothing for us; and there is the NDP, which hates all ethnics."

I didn't think this was too literal a translation of what I had said, so when my interpreter told me I remonstrated with Mrs. Pasternak and I said: "If you don't mind, I will have my own interpreter translate for me from here on in." She said: "You certainly will not. You are only here through my courtesy and you will do as we say." I was a little upset about that and I said: "Well, we are going to try to talk to them."

I said: "Is there anything I can do for any of you? Can I assist you in any way? Do you have any complaints?" My interpreter translated that, whereupon Mrs. Pasternak became very upset and said: "If anyone has any complaints, they can leave here immediately. We are not going to have anyone with complaints here. If they have complaints, they will be thrown out."

And I said: "Don't be frightened. If you have any complaints, you can tell us. If you are afraid to say anything now, have your relatives write me. And if there are any complaints, I'll see that an inspector comes from the Department of Social and Family Services and things will be rectified here."

She said: "Oh no they won't." And I said: "Oh yes, this is a public nursing home and if there are any complaints that are legitimate, she'll have to rectify the things that are wrong here or else the place will be closed." She said: "Don't you dare say that;" whereupon we were thrown out bodily and that was the end of the interview.

That was Monday, October 11. Next day, which was the 12th, the two Ukrainian newspapers appeared on the streets and there was a letter purporting—I use the word "purporting"—to appear from one of the elderly residents of the home, saying: "Dr. Shulman came to the Ivan Franco Home on High Park Gardens and if the NDP is elected, the home will be closed and all the old people will be thrown out in the streets."

I have a little more to say about that home and the then Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Wells), but we will come to that a little later.

The next day, Tuesday, October 12, a Conservative campaign worker came to 35 Marmaduke Street, which happened to be the address of a patient of mine, and said—and I quote—"Shulman is not only a Communist but also a member of the Mafia." I must admit that one threw me a bit, because I have never been given credit for that particular allegiance.

But, more seriously, on the very same day a large black swastika was painted on the side of my office on Roncesvalles Avenue.

At 7:40 that night there was a public meeting of all the candidates, and I had spoken to Mr. Roman Melnyk, who is the president of the Ukrainian Heritage Association. He is a very fine gentleman, a lawyer, and he is completely bilingual; although he is a Conservative, he is a thinking Conservative—a rarity, I must admit. I told him of the terrible things that were happening and he said: "I can't believe that Shymko knows this is going on. It must be some of the people who are working there who are doing this. Please let me get you together and tell him what is happening and I am sure this can be stopped. So 20 minutes before this meeting I met with the Conservative candidate. He asked for the details; I gave him all the details. He said he would investigate it and would let me know.

When the meeting began 20 minutes later, by the luck of the draw he was the first speaker. Let me say I was a little surprised when he got up and said: "There have been serious accusations made about some of the workers in my campaign. Let me say I have made a thorough investigation and there is no basis to any of them." Obviously his investigations are similar to the type of investigations we see from the right side of the House, and I use the word "right" advisedly. That was Tuesday, October 12.

Wednesday, October 13, the Syrena Stamp Store at 2049 Dundas Street West made the mistake of putting my picture in the window with a "Vote for Shulman" sign underneath. Three men entered the store at 8:45 p.m. that night and told the owner that he would lose all his customers if he didn't remove the picture. He refused. One of them knocked over his chocolate bar display. An argument developed with a customer who was in the store, and the customer was knocked in the nose. There was blood everywhere and the customer was taken to the hospital.

The next day, October 14, one of my workers went to 33 Parkway Avenue where she was driven from the door by the cries of, "Dirty Communist." Well, it was a private home and you can say what you wish in a private home. But I want to tell you the name of the person who said this because this woman happens to have some significance as we go along. Her name is Mrs. Julia Sanocka and she lives at 33 Parkway Avenue. I am mentioning her name because she is guilty of personation, which I will tell you about shortly. She was a Conservative scrutineer; she voted, and I will tell you about that very shortly.

October 15: another Conservative worker on Marmaduke Street and this is a new one, said: "Shulman, because he is bad medicine, has been taken off the medical rolls."

October 16, and this was a new switch, Mr. Roman Melnyk called me and said: "I am very upset with you, Dr. Shulman. I just received a phone call from Irma Patterson." Remember Irma Patterson? She was the lady that was giving all the instructions at Conservative headquarters. She informed him; she called Melnyk and said: "You know what that Shulman did now? He sent me a note today asking how I could work for a stupid honk." Well, I don't use terms like "honk," and I have never written a note to Irma Patterson ever. When Mr. Melnyk told me this, I said: "It is just a lie. Ask her to produce the note, because I didn't send any such note." He phoned her back and said: "May I see the note?" But she had misplaced it; she couldn't find it.

Another problem was that our signs had been disappearing. We wanted to find out who had been doing it, so we put out people watching. That day we caught a 14-year-old boy, the son of one of the Conservative campaign workers, at 373 Armadale ripping down the signs. We didn't lay any charges because of his age.

The next day, October 17, one of my workers who had gone with me to the Ivan Franco Home has his aunt as a patient in that home, so he went to visit her. This was not a political visit; he was just going as a visitor. He was not allowed in to see her. He was driven away with the cries of: "We don't allow Communists in here."

The next day, October 18, in front of the Brighton Theatre on Roncesvalles Avenue, signs were painted, "Dr. Shulman and Zionists out." The same signs appeared up on Bloor Street. Swastikas also appeared in front of the Polish church where the minister had suggested that I was worthy of some support.

The same day Karen's Boutique, which is a little store on Roncesvalles Avenue, had the awning torn because they put a sign up, and the people ripping the sign ripped the awning down. More serious—the store next door, the barber's supply shop, which had put a picture of mine in the window, had a brick thrown through the window and a phone call

immediately after saying, "If you put a Conservative sign up, you will have no more bricks."

The next day a letter was delivered to every Maltese home in the riding in Maltese – an anonymous letter – saying: "Don't vote for Laima Svegzda; she can't help you, she has no support. Don't vote for Shulman, he only helps his own people. The only person who looks after all the people and is fair and honest is the Conservative. Vote for the Conservative."

Finally we came to election night. On election night a man phoned me who had been working throughout for the Conservative candidate and he said: "I have worked for him throughout all this but something has finally happened that I can't tolerate. They have 200 ringers who are going to vote tomorrow who are either not citizens, or are from out of the riding, or are going to vote more than once. One of the polls you should watch specifically is number–I have it here –189, because they have about 20 ringers they are going to vote there."

We made a special point the next morning of watching that particular poll. The first person to vote was the Conservative scrutineer, a woman by the name of Julia Sanocka. I may have mentioned her earlier. She is not a Canadian citizen. She has only lived in Canada two years. She is a citizen of, I believe, the Soviet Union, or of Poland; I am not sure which. My scrutineer phoned me as soon as she had voted and said: "We caught the first one." And I immediately called the police and ran over there myself.

As my car came up, I parked in front and ran in and went up to the deputy returning officer, and her name is Donata Rogocki, and I said: "This woman is guilty of personation and I demand that you follow the regulations which you have in front of you on the desk"; and I have a copy of them here. The regulations read as follows:

> It is your duty to take the information of the person making the charge of personation on oath when requested to do so by a candidate or scrutineer. You may either on your own or at the request of anyone proposing to lay such a charge, detain or direct the detention of the person against whom the charge is being made until an information is laid and a warrant for his arrest issued.

And then the definition is given:

> Every person who votes when not qualified to do so is guilty of personation.

There is no question she was guilty of personation. Well Mrs. Rogocki said: "Well, I have to get instructions from the returning officer," and she went to phone. Five minutes passed and a car screeched to a stop in front of the building. I had moved back into the kitchen and the person getting out of the car couldn't see me. Guess who it was? It was Miss Irma Patterson.

Remember Miss Patterson, in charge of Conservative headquarters? And she came running in and she ran up to Miss Sanocka. "You must leave immediately. We have got certain information. You have to get out of here. We need you somewhere else."

And I said: "Oh, no, she doesn't," and I came out from the back of the building. "Oh, no, she's not going anywhere." And just at that moment, fortunately, the police car came up and a policeman came in and I gave them the evidence. He said: "Well, it is very clear here; it is very clear she is guilty of personation. It is very clear here the deputy returning officer, having heard the instructions, must hold that person and lay the charge."

But the deputy returning officer came back from the phone and said, "I have received instructions from the returning officer in the riding that I am not to lay the charge."

And the returning officer of the riding, when I phoned her at that point and said, "How can you give these instructions," replied: "I didn't know what to do so I phoned the chief electoral officer, Mr. Lewis, and he said the charge was not to be laid."

What proof do you need of personation when you catch them red-handed; and he said the charge was not to be laid. So I said to the policeman: "Don't you dare let that woman go." And I called the Crown attorney for Metropolitan Toronto and he said: "All right, give me all the information. I don't see any reason to arrest her. We will summons her later. Let her go."

They let her go and guess what happened. I get a phone call two weeks later: "We are not going to lay any charges because there was no intent. She said she didn't know she wasn't allowed to vote, and chief electoral officer, Rod Lewis, agrees with our decision."

So now ignorance of the law is an excuse? If you say you didn't know you weren't allowed to vote, you can go in and do it?

Can the Conservatives get away with ballot stuffing? They have got one guy on the front bench ballot-stuffed in here and I'll bet they are sorry they did.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Those guys were pretty desperate in the last election after blowing $6 million.

Mr. Shulman: Well that isn't the end of this sorry story, I am sorry to say.

All right, they got away with every dirty trick in the book and it didn't really help them any. They couldn't win that riding anyway. It was an exercise in building up people's passions and building up hate, which will serve them ill in other parts of the province and is serving them ill right now in High Park because people aren't stupid. Every ethnic group reacted against this.

The result was I got a bigger majority than before. I got 58 per cent of the vote instead of 49 per cent of the vote. It didn't help the Conservatives but they done a lot of damage to inter-racial relations out there and everywhere else and they should be ashamed and someone from that side should disown it; nobody has. And someone from that side should disown Yuri Shymko.

Let me tell what has happened now. Yesterday I got a letter—the final, final sad thing in this horrible story—I get a letter from one Kurt Jeppesen, owner of Kurt Signs Limited, and he says: "Can you do something so I can collect my money, owing to me by the Conservatives?"

I will just read a copy of the letter which he sent to the Conservative:

> Dear Mr. Shymko:
>
> During the last provincial election my company was engaged to supply campaign material for you as a Conservative candidate in the High Park riding. The charges for this material were as follows—

He goes on and lays out the charges. Then it says:

> Balance due and outstanding—$1,637.40. I have consistently been promised payment on this long overdue account, but to date have not received full amount. Being a small manufacturer I am unable to carry such a large amount for five months.
>
> The work was undertaken in good faith and under a very small profit margin, barely enough to cover my overhead for the time involved. I am sure that the party, the candidate and the candidate's agent would not want this made public. Please pay me.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Kurt Jeppesen.

Mr. Renwick: The big blue machine.

Mr. Shulman: So I phoned Mr. Jeppesen and I said: "Is there some misunderstanding? Maybe the candidate doesn't know that you haven't been paid." He said: "I spoke to him just yesterday. He said the Conservatives promised to give him the money for the campaign but never came across."

I knew that the government opposite did lots of dirty things; but I didn't know it doublecrossed its own candidates.

He is not the nicest candidate in the world, he is not the best candidate in the world, but at least pay his bills. You are not doing him a favour; you are doing a favour to the small people who are victimized by the Conservative party.

We read the statement of receipts and expenditures and I understand why he is in some difficulties. His receipts were only $18,369.28—enough to run four of our campaigns—his expenditures went somewhat over $24,209.88. So he decided not to pay the small printer.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry story and if I were a member of the Conservative party today I would be ashamed. I am ashamed even though I haven't been a member of that party for 10 years. It is an embarrassing thing. I am embarrassed that it could happen with any political party today. The Social Credit wouldn't do anything like that; the Birchers wouldn't do anything like that; the Edmund Burke Society wouldn't do anything like that. It had to be the Conservative party. I am ashamed for all of you.

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member is sorry for himself.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): We never thought they were that bad.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): The member is all right, though.

Mr. Ferrier: Is that the way they do things up in Algoma?

Mr. Shulman: Unfortunately this wasn't the only riding here the Conservative party got a little desperate. I could spend two days talking about what went on in St. Andrew-St. Patrick, and there they were really desperate. If there is one man who should not be sitting in the House, it is the man who purports to represent the people of St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman). They did things in other ridings which were not as flagrant, although there is one in Humber I must tell you about. I think you will find that amusing.

That reminds me, I must come back to the Ivan Franco Home. Remember the Ivan Franco Home? They had an interesting experience on election day. We were smart enough in High Park to put scrutineers in that particular area, but in Humber they must have been short of scrutineers because neither the Liberals nor the NDP put a scrutineer into—

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): We won didn't we?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, the member won all right—put a scrutineer into poll 62B. That is the poll at the Ivan Franco Home. There were 86 votes cast and the vote was as follows: Leluk—85; Cummings—1; Ben—0.

I was rather intrigued — hear them clap; I wonder if they will clap in a minute.

Mr. Leluk: Let's hear it.

Mr. Shulman: The persons in that home are elderly people, most of whom do not speak English. The morning of the vote they were told: "We will have someone mark your ballots for you." Only four of the people objected. One of them insisted on voting himself. I wonder who she voted for? That one person went under such severe pressure that she had to leave the home.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is that what you Conservatives clapped for?

Mr. Shulman: That is how the Conservatives get votes and they have the gall to stand there and clap for it.

Mr. Leluk: Claptrap, claptrap.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Shame on them.

Mr. Martel: The epitome of society.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, there was an aftermath of this situation in the Ivan Franco Home. I received letters from relatives of the residents complaining that the patients were being mistreated. I waited until the election was over and the heat of all this passion had dissipated somewhat.

At that time I was debating what to do when several of the employees of the home came to my office and said: "The patients are being very badly treated in that home. In some cases they are not receiving their proper medication. In some cases they are being actually mistreated by the woman in charge, Mrs. Pasternak." What could I do about it? I said: "There is not much I can do. We lost the election but I'll get in touch with the minister in charge—

Unfortunately, it was the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells)—and see what can be done. We don't expect much from the member for Scarborough North but we think he can understand a simple little think like this." So I wrote him a letter—

Mr. Martel: That is stretching it.

Mr. Shulman: It was expecting too much, as it turned out.

Mr. Martel: That is still stretching it.

Mr. Shulman: I wrote him a letter on November 18 and I told him about the complaints that had been received from patients and from staff. I sent him a copy of one of the letters I had received from the mother of one of the patients and I asked—and I'll read the last line—"I hope you will see that the inmates of the home are visited by a Ukrainian-speaking inspector who has the opportunity to speak to them individually and privately. Yours sincerely."

I didn't hear back from the minister but I did get a visit some three weeks later from three employees of the home who said: "What kind of help are you giving us? Someone came to the home to investigate and the employees and the residents were all questioned in front of Mrs. Pasternak. What did you expect us to do, lose our jobs and tell the truth? Of course, we couldn't tell the truth, we were afraid of our jobs. The residents were afraid of being mistreated after the inspectors left. No one was willing to speak up."

That is typical of the minister, as we recall what he has been like in his previous portfolios. Thank God he is in education. Maybe some of it will rub off now.

In any care, I wrote him again on December 15:

> Dear Mr. Minister:
>
> You may recall I wrote to you of the Ivan Franco, a home for the aged, on November 25. Subsequent to my letter, an investigation was held by three members of your department, including one who spoke Ukrainian. Yesterday, I was visited by a delegation of three employees of the home who informed me all the interviews took place in the presence of Mrs. Pasternak, the administrator, and the persons interviewed were afraid to answer truthfully for fear that they would be ejected from the home.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that the Indian Road home?

Mr. Shulman: No, it is on High Park Gardens. It is at the corner of Indian Road. No, it's not. It's at the corner of—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The one I went to?

Mr. Shulman: No, the Leader of the Opposition went to the one out on Royal York—that is the same management. I'll finish the quotation:

> I then phoned the head of the team that did the investigation for you—a Mr. Penny—who responded to my complaint by saying that he would call Mrs. Pasternak to check if the investigations were done properly This really is a farcical form of an investigation. I once again request that a proper investigation take place.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Morton Shulman.

Well, that was December 15. Nothing happened. Weeks went by and on January 25 I received another complaint from other people who had been in the home so I wrote again to the minister.

> Dear Mr. Minister:
>
> When can I expect a reply to my letters to you of November 25 and December 15 concerning the Ivan Franco Home. This matter is extremely urgent as the welfare of many people is involved. I hope you can find time to take care of your correspondence.
>
> Your sincerely.

That seemed to do it. I finally got a reply dated January 27—a very lengthy reply which, in effect, said: "Everything is fine. Of course we interviewed all the people in the presence of Mrs. Pasternak. After all, she is the administrator and we should interview them in her presence, and there is no reason why anybody should be afraid to answer in her presence."

Well, the mind boggles at the man's incompetence. The only good thing is that there is a ceiling on the expenditures in the department in which he is now in, because, otherwise, I am sure he would bankrupt us all. Of all the incompetent members on that side—and there are many—he without doubt ranks first.

He is incompetent; he is unfeeling; he is unaware and he is unfit to carry out his job. Here we have people in a home for the aged where there have been a series of serious complaints that people are being mistreated, and he won't even look. He won't give a proper look.

Well, I phoned. I thought let's see what really happened when these people went there. So I phoned the Ukrainian interpreter, who had gone along with the inspector, who had gone to do the interviewing. I don't want to get this gentleman into any difficulty. I wont quote his name here. He was just the interpreter. He said to me—off the record and over the phone: "There is something funny going on there, but what can I do? I was just called as the interpreter and Mrs. Pasternak was present while the questions were asked." But, by coincidence, three more employees came in who are willing to have their names used, because they have now given up and left the home and I am going to give their names.

First, there is the cook. She worked there for three years, leaving in 1971. Her name is Mrs. Zoia Hrachko. She lives at 141 Beresford Avenue. Her phone number is RO3-1671. She has now left, so she said: "You may use my name." She came to me and she said: "Most patients in that home are afraid. The patients fear Mrs. Pasternak because of her irrational actions and the staff fear her and they are afraid to speak out. She should not be in charge of elderly or sick people."

The second person – bear with me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, while I get my list—

Mr. Johnston: The old scandal sheet!

Mr. Shulman: Doesn't the member care about elderly people? We expect little from the member for St. Catharines.

Mr. Johnston: I certainly do.

Mr. Shulman: The member is also front-bench material. We keep praying that he can get in the cabinet and raise their intellectual level.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ferrier: Is that the member for St. Catharines' maiden speech?

Mr. Shulman: The second person is a nurse—

Mr. Martel: Bullet Bob Johnston!

Mr. Shulman: —Mrs. Rose Bojvczak.

I have to digress just for a moment. The strangest thing happened during the last campaign. In St. Catharines all of the opposition were hoping that the member would be re-elected, and all of the Conservatives were hoping that he would be defeated—for obvious reasons.

To come back, the nurse, Mrs. Rose Bojvczak, 69 Fullwell Crescent, phone number 635-1589, said in her statement:

> The patients are treated badly. They are punished capriciously with no reason whatsoever. Mrs. Pasternak has no respect for them. She will treat them very peculiarly, depending on her mood. One day she will come in, and there will be food left by a patient's relative and she will say nothing, if she likes the patient. If she dislikes the patient, she will scream and rant and rave and take the food and throw it on the floor.

This is from the nurse.

> The people in there are scared. I would have told when the inspector came, but what could I do? Where will we go?

That is what one patient said to her.

The third ex-employee is one, Mr. Zenin Wijtenko, and he was the accountant for the Ivan Franco Home. He lives at 72 Indian Grove. He said:

> The patients are treated badly and with favouritism, depending on whether they fawn on Mrs. Pasternak or not. Medications are cut off at her whim and the doctor is afraid to say anything, because he has a limited licence and much of his work comes from these two homes. There is no use asking the doctor for what is happening there. Mrs. Pasternak is the boss.

There we have three employees who are not afraid for their jobs. They have given up in disgust. They are willing to be spoken for. We also have the interpreter from the department.

Thank God we have got a human being in as the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Brunelle) now. Yesterday, I called him, and to him I give a tip of the hat because he is one of the better ministers—and thank God there are a few of them over there—and I showed him all this. He said: "Obviously what we have to do is have an inspector go in with an interpreter and interview the patients privately and see if something is wrong, because, let's face it, it is possible that things have been exaggerated. It is possible that the employees there don't like an authoritative boss. It is possible that a few of the patients are senile and are misunderstanding."

All this is possible and I don't deny this possibility, but how can we be sure if the minister who's responsible for the welfare of those elderly people won't even look? Thank God that man has gone off to a relatively harmless spot in Education. I can't imagine what great harm he can do there. He's not in charge of the innocent and the helpless! We have a man now for whom I have the greatest of respect and I'm hopeful that something will be done for these people. At least a proper investigation will take place.

Enough of that, Mr. Speaker. Let's turn to lighter subjects for a while. I would now like to look at the government ministries, some of the government boards, because some of them are worth looking at. It's interesting to see how these ministries work and it's educational for the new members to know how their government looks after everything. We know how proud they are over there of the ministries and the boards they administer.

I want to tell you what some of the boards have been doing recently to help things. In today's Star I noticed an article that the Liquor Licence Board has struck again. You know the Liquor Licence Board? That's that wonderful board which comes under the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko), unfortunately; that's another of the front bench material they have.

The Liquor Licence Board is supposed to license, as I understand it. They are supposed to go around and supervise the places that sell liquor; to make sure they're clean and that they don't cheat their customers; and that the gang doesn't move in and that nobody gets beaten up there. In other words, to make sure that the Liquor Licence places are run with proper health and safety rules.

However, somewhere a while back, a little misunderstanding took place. The head of the Liquor Licence Board, is an ex-policeman. He was a good policeman, Chief of Police Mackey. The best policeman I've ever known, but as the head of the Liquor Licence Board he should have stayed a policeman.

He has decided that what is important is not so much: Is it clean? Is it proper? Are they cheating the customers? What is important is: What is the entertainment that is going on in these places? Are the people sitting or standing at the time they have the entertainment?

Remember the great crisis last year when he said the people in Julie's may not stand and drink, they must sit down? Then he went to other places and said people may not sit and drink, they must stand up. Apparently there was different terminology in those places. He struck, as you'll recall—I like this one—at Honest Ed and said people in Honest Ed's, if they order drinks, may not order hot

dogs. The hot dog is the symbol of dissolution. That still stands, you know. At Honest Ed's, by rule of Chief Mackey, you may not order a hot dog, because if you order a hot dog they can't give you a drink.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Honest Ed even makes you wear a coat.

Mr. Shulman: We can't blame that on Chief Mackey, but we can blame the lack of hot dogs on Chief Mackey. Let's say there is not much common sense shown by this particular official and by this particular board. I was intrigued by today's paper—they have struck again. Let me just read what it says:

> Regular Sunday floor shows at the Neraida Club, a Greek night spot on the Danforth, are being halted by the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario.

Mr. Worton: I am all for that.

Mr. Shulman: To continue:

> We will permit only recorded background music or live dinner dancing. No cabarets. We read an article in the Star last Monday which said that several performers occasionally danced on the tables and this cannot be allowed.

Dancing on the tables is verboten for entertainment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is this on Sunday?

Mr. Shulman: Only on Sunday.

Mr. J. F. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Never on Sunday!

Mr. Shulman: Now Chief Mackey with his brilliance, his clear insight as to what the Conservative government wants him to do, has said "We must not allow dancing on tables on Sunday. If you have anybody dance on the table on Sunday, we'll take your licence away."

Mr. Worton: Not if they're sober anyway.

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps that was it! Perhaps they thought if people were dancing on the tables, if the entertainers were dancing on the tables, the people who were sitting around would get carried away and they might dance on the tables and Conservatism would collapse in Ontario! That might be the explanation.

There's another one here that puzzles me. That must be the explanation. There's one here that I hope someone on the Conservative said will enlighten me on because this one—really I don't understand it. It says here: "The Liquor Licence Board of Ontario has now enforced a ban on dart throwing in the Starting Game Room of the Heritage Inn, east of New Woodbine."

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Even against sports.

Mr. Shulman: I quote:

> What had started to become a most appreciated social gathering of the feathered arrow fans in an appropriate setting, has now ended. Said one bitterly upset dart-playing addict: "Since my favourite game is now no longer permitted here, I suppose I'll have to settle for Liquor Licence Board-approved nude entertainment. Oh well, I suppose our peers know it is better to stare with glazed eyes at bare boobs instead of shooting for double tops."

This is Conservatism today—conservatism in action! This is not a staid government. They know they are moving forward. This is a province today; is there anywhere you'd rather be?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The member should be on the stage.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): The people of Ontario said so.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: It isn't just the Liquor Licence Board, mind you, who are, if I may say so, slightly off their rocker. They have to be off their rocker to enforce rules like this. It is just beyond all comprehension.

I think the explanation, Mr. Speaker, is simple. Someone up there—that's in the Liquor Licence Board; there is an office somewhere up there—received a message from someone down here. Our great minister, the Provincial Secretary, who is in charge of liquor, said: "Here is the book of regulations. This is what is allowed and this is what is not allowed." Somewhere in there I think they mispelled the word as "darting" in pubs. As a result he has gone out and he has carried out the rules very, very carefully; and through his misunderstanding we are no longer allowed to have darts.

Anyway that is a suggestion that has come from someone to the right. We will never know what the true reason is.

There are sounds of levity about me, Mr. Speaker.

It isn't just the Liquor Licence Board—we also have the Liquor Control Board. I want to tell you about the Liquor Control Board because I had a wonderful experience with them last week.

I bought some liquor. I confess to all concerned!

Some hon. members: Shame!

Mr. Shulman: I represent one of the two dry areas left in the province. I think Owen Sound is still dry. And the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) and I have decreed that we are going to fight to keep our two areas dry as long as we can—and certainly I am fighting it a little harder than he is—but in all fairness and all honesty my area is dry and I hope it remains dry. It is one of the few oases in the city that is like that. But despite the fact that I don't like them selling it out there I like bringing some home occasionally to drink.

I made the mistake of buying some brandy. I made the mistake of not buying it through the Liquor Control Board. I saw an ad for some brandy over in England and I bought 24 bottles.

There is a law in this province that you may not import any liquor or any wine unless you do it through the Liquor Control Board. That's reasonable. They want to get their cut too. So I phoned up the Liquor Control Board and said: "What do I do?" The man said: "Well, just have them send it to us and we'll look after it and when we get it, you can have it—once you pay a little squeeze."

So fine, I sent a letter to the firm in London and they sent me a letter saying they were shipping the stuff airmail. Three months went by and I received a lovely letter from the Liquor Control Board saying: "If you will come down and pay us"—and the sum was a little more than I paid for the original brandy—"you can have it." I thought, that is great. After all, they have to live too.

So I made out my cheque and said: "I was wondering, if it is all right if I bring a cheque?" They said: "Yes."

I said: "Okay, I'll be down shortly after 12."

"Oh, don't come then."

I said: "Why?"

"Well, it's siesta hour."

"What do you mean, siesta hour?"

"We all take lunch together."

I said: "You've got to be kidding."

"No, we close at 12 every day. From 12 to 1, that's siesta time."

So, I don't know; they have that in Mexico. I thought maybe the Ontario government had decided this was the way we should live—that we should bring it here, to Ontario. It's not a bad idea.

So I phoned the Premier's office—I was curious about this—and I said: "Are you bringing in the siesta? Is this the new thing? We are now going to work from 9 to 12 and we'll siesta from 12 to 3 or something, and then we'll work from 3 to 8? It works fairly well in the hot countries, I am told. If he want to bring it here I am not going to fight it hard, I just like to get the rules straight."

The girl in the office said: "No, I wasn't aware of this." I said: "Well, one government department is, the Liquor Control Board." She said: "No, I don't think so."

So I phoned back to the Liquor Control Board. I said "Are you sure this is the policy because the Premier's office doesn't know about it?" He said: "Well, that's the policy here. We all like to take our lunch together." So I said: "All right, if that's the policy, I'll be down at a quarter to 12." He said: "Oh, you'd better come before that." I said: "Well, why should I come before that?" He said: "Well, you see we all like to be out at 12 sharp, and if you only arrive at a quarter to 12, somebody might have to stay behind and we all like to take our lunch together." So I went down, and I had a rather interesting experience there. Perhaps I should tell the House about it; it was enlightening.

It was on Friedland Street and I got there at 11:30 as I didn't want to be late. There was a huge parking lot but it was all filled. I thought: "My God, they must be busy in there." Actually I was the only customer. They have this big parking lot for the employees, but they don't leave any space for the customers because, well, what the heck, we know who's important in Conservative Ontario—the employees.

I looked, I went around the block a couple of times and there was nowhere to park. There was a public parking lot two blocks away, but there were two cases of brandy I didn't see how I could carry two cases of brandy so far.

Finally, there was a tiny spot right beside the entrance, so I squeezed in there and got out of my car.

I went into the front office and said: "I would like to pick up my brandy. Here is the receipt for it." He said: "Is that your car?" I said: "Yes." He said: "Well, you'll have to move your car first." I said: "Okay, where shall I move it to?" He said: "I don't care where you move it, just move it anywhere." I said: "But there is nowhere to move it to; you have all the spots filled with your employees' cars." "That's your problem."

I thought about that for a minute, then I said: "Well, what if I don't move it?" He said: "We will have the police tow it away." I said: "Okay, you have the police tow it away. I just want to pick up my case, and I'll be gone before the police arrive anyway." Where do I pick up the liquor?" He said: "I'm not telling you."

On the wall a sign shows where the various offices are; and I got in the elevator to push the button to go up to the third floor, which I presumed was where I was to pick it up. Another fellow came running out and said: "You can't use the elevator until you've moved your car." I said: "There is nowhere to move the car to."

I pushed the button on the elevator, and he said: "Oh, no you don't," and put his foot in the door to make sure the elevator couldn't go up. I thought this was a little strange, but I guess this is normal government civility. I said: "Okay, if I can't use the elevator, I'm willing to abide by the rules." So I walked up the three flights. I didn't want to get mad because they have rules—if you park in the wrong place you can't use the elevator.

I went up to the third floor and I said to the girl on duty: "Where do I pick up my brandy?" She said: "Oh, that's down on the first floor. Leave the money here." So I gave her the money, and said: "Well, where do I get it?" "You go into the shipping department." So I said: "Where is the shipping department?" "Well, when you go down to the first floor, ask that fellow by the elevator where it is."

I said: "What if he won't tell me?" She said: "Of course he'll tell you—don't be ridiculous."

So down I went. I said: "Where's the shipping department?" "I won't tell you." Honest!

I didn't know what to do. I thought there was no use perpetuating this. I went outside, and there was a fellow walking by. I said: "Do you know where the shipping department is?" He said: "Oh yes, right in there." So I got in my car and drove over. I said: "Where do you pick up liquor?" And he said: "That ramp."

I backed the car up to the ramp, got out of my car and said: "Here's my receipt; I paid for it. Can I have my brandy?" Another official appeared and said: "Oh, no, you can't put your car there. Move it back to where it was before, and you have to enter the shipping department through the lobby." I said: "I don't know if they will let me." He said: "Sure they'll let you. You move your car back right where it was before beside the door and come in through the lobby."

So I moved the car back to where it was before, went into the lobby and said: "Where is the shipping department?" There were two of them now standing shoulder to shoulder. "Oh, no you don't! You're not going into the shipping department until the police arrive." At this point I thought I'd better go up and speak to whomever is in charge of this establishment. I couldn't use the elevator, so I climbed up the three floors again.

There are all sorts of offices all around the outside, and I wasn't sure which person to speak to, so I stood in the middle of the floor and, at the top of my voice, I yelled: "Who runs this madhouse?" They all ran out—and several of them claimed credit for it! They took me back downstairs again, and a whole bunch of them escorted me bodily into the shipping department and gave me my brandy—all except three bottles which apparently had got lost between the time it arrived at the Liquor Control Board and the time I had gone to pick it up. They told me at the time that they had been broken on arrival. I opened the original cases but there are no liquor stains or broken glass; I guess they must have evaporated.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Glass and all!

Mr. Shulman: Glass and all! There is only one thing that really bothers me about this, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps you can enlighten me: Why do they all have to have their lunch together?

Oh well, I guess I'm not going to get an answer there.

Someone has just handed me a poem which they've asked me to put in the record, and for the sake of completeness I will, before I leave the subject of the liquor Licence Board:

Ontario is such a respectable place,
Drinking is no crime but it is still a disgrace.

That is courtesy of one of the Liberals to my right and I thank him.

I want to go on to a more serious matter, Mr. Speaker. I really have very little hope of any reform in the liquor field until a particular minister, the Solicitor General—designate (Mr. Yaremko), goes to his just reward. Let's hope the Conservatives win the next federal election so that they can put him in the Senate because that is the only hope we have of getting sane liquor laws in this province.

I want to turn to the Securities Commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange, because something very unfortunate has happened there, which to my mind is extremely discriminatory and about which something should be done.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon, was that a question?

Mr. Speaker, last year there was a very flamboyant securities collapse by a company of the name of Malone Lynch. This company went bankrupt, as a result of which it appeared as though a number of clients would lose their money. Fortunately, the exchange stepped in and used its contingency fund to make up the losses and there was no difficulty there. But I am speaking now on behalf of the employees of Malone Lynch, many of whom were completely innocent of the situation that led to this collapse, yet some of whom have been punished most unfairly.

After the collapse took place the Securities Commission and the Toronto Stock Exchange stepped in and said that they were very concerned that the particular stock—which I believe was called Security Freehold—had been sold in the manner that it had and so had caused the collapse that occurred. As a result of that they intended to prosecute any crimes that occurred and they intended to re-examine all of the customer's men who worked for Malone Lynch.

Well, they were certainly correct to prosecute any crimes, and they were certainly correct to re-examine or closely examine any of the customer's men who were involved in any way with the selling of this crooked stock. But they did not stop at that. They also said: "We are going to re-examine the customer's men who are innoncent."

This is rather interesting. In what way were they going to re-examine? "We are going to cancel the licences of the customer's men who are innocent. However, we want to be fair, and if they are innocent we will let them write an exam. If they pass their exam they can get their licence back."

It seemed odd to me that they would cancel the licences of the innocent as well as the guilty, and I contacted Mr. Kimber to ask him about this. He explained—I have his letter here, perhaps I should be fair to him. He said:

> There is no thought that sales staff, because of employment with a bankrupt, is automatically involved with the bankruptcy but rather has been exposed to a lack of supervision. Accordingly, in an effort to ensure that these salesmen are qualified to give financial counsel to members of the public, and are familiar with the procedures to be followed in handling clients' accounts, the board of governors has ruled in the Malone Lynch case that the transfers to other companies will be permitted only where the registered representative has first displayed his knowledge of compliance rules.

That seems very reasonable, but if you are going to follow this type of reasoning, surely the same reasoning should apply to all transfers across the exchange? If a man works for Merrill-Lynch and puts in a transfer and he wants to go to another firm, you do not say to him: "Fine, you have to try your security exam again." Because if they did, many of them would fail, the same as if you took a doctor who has been out in practice for 20 years and put him back to write his final exams. You forget the theory. You remember the practical aspect of it but you forget the theory and you cannot pass the exams 20 years later.

So I said to them: "This is unfair. You are taking elderly men, some of whom have been in the business their whole lives—some are 65, some are older—and through no fault of their own you are asking them to write an exam which you are not asking other people in exactly the same situation in other firms to write."

One of the men involved was a Mr. Austin Sime. He was told that if he wanted to continue in the business with another firm he had to write the exam, and he went in to write the exam but became so excited that he just could not write it and failed. He went in a second time and the same thing happened. And when I remonstrated with Mr. Kimber, he said: "Well, we will give him a third chance, a third and final chance, to write an exam."

His doctor says his temperament is such that he can't write an exam. He is a type of man who gets under pressure when one is there in front of him saying do this and do that and he cannot do it. His business before was largely consultative. He was not involved in this crooked stock at all. He advised persons, under no pressure, how to invest their money, how to put their money into bonds, stocks, and thing of this nature. The questions they were asking him, all of which are very interesting questions—many of which are very practical—are things which he wouldn't meet in the sort of business he was carrying on. He is too elderly to learn.

Suddenly, here's a guy who through no fault of his own is thrown out of business. He has no money. He didn't get a cent out of this whole swindle and he is the victim who is taken.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is unfair. It is something where the designate Minister of Public Protection (Mr. Winkler) should move, should take some action. He is here. And thank goodness we have a minister in the House. He should personally take some action.

It is unfair to penalize a man for doing nothing wrong, merely because he happened to be in the same street as an accident occurred. It is like taking a witness to an accident and then lock him up and saying, "We'll keep you here until the accident trial is over." It is just not fair, and if the security commission or the Toronto Stock Exchange doesn't realize it, the minister should realize it and should do something about it. I will leave that for the moment to the minister. I trust he will do something.

Now I want to turn to the Minister of Health for a moment, and I am delighted that we have the new Minister of Health (Mr. Potter). His predecessor (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) did a magnificent job; or actually he appeared to do a magnificent job. He only appeared so great in comparison with his predecessors; but he tried. I have no complaints about the member from Carleton. He did his very best, but the member for Quinte is now there. I give him my congratulations too.

We on this side of the House have promoted his being promoted for many years, away back in the old Robarts' days, and I am glad he has finally made it. I am glad he has got the energy and he is starting off and he is doing the right thing and I think we are going to see great things from him.

However, there is one problem that I think he has to do something about. It has got to be done now unless we are all going to go bankrupt. I am going to become very unpopular with my profession, but this has to be said.

The amount of money that is being paid to OHSIP is astronomical and it is growing astronomically and the doctors, as a profession, still haven't seen the light.

Now that we, as physicians, are being paid by the public, we can't charge what we want. We can't charge what the traffic will bear. We now have to be the same as any other group paid through the public purse; be they nurses, be they teachers, be they MPPs —well, perhaps I shouldn't use MPPs as an example, they are not the most responsible. But be it any group of public servants, we have to be responsible.

Two instances have just came to hand now and have upset me so much that I am going to mention them, because they indicate a complete lack of responsibility. Admittedly, again, we are picking rotten apples out of the barrel, but this type of thing so turns the public off.

I received a letter just a few weeks ago from a Mr. Roy Ohearn, who lives at 394 Merton Street in Toronto. I'll just find the original letter. I will just read one paragraph, which sums it all up. He had been to a doctor, let me say, before this letter. He wrote complaining to the Ontario Medical Association and subsequently to my party.

> My letter of September 23 to the Ontario Medical Association explained the problem thoroughly. In substance, on my attorney's suggestion, while in Dr. — yes, I will mention his name — Dr. Wright's office, I asked whether or not my back problem could be a result of an automobile accident of December, 1969. A simple "yes" or "no" was all that was necessary. Dr. Wright refused to give me an answer and asked that my attorney contact him. Dr. Wright thereby created his own reason for the correspondence. He wrote his first letter on April 28, including his invoice for $25, but failed to answer the question directly. On the second request from my attorney, Dr. Wright once again wrote a lengthier reply and enclosed his charge of $100 for the letter.

Well, Mr. Ohearn felt that it was a somewhat excessive charge. He got in touch with the Ontario Medical Association to complain that

he thought that they were—you know, that the doctors were being a little greedy—and asked that they do something about it. I would like to read their reply, because it speaks much for the association which still, apparently, are asleep. This is dated December 13, 1971.

> Dear Mr. Ohearn:
>
> The College of Physicians and Surgeons has completed its inquiry into the complaint you registered relating to professional fees submitted by Dr. Thomas Wright for two medical-legal reports.

Then there is a great deal about the investigation, which is not relevant. It continues:

> With respect to the professional fees which have been submitted by Dr. Wright for medical-legal report, the investigation confirms that it is his practice to submit an account in the amount of $100 for his initial medical-legal report and $25 for subsequent reports. Dr. Wright fully admits that an error did occur in his billing practices and that his regular procedure was reversed in the situation in question.
>
> The college respectfully advises that the supply of medical-legal reports by physicians is not a scheduled item in the Ontario Medical Association schedule of fees. The supply of such communications for medical-legal purposes is established by the individual physician supplying the report and the amount submitted to you by Dr. Wright appear in line with the present practice used by many specialists in Ontario at this time.
>
> The college confirms that its investigation indicates, however, that a billing error did occur in your case in that the initial billing and subsequent report practices of Dr. Wright were reversed in your case.

Therefore—stopping my quotation—the initial bill of $25 should be paid as the second bill. You should pay $100 for the first bill and $25 for the second bill, so that your total bill will be $125 instead of $125.

That is from the College of Physicians and Surgeons—pardon me, that is from the Ontario Medical Association. I don't expect much from the ruling body of that particular association. But what bothers me mostly in that particular letter is their line, "This is common practice."

How can anyone justify taking out the records of a case and dictating a letter and charging $100 for it? You could have, literally in any profession, a man work half a day or a day—or far more outside the professions; a week—for this kind of money. The letter is dictated by the doctor. It takes, at the most, 15 minutes, although from my own experience it is probably closer to five or 10, or two or three, depending on the letter. A reasonable charge is reasonable, but $100? And this is what they say is common.

Here's another one, also very recent. I am not going to mention this particular doctor's name because, apparently, this is standard practice. Here is a patient who goes to the Sick Children's hospital and doesn't see any staff doctor because it is a very simple case. The patient's name is George Mayol, 330 Hopewell Avenue, Apartment 409. He brought his daughter, Nadia, there and—let's just see what the trouble was—it was a sprain. The intern saw and looked after him. He never saw a staff doctor—interns of course cannot charge—but he, subsequently, received a bill for $15 from Pediatrics Surgical Associates with the name of a certain doctor on here whom he never saw.

This patient, with some reason, complained to the doctor. The doctor said: "Don't worry; your OHSIP will pay it. What do you care? It isn't anything out of your pocket."

The patient said: "Well, what does that matter? OHSIP is being paid for out of my taxes. I don't want OHSIP to pay, because I don't think you should be paid for something you didn't do." The reply came back: "It is the practice that, if an intern who is under our supervision sees someone, we charge for it."

Sometimes I worry about my profession, Mr. Speaker. It consists of a vast majority of highly dedicated men but, every now and then, we have a few like this who are hungry for money. When it happens in a place like the Sick Children's hospital, the rot is pretty deep.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this is plain padding. The government shouldn't allow it. They shouldn't allow any payments under any circumstances to a physician when he hasn't carried out the treatment. Apparently, it is now becoming the practice throughout this city because, just yesterday, when I was querying one of the doctors on staff at the Toronto General Hospital, saying: "How can they do this sort of thing?" He said: "We do the same thing at the Toronto General. Our feeling is, if the intern sees the patient, we have the responsibility and, if we have the responsibility, even if we have not done anything, we should charge for it."

This is sheer, utter nonsense.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hear, hear!

Mr. Shulman: You are going to get a terrible shock, Mr. Speaker, when the expenses for OHSIP come down this year. We got a little inkling last year when some of the printouts came from the computer, but that was just a half of it, because half of the money wasn't going through the computer. Starting April 1, all the money is going to go through the computer, and you are going to have the shock of your lives when you see how much is being spent and where it is going.

Now there are rackets. One of them thank goodness is finally being stopped; the one of referring patients to yourself for laboratory tests, where someone comes in for an office call for five bucks and gets referred to yourself for $100 worth of tests. They are finally doing something about that.

But this is another one; this is a major one in the teaching hospitals. It used to be understood—it was understood for 100 years in the teaching hospitals—that one of the privileges of being on the staff of the teaching hospital was looking after the staff patients. In return for that privilege you were given beds in the hospital.

If I phone up the Toronto Hospital and say I've got a patient with a coronary, I won't get a bed; they won't give me a bed for my patient. I have to refer it to one of the inner circle who will get the bed and then this is his cream. In return for this, what they always did was work on the public side and this is their return. They supervised the interns and they did free work for people who couldn't afford it.

But those days are gone. Nobody does anything free any more. There is still a public ward, the interns still do the work, the staff men still supervise them—but guess what? They bill OHSIP—and OHSIP shouldn't pay it. The doctors had no way of collecting these fees before. These cases are on the public wards and shouldn't be paid. Hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of dollars a year are being paid improperly, and I hope the Minister of Health, wherever he is, hears these words and does something about it.

I want to turn to a related subject which also comes under health, and this is the matter of prescriptions for persons under welfare and family benefit plans. This is a very serious hardship for the persons who are under such plans. At the present time, if you are on welfare in the City of Toronto you are given an orange welfare card and your medical fees are paid by OHSIP. When you are given a prescription you may take that card to the druggist and he fills your prescription without charge and he is reimbursed through the Department of Welfare.

This is working very well. There are druggists in the House who I am sure will corroborate what I am saying is true, and it is a fine system. Unfortunately, this system does not apply in the welfare schemes that are run by the province. For some reason they are a little bit behind the city. And what happens if you are on mother's allowance or any of the family benefit plans? You must go out and buy those prescriptions and then you have to apply to the government at the end of the month to get your money refunded, and sometimes it is and sometimes it isn't. They allow a certain amount a month, and in any case you have to wait a fairly lengthy time.

People who are drawing down $25 a week can't wait that lengthy time, and as a result a group has been formed called Operation Family Rights. This group is centred at 310 Danforth Avenue, here in Toronto. The chairman is a Mrs. T. Scriber. And what they are trying to do, with some difficulty, is get through to the minister responsible—I am not sure whether it is Social and Family Services or Health. In any case, their problem when they were trying to get through to the former Minister of Social and Family Services was, as they put it: "He couldn't seem to understand what we were saying." Well, that's understandable. We now have a better Minister of Social and Family Services, who has a little comprehension; we have a better Minister of Health, so perhaps they'll listen. But this is so important, it is so important that I am going to put it on the record, because this involves thousands of people. They are in very serious financial trouble and the result of this rule is that many of these people do not get the medicines that they essentially need and which their doctors prescribed for them. I'm not going to read all of it. I will just quote one brief bit so that the substance will be available to the ministers if they happen to read Hansard.

> Operation Family Rights is presenting a proposal for the change in the present method used to cover the costs of prescription drugs for recipients of general welfare and family benefits. Along with many other groups and citizens of Ontario, Operation Family Rights supports the idea of a pro-

> vincial plan for total health coverage, including the cost of prescription drugs.
>
> However, since the present method is so completely inadequate—particularly for those on family benefits—that a total health plan cannot be foreseen in the immediate future, OFR requests that this proposal be given immediate consideration. It may be well to point out the municipality of Toronto provides drug coverage for recipients of general welfare. An orange card is given to a recipient upon request. This method is effective inasmuch as all prescriptions are covered and the recipient does not need to keep a record or receipt of prescriptions. It is no use, however, at night time if a person must receive immediate medication. Unless a hospital emergency department is willing to give the patient the necessary medication to last until the prescription can be filled during normal business hours, a person must return home without it. This is particularly dangerous for a child. If a child cannot be taken out to a hospital emergency thereby requiring a home visit by a family doctor, there are no means provided for filling a prescription.

Anyway, that is not too essential. The important thing comes under family benefits.

> It should be noted that this particular plan does not include recipients of other government allowances who might be eligible to supplementary aid or a special assistance allowance to aid in the purchase of prescribed drugs. The GWA Act provides for special assistance for those receiving family benefits for the cost of prescription drugs. The recipient of family benefits must purchase the prescribed drugs, obtain receipts and submit them to the family benefit branch at the end of each month. Reimbursement is made after the branch has forwarded the receipts to the municipal welfare department. Many recipients are not aware that drugs under $5 are not reimbursed and there is a limit of $20 per month for each person.

It goes on at some length but I shan't read it in. I think this is the kernel of it. I just want to read the final proposal which is very brief.

> Operation Family Rights therefore proposes a method whereby each recipient, both of welfare and family benefits, would receive an identification card with a number similar to that of OHSIP or OMSIP. This card would be presented to the pharmacist who would then be able to issue the prescription and submit the client's number to the department for reimbursement. This card could be carried by the recipient and conveniently used at any pharmacy including those which are open after regular business hours and on holidays.

I take great pleasure in endorsing Operation Family Rights. It is a reform which is long overdue and is something which really is going to cost nothing because the little extra that the government is going to pay for the few extra prescriptions that are filled, it will save by not having this tremendous paper work and all these civil servants, who must be paid, to check them when they first bring them in; send them up to family benefits branch; send them down to the family benefits branch of the municipal welfare department; send back the ones that are allowed to the municipal welfare department or family benefits branch, then send out the cheque to the recipient.

All red tape—all can be disposed of in one swoop. I'm certain that not only would this plan not cost money, it would save money and besides it would save a lot of hardship. As a general practitioner in this city, I am aware that time after time, patients have said to me, "There is no way I can fill that prescription because I would have to wait a month until the family benefits branch pays me back and I don't have the money to eat."

This is not a political thing. I hope it can be accepted by the government despite the despicable place it has come from — the suggestion and manner in which it is given. I am not giving it to the government in any critical way. It is something that should have been done in the past. I hope it will do it now because it is going to cost nothing. It is a simple thing it can do quickly in weeks, and it will save a lot of hardship. It will even get the government votes in the next election. All those people will be grateful and they won't know that I gave the speech and they will think that the government did it out of the kindness of its heart.

Okay. I want to go on to another matter.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): That will be the day.

Mr. Shulman: The government doesn't have to worry. I am not running again so I won't be publicizing it.

I want to go on to the way the government treats civil servants and it is pretty shabby on occasion. On January 15 of this year a notice was posted up in the Department of

Public Works which literally destroyed the financial security of some hundreds of employees. What the notice said was that staff who had been working for as long as 20 years were having their salaries drastically cut.

The notice was brought to me by one of the employees and I was quite shocked because the same thing had been attempted by the former Minister of Public Works, the late unlamented John Simonett, last year. There was such an outcry in this House as a result of it that he abandoned the plan.

There was an outcry in the House. There was an outcry in the press. There was an outcry among the civil service. There was an election coming up then and after giving an ultimatum saying that everybody must join the Civil Service Association, must come under the civil service plan, must become permanent, must have their salaries cut in half, we raised so much hell here, the Liberals and ourselves—and, to their credit, some of the Conservatives – that the plan was abandoned. I was shocked, therefore, to find that the new Minister of Public Works—he is now the old Minister of Public Works; (Mr. Auld) he is now in charge of Environment, which makes us all shudder a little – had instituted a new plan: We must save money.

Mr. Martel: The House was not in session.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, he did this while the House was not in session so there wouldn't be an outcry in here. Who was going to complain? Just those few employees? They don't get a chance to vote for five more years anyway. So quietly they post this notice – and I must say I am disappointed in the Prime Minister of this province, who up until now I have always found to be a kindly and responsive human being. When this information was brought to me I didn't call a press conference, I didn't make it public; I wrote him a personal and confidential letter in the hope that he would do something. I wrote the letter on January 27; I've phoned his office twice since then, asking if and when I was going to get a reply—and it is still coming; it hasn't come yet.

I will read the letter I wrote to him because it sums up the situation so well:

Dear Mr. Premier:

I am writing to you about a tragic situation that is developing in your Department of Public Works. You will recall that last year the previous Minister of Public Works attempted to reclassify his employees which would have resulted in massive cuts in their take-home pay. At the time there was such an outcry both from employees and from within the Legislature that the plan was abandoned.

Now the staff of the Department of Public Works has received a notice that all of the temporary employees are to be reclassified as a part of the civil service with cuts in pay ranging up to 40 per cent. I wish to stress that these temporary employees are temporary only in name. Most of them have worked steadily for the department for over 10 years with no layoffs. Some have worked as long as 20 years for the provincial government.

Equally bad, the men feel very bitter at the arbitrary way in which their salaries are being cut. For example, electricians' helpers who were earning $5.60 an hour are to be paid only $3.06 an hour, while labourers who were earning $4.60 an hour are to be paid $3.73 an hour.

I am well aware of the province's need to economize, but surely the place to start is not with employees of long service who are earning such moderate rates of pay.

There was no answer to that letter, Mr. Speaker. I phoned his office –

Mr. Cassidy: There never is.

Mr. Shulman: That is not true. He usually answers his letters; that's why I was surprised he didn't. I presume he was so embarrassed he didn't know what to say. He should well be embarrassed.

Several of the employees went up to the officials in the Department of Public Works and said: "We can't keep up the payments on our houses. We won't be able to keep up our rent. How can you expect us when we have been earning" – Here is a man 60 years of age who had been earning $5.56 an hour who is told from now on he has to manage on $3.06 an hour.

This particular man said in front of four witnesses: "How can I manage? I have five children." And this particular official in the Department of Public Works, in front of witnesses, replied: "Who told you to have five children? You shouldn't have had so many."

Well, this is the way the Conservative government treats its employees, the kindly old Conservative government. They don't do that before an election, mind you – only after an election. "There is lots of time. Some will move, some will die off – they'll forget. We'll bring in some goodies before the next election."

Seeing the way your party has behaved, Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that you, as one of the few men of integrity in this House, have not crossed the floor. It really surprises me to see you still sitting there under those auspices. I am glad you are, mind you; I am glad you are. It is nice to have some touch of fairness in here.

But I am embarrassed for you, sir, having to sit with that label upon you, because you know what they are like and you know how they treat people—and it is a shame. I make this appeal now, really having given up, because I know now it has reached the papers—it wasn't through me; the Toronto Star published it, finally, because a number of employees became so upset—and now that the government has already had the bad publicity, what the heck, there is no point in changing it anyway; it might as well go through with the play. I know it is going to do this to these employees and there is nothing we can do about it except point the finger of shame and hope that some day—and I am sorry I won't be here to see it, because this is my last shot at this madhouse. Let me say this is my last shot, but I intend to make your lives miserable for the four years I am going to be here!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: But I hope I will be able to sit up in that public gallery—preferably in the members' gallery over there—after the next election and look down at the fine group of Liberals and NDP over on that side and the little rump over here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: That is what the member said the last time.

Mr. Carruthers: We have heard that before.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I said it the last time and I was wrong and I am disappointed. It proves you can fool the public lots of the time but somebody said you can't fool them all the time.

And you know what those people opposite are doing? With these things that they are doing to human beings, the word is getting out and more and more people know.

Mr. Gilbertson: They don't believe the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: And one of these days there is going to be a house-cleaning in here and none of those members is going to be left.

I hope the corporal's guard is left. I hope the hon. member for Algoma is left. I want him to see what good government can do here.

It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, when you see a good man come in here occasionally and get corrupted. You see, now he has taken an official post. He has taken an official post with those evil men.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am just about to start a rather lengthy topic. I really want to talk about the insurance companies. I have not got through my introduction yet.

Perhaps this might be a good moment to adjourn the debate and we will continue at some time that is mutually convenient to us.

Mr. Shulman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): More of the same tomorrow?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the adjournment of the House, the House leader indicated to us on Tuesday that he would be able to tell us something about the night sittings, hopefully before Tuesday evening. Would he be able to tell us now what the plan is?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately neither the hon. member nor his leader was in the House to ask me that question at 6 o'clock on Tuesday when I was ready to reply. I wasn't asked.

Mr. Deans: He could have replied without a question.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: However, I would inform him that tomorrow we will continue with the debate, and on Monday we will have an evening sitting as we will some other evenings of the week.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 9, 1972

Civil service arbitration board award on employee benefits, statement by Mr. MacNaughton 185

Hamilton Harbour landfill regulations re steel mills, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon 186

Medicare coverage of nursing homes, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon 186

Establishment of detoxification centres throughout province, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Foulds 187

Education expenditures re teacher negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells and Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Foulds 190

Police protection at Gull Bay, questions of Mr. Bales and Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Deans 192

Savings in health insurance premiums re school board employees, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Deans 193

Bookbinders dispute with Queen's Printer, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Deans, Mr. Bounsall 193

Civil service bargaining, questions of Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Deans 194

WCB definition of light work, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans 195

Establishment of detoxification centres, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deans 195

Land purchase in Toronto adjoining U of T, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 195

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Henderson 198

Surrogate Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bales, first reading 198

Edible Oil Products Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 199

Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading 199

Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Givens, first reading 199

County of Simcoe, bill respecting, Mr. Evans, first reading 199

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Burr, first reading 199

Sue-Carib Industries Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Timbrell, first reading 199

City of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Good, first reading 199

Esbeco Limited, bill respecting, Mr. Edigoffer, first reading 199

Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 199

St. Peter's Seminary Corporation of London, Ontario, bill respecting, Mr. Walker, first reading 200

Beds of Navigable Waters Act, bill to amend, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 200

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Drea, Mr. Shulman 200

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Shulman, agreed to 232

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 232

No. 8

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 10, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have guests with us today, in the west gallery, students from the George Brown College of Toronto and students from the Givens Public School of Toronto. In the east gallery, students from C. B. Parson's Junior High School and from York Humber High School.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, just a brief statement with respect to the summer employment programme for this year.

The government of Ontario is now in the process of implementing a supplementary programme to provide additional opportunities for the employment of about 6,000 young people during the coming summer months. This programme is designed to broaden the existing regular summer youth employment programmes for which $15 million has already been made available.

This allocation itself generates approximately 12,500 job openings With the $6.4 million to be spent on Summer 72, the title of the Ontario government's new special summer employment programme, a total of $21.4 million will be invested by the provincial government this year to provide interesting and purposeful activity for approximately 18,500 students over the summer period.

This further stimulus by the Ontario government to summer youth employment was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session. As was stated then, our own extensive programme of constructive summer activities is designed to complement the Opportunities for Youth Programme of the federal government.

Ontario's Summer 72 offers young people the chance to serve and test themselves in a variety of fields. Youth in Action, the programme organized by the Department of Education, will directly employ a number of secondary and postsecondary school students on projects such as Summersound, track and field clinics, the Ontario Youth Theatre which in turn will indirectly involve about another 100,000 young people in alternatives to employment programmes.

Youth and the Law will bring university students into direct contact with the working of police departments across the province for three months. The Summer Volunteer Programme 72 will offer outlets for secondary and postsecondary students interested in social activity projects with institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of Social and Family Services. Project SWEEP will engage a rather large group of students in a variety of environmental activities which will be co-ordinated through the 37 conservation authorities in the province.

A further large group of secondary school students will work in the urban-rural exchange programme. The Retardation Student Volunteer Programme operated in co-operation with the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded will be open to secondary school volunteers. Ontario Youth Summer Enterprises will provide a chance for secondary students to show their prowess as aspiring businessmen in miniature companies which they will be able to run during the summer. In the true entrepreneur fashion they will be paid according to the success of their company ventures.

Project SNAP, Student Nursing Activity Programme, will present opportunities to students to help with recreational and other social activity programmes for residents of nursing homes and homes for special care. Project CRISP, Correctional Rehabilitation Involving Student Participation, will offer means for postsecondary students to develop positive relationships with children and young adults in training schools in our centres.

As I have stressed many times, Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario will continue to make every effort to help our young people direct their energies into channels of service to others and so combine new experiences with learning. It is therefore a very particular pleasure for me to make this general announcement concerning Summer

72. Detailed announcements concerning individual programmes and covering rates of pay will be issued very shortly by departments directly associated with the programmes concerned.

Those who are interested in a brief review of the separate opportunities in the Summer 72 programme can obtain a copy of the brochure under that title or further information from the office of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells). Copies of the brochure are being distributed to the media along with this statement.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

SUMMER 72 PROGRAMME

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell us how the young people apply for these jobs? I may have missed that in his statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it will be explained in the brochure—well, I am sure some obviously find their way to the members—but the applications will go, by and large, to those departments which will have jurisdiction over the particular programmes.

SPADINA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker:

Can he explain to the House the procedures which led up to the order-in-council designating the Spadina cut for the location of the rapid transit system? What is the rationale that could leave this decision exclusively in the hands of the cabinet, probably in the hands of the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't think it does.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The order-in-council says it is there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think perhaps the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) might explain this legal term. The application to the OMB, as I recall it, had a combined application for the rapid transit and for the expressway. The cabinet, in its determination, said no to the expressway portion but not to the rapid transit portion. I am assuming the order-in-council is worded in this fashion to make it very clear that the government was not saying no to the rapid transit section of the Spadina.

I think it is also quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the technical committee has recommended, I think five alternatives. This is basically the decision for Metro and the TTC and while, for technical reasons, the order-in-council may say it is to go in such and such a place—and incidentally all five recommendations said that it was to go along the right of way from Lawrence to Eglinton—the decision as to the exact location is basically that of Metro.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the Premier explain the significance, or perhaps even the incorrectness, of the newspaper account this morning which indicated there was a new order-in-council in February of this year as yet unpublished? And what really does the government hope to achieve by this new order-in-council if in fact there is such an order-in-council?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I would have to check this with the Attorney General.

If there is a new order-in-council, if there is some question as to the wording of the previous order, it would be to clarify that.

There is no alteration in government policy. The decision as to the precise location of the rapid transit line, as I say, is basically that of Metro and that really is the only determination involved.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, when the Premier last June made his announcement about the government decision stopping Spadina, his indication was that within a few months—if my memory serves me correctly, it was within three months—a decision would be made on the location and the commencement of work on the rapid transit. We are eight months past and apparently, if I understand the Premier correctly this morning, still no decision is apparent and still no decision is looked for. Can we expect any rapid transit in that area in the next year or 15 months or 18 months or what?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, at the time the announcement was made I don't think any specific time limit was set as to when it would be possible to determine the exact location of the rapid transit portion. The joint technical committee came in with its report—I am only going by memory—about a month and a half ago. I think it is somewhere in that neighbourhood. It is now being assessed by Metro and the TTC. I under-

stand they are actually very close to making a decision.

Apparently, from the report, the decision as to the location from Lawrence to Eglinton really has been made, because that portion is consistent with all five recommendations.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I have the order-in-council. It is dated February 2. It indicates that the project will be designated as a subway, I presume for purposes of grants, under the Public Transportation and Highway Improvement Act. The government has, therefore, made its decision and directed the outcome. I am not going to quibble with the outcome for a moment, but I take it the choice is implicit in this order-in-council?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the choice is not implicit in the order-in-council as to the exact location. As I was explaining to the hon. member for Downsview, the exact location really hasn't been determined. It is the basic responsibility of Metro and the TTC.

However, I don't think there is any doubt that the location from Lawrence to Eglinton has been determined, because that particular area was consistent with all five recommendations.

Mr. Lewis: A last supplementary: What then prompted the need for an unpublished order-in-council, dated February 2, about which the Legislature was not informed and upon which the press stumbled, almost by accident I think?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I was explaining, I think the question would more appropriately be asked of the Attorney General. I assume that it is to put it in a legal sense, if there was any discrepancy or problems with the initial order-in-council, and probably to designate it for grant purposes. But it doesn't alter the basic order-in-council or the policy as of last June.

SALARY OF AGENT GENERAL

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell the House what the salary offer was that enabled him to pursuade his friend Ward Cornell to act as agent general for us in London for the next three years?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition the amount of the salary offer. I would assume it was consistent with that which was already being paid. I am sure the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. White) could give the hon. Leader of the Opposition that information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would think he is the one that would know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will try to find out in case the minister is not here this morning, but I may not have that information until after lunch.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Premier can tell us if that appointment was made in lieu of the decision to go ahead with the more elaborate information office under the direction of the government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know to what office to hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring. In that there hasn't been any decision to establish an elaborate information office, this appointment could hardly be in lieu of that appointment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He must have been pretty disappointed.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In what?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Is it not true that Mr. Cornell, or people employed through and by him, prepared recommendations for the administration, or for the Premier, or for the Minister of Trade and Development more likely, recommending such an expansion of information services?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No Mr. Speaker, I thought that the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think recommendation No. 1 was that Mr. Cornell himself would head it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, while I recognize the desire of the hon. Leader of the Opposition to be somewhat facetious in this regard—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I want just to get information about what the Premier is doing for his friends.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): How they are spending the taxpayers' money!

Mr. Singer: Campaign managers!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition would read the Throne Speech very carefully, which I assume he had done prior to his constructive presentation to the House with his multitude of amendments, he would have read the specific reference to

the communications committee, which is a sub-committee of the Committee on Government Productivity; its report will be made available to the government fairly soon. What those recommendations contain I can't tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Looks like Ward Cornell is not going to be made director of "Information Ontario."

Hon. Mr. Davis: —except I sense that they are not suggesting any large information structure whatsoever. So, to get back to the former question, in that the report has not been made available, it is quite obvious that Mr. Cornell's appointment as agent general in London cannot be in lieu of a recommendation that may or may not exist, and I would say—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't think that is obvious at all.

Mr. Singer: And one should have sensed, as the Premier said—

Hon. Mr. Davis: And one should have sensed—

Mr. Singer: —and not discouraged it, because—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, reference was made in the Throne Speech that the report would be coming. I can't tell the member which paragraph it is, but it is there.

Mr. Singer: Yes, and one should have sensed what it was going to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: As I recall the Throne Speech, it also made reference to plans for an office in Washington. I take it there will be a designate from Ontario to that office as well. Will he have a title, and is it true that Alan Eagleson is the Premier's first choice?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It would be the first time Washington has been designated as Siberia.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but I would suggest that Mr. Eagleson could discharge that responsibility with great ability.

Mr. Lewis: Oh I am sure he can. He can justify almost any responsibility.

Mr. MacDonald: He'll organize the Premier's backbenchers and then the Premier will really be in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is a man of very great talent; he would do it very well. However, I think it is safe to assume that Mr. Eagleson will not be appointed, in that I don't think he would be remotely interested in it; at least I don't believe Washington—is it going to be part of any expansion of the World Hockey Association or get a hockey franchise?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier needs him right here.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I don't think they are ready for him.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): All amateurs there!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think Alan will be the one designated. What the title will be I can't tell the leader of the New Democratic Party at this moment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: While the Minister of Revenue (Hon. Mr. Grossman) is in China, wouldn't the government be able to save substantial money if they kept him there and established a new office for him?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not being familiar with the conditions or the environment in China, I can't really say whether the Minister of Revenue would be anxious to remain in that jurisdiction. But in that he, by quite a substantial majority, succeeded in defeating representatives of the party represented by the member for Downsview and the leader of the New Democratic Party, I think it is quite obvious that he will wish to return here to very adequately represent those people—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, he is adaptable all right; he is adaptable.

Mr. Singer: By quite a substantial majority?

Mr. MacDonald: Not too substantial.

Mr. Lewis: Not what they call a substantial majority.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —from his constituency and to give me the benefit of his very real experience and advice in the administration of the affairs of this province.

Mr. T. P. Reid: He knows how rotten—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

An hon. member: No.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I beg your direction on an issue. Since the Minister of Trade and Development is not here and since his parliamentary assistant is, is it proper to direct the same question to the parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, of course.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am acting minister of that department.

Mr. Singer: Oh, that will get the member a lot of information!

Mr. Lawlor: What has the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Lawlor: It is a supplementary question to the question asked of the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? Very good.

Mr. Lawlor: What has the new blossoming and erstwhile parliamentary assistant got to say about the appointment of Ward Cornell? What is the word up in the inner office?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are obviously delighted.

Mr. Lewis: Well, just by way of further supplementary, since it all has to do with the Department of Trade and Industry and Tourism, I gather that the major advertising account was shifted from one firm to a firm whose name is relatively well known in the world of politics in Ontario. Is this a sort of gradual progression which the government will not follow in terms of the awarding of contracts and positions of agent general and posts in Washington and so on?

Mr. MacDonald: Are there any of the Premier's friends whose needs have not been met?

Mr. Lewis: Does the Premier tender for some of his public officers? Or does he just choose?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, we don't really tender for those areas of important departments.

Mr. Lewis: How does he arrive at his choices then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We arrive at the choice—and it's a very simple determination—by seeking out men and women of great qualifications, a talent and ability who can ably represent the people of this province in positions like the agent general. And, with respect, Ward Cornell can do just that. I am sure the members opposite will find, over a period of time, just how able a person he is and how well he will represent our province in London.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: He was chosen in the same way as the people of Ontario made their choice.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Is the government planning to supply Mr. Cornell with a gondola above Trafalgar Square?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I guess it's a supplementary under these circumstances. Have they found a title for Arthur Harnett; and what are they paying him down at Ontario Place?

An hon. member: The hon. member will need one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know the title that Mr. Harnett has been given nor what salary he is being paid. I shall endeavour to find out. I believe the minister will be here, probably on Monday. He will have that information. If I see the Leader of the Opposition after lunch, I may have it for him.

But, once again, Mr. Harnett being a man of very substantial talent, I think it is quite obvious he will do a very commendable job at Ontario Place.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Are any of those jobs of interest to the Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Lewis: He says he needs an application form.

Mr. Speaker: Since there have been a reasonable number of supplementaries—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: This is what you call the DIP programme—the Tory equivalent of the LIP programme.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? If not, the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would the member for York South have liked to have gone to London? Maybe Washington? If the member wants to go to Washington, I'll think about it.

Mr. MacDonald: London, I would have preferred.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would he?

DE HAVILLAND LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question first of the Minister of Labour: Can he table for the House the actual contacts between his department and the de Havilland plant and the UAW local 112 during the period of the strike?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, this matter is still under very active review by our department and I doubt that there would be any merit in tabling them at this time. I would be glad to talk with my officials first, because I gave them instructions yesterday to look into this matter very closely.

Mr. Lewis: I may ask, by way of supplementary, is the minister aware that the union doesn't feel that it has been in quite the degree of contact which apparently was conveyed to the minister and that it would do his department well to pursue the negotiations at this point?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps I misled the hon. member from Yorkview (Mr. Young) in my reply the other day. I perhaps left the wrong impression, but we are actively working on it.

HARBOUR CITY COST

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier about Harbour City: How much did all the Harbour City preparation cost, prior to its abandonment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, I can't give the hon leader of the New Democratic Party that figure. I shall endeavour to get it for him.

There has been a minimum amount of work on Harbour City, I would think, in the last year or year and a half, but I will certainly try to get those totals for him.

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General has the answer to a question asked previously by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans).

Mr. MacDonald: It is rough here too, as it was in Ottawa.

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): It is ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: There is no Solicitor General.

POLICE PROTECTION AT GULL BAY

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the member for Wentworth asked a question yesterday as follows:

> Can the Minister of Justice explain why the Ontario Provincial Police have refused to provide adequate police protection for the Gull Bay area of northern Ontario on the west shore of Lake Nipigon, in spite of the request being made by the chief of the band and by the member for Thunder Bay?

Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Provincial Police have been providing police protection to this reserve, as well as to the many other communities in the area, from the Armstrong detachment.

I understand that in addition to normal patrols from the Armstrong detachment, the OPP is also providing continuing patrols into this particular reserve from the Thunder Bay detachment. Two men—usually on the afternoon shift, on a daily basis, weather permitting—are at the reserve.

This is a matter that has been the subject of discussion and consultation between the OPP and the Gull Bay reserve for several years.

As recently as February 1, Assistant Commissioner Bird, in a letter to the hon. member for Thunder Bay, offered to provide full recruit training courses at the Ontario Police College for any suitable person chosen by the Gull Bay band who could then serve as a full-time constable on the reserve. The full cost of this training would be borne by the provincial government.

At the same time, Assistant Commissioner Bird offered the assistance of the superintendent of No. 16 district in Thunder Bay to facilitate the matter. Immediately following this letter the superintendent wrote to Chief Ronald King and personally offered his help in selecting and training an Indian constable. In addition, the superintendent has sent a corporal from the detachment to consult with the chief.

Mr. Speaker, I of course am greatly concerned about the closing of the school, and as of yesterday a meeting has been arranged for Tuesday next at the Gull Bay reserve with representatives from the Department of Indian Affairs, the band council and members of the OPP, to discuss the matter.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Did the minister take it upon himself to find out why the Department of Indian Affairs found it necessary to close the school? Does the minister not think that the situation demands immediate action, rather than suggesting to the Indian band that they pick someone who they feel would be competent to act as a constable and send him all the way down here to Aylmer for a three to six month course? What are they going to do for police protection and the administration of justice in the meantime?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the closing of the school is related to the conditions on the reserve, as touched upon by the hon. member.

There is, of course, the short-term necessity; there is also the long-term solution. This matter, as the hon. member knows, has been a matter that, as I said, has been going on for a matter of some years, so that—

Mr. MacDonald: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —I think there is the short-term solution, the short-term requirement, and what I would hope to be the long-term solution.

Of course, as the hon. member knows, there are expressions of opinion that the policing on reserves should be done by Indian constables. I am not leaving the matter as it is; I will be following closely the results of the meeting on Tuesday next, and if necessary the whole matter will be taken under review.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Does the minister agree that the recent incidents—and incidents which occurred prior to the last week—indicate that there has in fact been a lack of adequate police protection?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I have read the file and I have noted the instances which have occurred over the past two years and the number of convictions that have taken place. It was the considered judgement of the OPP that the situation did not warrant the location of a detachment specifically for the reserve, which I think is the position that the chief has taken. As I say Mr. Speaker, after Tuesday the whole matter will be taken under review if necessary.

Mr. Stokes: One final supplementary: As a result of the minister informing himself of the details in this case, will he now concede that the question was based on real facts rather than the figment of someone's imagination?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I review for you the question and I need not concede the matter. This is the question, and I read it for the hon. member: "Can the minister explain why the Ontario Provincial Police have refused to provide adequate police protection . . ."

Mr. Deans: They have refused to provide adequate police protection. They had to close the school.

Mr. Lewis: Putting the minister in charge of the police will bring this government down in six months.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Putting that man in charge of the NDP will ruin the ND Party.

Mr. Reid: It is already done.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It came within 100 votes!

Mr. Speaker, the wording of that question is a typical NDP question, a loaded thing, shifting responsibility to the OPP. And I may say that I was pleased when the Globe and Mail didn't pick up that point of view but stated the significant part.

The hon. member was trying to shift the responsibility of the OPP and they have discharged their responsibility.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has a reply to a question asked yesterday.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs; and Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the NDP inquired, in a supplementary question, regarding the removal of trees from land under lease from

my department by the Lake Ontario Cement Co. I have this reply for him.

Article 8 of the agreement states that the lessee may not remove any tree or timber standing from the leased area without the permission of the district forester. It was drawn to our attention that cutting was taking place and the matter was investigated immediately. I have been advised that 10 to 12 trees, two to four inches in diameter, have been cut apparently with an axe or a hatchet on the leased land remote from where the sand is being excavated.

There is no evidence that indicates that the Lake Ontario Cement Co. was responsible for the cutting. These trees were recently, or still are, lying where they fell. Three other trees, slightly larger, were apparently uprooted by the wind near the excavation. The company's operations may have contributed to this result.

Mr. Lewis: It certainly did. There's a picture of a bulldozer—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We can find no evidence, sir, to indicate that the company has violated any conditions of the lease.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill has been trying to gain the floor.

ARTIFACTS STOLEN FROM MEMORIAL

Mr. Givens: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question, through you sir, to the Attorney General.

He will appreciate the urgency of this, sir. Would he consider posting a reward for the recovery of certain very irreplaceable historical artifacts which were stolen from a showcase in the Sir Casmir Gzowski memorial on the lakefront on the night of February 21, when the memorial was vandalized? Since then the trail has grown very cold.

I'm sure that if the Attorney General consults with the Minister of Citizenship, he will appreciate the significance of this memorial to one of Upper Canada's most energetic and prominent pioneers. Would he consider posting such a reward because the trail has grown cold?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I believe this gentleman may have been a former Lieutenant Governor of this province. I will certainly look into the matter and see what can be done. I'll have a report on it next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David.

PROTECTION FOR CLEANED BUILDING

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works.

Like so many others I have observed with interest the cleaning of the exterior stone of this building. My question is: Is it planned to follow up this exterior cleaning with a coating of silica or other protective material?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I know, as the cleaning is taking place the stonework is being refurbished and tuckpointed. I'm not sure whether or not a silicone spray will be added, but I will inquire and get the information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

COMPANY'S MOVE FROM ONTARIO TO QUEBEC

Mr. MacDonald: In the continued absence of the Minister of Trade and Development I have a question of the Premier.

Has this government ascertained whether the federal government did or did not make a grant to Belanger-Tappan which permitted that company to move the Findlay operation out of Carleton Place to Quebec? If it is the minister's view that the government did assist in the financing of this rationalization of that company, what does the government plan to do to replace a 100-year-old industry which is basic to that eastern Ontario town?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I believe the minister is finding out from the federal authorities whether there was any federal money allocated. I personally don't know but I shall endeavour to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that the company had never complained about financial problems, and in fact was paying rather low wage rates, would the Premier consider having the company open its books so that the comumnity and the workers involved can in fact see whether or not the moving was justified? Would the Premier also consider seeking other purchasers for the plant to maintain it as a going concern?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, of course obviously we would be interested in a prospective purchaser of the plant. It is not possible for us just to produce purchasers of the plant. I am not sufficiently familiar with the actual economics of it or the rationale for their move. The minister is, and I am sure he would be prepared to inform the hon. member with as much detail as he can.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

SUMMER 72 PROGRAMME

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier in relation to the statement this morning on the summer youth programme.

Is the Premier aware of a commission report which was published in the Ottawa Citizen indicating that the summer youth programme, at least the federal youth programme, was of questionable value to the students, the youth involved and to society at large? I would ask the Premier whether he considered the recommendations of the leaks, at least in the paper, of that report, and whether this had had any effect on this Ontario summer youth programme?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't seen the report. I just heard about it very recently. I believe it was an analysis of one of the federal programmes in the city of Ottawa that has no bearing on what we are doing with our own summer youth programme. We think the programmes are constructive, and helpful to the students and to the public generally and we will be proceeding with them.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it expected when the government is paying youths to participate in one of these programmes that they can put aside sufficient moneys to pay their education costs, or at least part of their tuition? Is there a savings, for instance, expected for the student in one of these programmes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The degree of savings depends on how much money the student spends during the summer months. I can't predict this accurately for the hon. member.

I would say that in a number of programmes the salaries or the weekly incomes that are paid compare with many other summer job opportunities. It has been traditionally possible for a number of students to save sufficient to pay at least a portion of their tuition or their room and board at post-secondary institutions. But really, I think the hon. member would recognize it would be impossible for me to tell him accurately just what percentage of the money earned they will, in fact, be able to set aside.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT IN SUDBURY DISTRICT

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), could I direct a question to the Premier? When could we in Sudbury expect the government to break up the tax haven presently enjoyed by the International Nickel Company in the town of Copper Cliff by the introduction of a regional form of government in that area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recognize the member for Sudbury is concerned, and quite obviously is in complete support of regional government in that area; otherwise he would not have raised the question in the way he has. If he will recall, the Throne Speech said that in this session the government would be introducing legislation to create a regional government in the Sudbury district. So I think the question is itself answered in the Throne Speech on February 29.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Lawlor: The government is taking an awful long time.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The government has been saying we were going to get it in since 1969. It is still coming.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre, not Sudbury East.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, two questions of the Premier: Does this government favour the new Pickering airport site over all other alternatives?

The second question: Is the site a compromise between the preference of the federal government and those of this government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, quite obviously, the statement that was made last week—a joint statement by the Treasurer (Mr.

McKeough) and by the Minister of Transport of the federal government—indicated the federal government's acceptance in selection of the site, which is, after all, its basic responsibility for the transportation facility itself.

As to what other sites were considered, I have read many stories, about 59 sites, four sites. I can't inform the hon. member just what particular locations may or may not have been considered, but obviously there was a degree of consensus as it related to the Pickering site.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, would the Premier have preferred a site farther east or in some other direction from this particular site?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really can't say that I have any personal preference. I don't purport to be knowledgeable as to the climatic, geographic and other reasons for the locations of specific sites.

Mr. Deacon: I am asking what the government would have preferred.

Mr. MacDonald: As far east as St. Scholastique, for example?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to state that we would not have supported an Ontario airport in Quebec. I think it is quite obvious that that would not have been acceptable.

Mr. Deacon: The Premier still hasn't answered the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In spite of the observations in the Globe and Mail this morning, as made by a former Prime Minister of this country, that St. Scholastique was, in fact, to be serving Ontario, I really think the new Pickering international airport will go a long way to resolving our problems.

Mr. Deacon: The Premier still hasn't answered the question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the designated Minister of Public Protection (Mr. Winkler), Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Cassidy: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? I am sorry.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary of the Premier: Was the government influenced in its choice of the airport location by the interests of its friends in Revenue Properties who were having a tough time in the stock market and who have extensive holdings in the area?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It's an improper question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the member for Ottawa Centre, who I think still has a great deal to learn about this House and the members in it, I would say to him that the selection of the site in Pickering was made on a very statistical, professional basis and did not relate to owners of property either there or anywhere else; and I would like to think that the member for Ottawa Centre would understand that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

MISLEADING ADVERTISING BY INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, Mr. Speaker:

Has the minister taken note of the misleading advertising campaign currently being indulged in by the Allstate Insurance Co.; and if he has, what is he doing about it?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): We are aware of a number of such advertising programmes. We have already acted in some instances. We will act in all of them in the same fashion, and the companies have been communicated with.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the Allstate co. specifically been communicated with, and if they have, why are they still running that programme on the air every half hour?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't know the programme the hon. member refers to, but I shall take the question as notice and act in that case the same as we have in the others.

Mr. Shulman: The same supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the Allstate co. specifically been communicated with?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, what does the minister mean by action with the others? Exactly what action has his department taken?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I was referring more specifically to newspaper advertising, where we have communicated with them and asked them to desist where we felt the advertising was of a misleading nature.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, whom has the minister asked to desist—which companies, for which advertisements, in which fields?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't have that information with me, but I could supply it to the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister saying that some of them were insurance companies?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Lewis: Will the minister file that information on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes I will.

Mr. Lewis: Does Laurier Life live in the minister's mind as one of those companies with whom he communicated?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The name is somewhat familiar to me, and if the situation applies I will certainly give the member that information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The minister stated he was aware of the misleading advertising. As the minister knows, this is under the purview of the federal Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has he contacted that department?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Pardon me? Have I contacted them?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I certainly have.

Mr. Roy: When?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can't tell the member the date, but it was since I was transferred to that ministry; that's not too many days ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington South.

DISPOSITION OF CATTLE AT CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I have a question of the Minister of Correctional Services.

Can he inform me as to the state of the disposition of the dairy and beef herds connected with correctional institutions? And what steps are being taken to protect the historic part that they have played in the dairy and beef herds of Ontario?

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Yes, Mr. Speaker. As the member knows, the Department of Correctional Services is going out of the farming business. The herds are being dispersed on the advice of the Department of Agriculture and Food. I understand the department is taking over some of them, some are being made available to the federal Department of Agriculture, if they so wish, for their experimental purposes; and the balance is being sold at auction in the various areas where the herds are now.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will there be no continuation of farm training at any of these institutions? Is it being abandoned completely?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Yes, for the most part. In some of the correctional centres and training schools there will still be some market gardening done, but the overall farming operations are being discontinued.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a supplementary, was this done on the advice of the Department of Agriculture and Food or did the minister take their advice only on how to disperse the herds?

Hon. Mr. Apps: I got their advice on how the herds should be dispersed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

DPW NEWS RELEASES ON CONTRACT AWARDS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works concerning the news releases announcing contract awards by his department.

Why do most of these announcements begin with the statement that the Hon. John

White or the Hon Robert Welch has been advised by the Hon. James W. Snow . . .?"

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I think it is self-explanatory that I have advised them of these works.

Mr. Burr: Why does the minister never advise the members of the opposition ridings in this way?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well, Mr. Speaker, I only advise the members who have inquired about particular jobs in their ridings.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: That's just a courteous service.

Mr. Shulman: Will the minister accept a blanket request from the members of this party that they would like to be advised of anything happening in their riding?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, if any member of this House inquires of me or my office regarding a project, or the status of it, in their riding, I will be pleased to advise them of that particular project—

Mr. Martel: But with the Tories it goes unrequested.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —even the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Martel: The minister grinds them out in the basement.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions? The hon. member for Renfrew South.

ASSISTANCE TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): A question of the Minister of the Environment: On December 14 last the minister's predecessor stated in this House that he would shortly be announcing a new formula on assistance to small municipalities for installation of water and sewage. To date we have not had that announcement. I am wondering when the minister will be making that announcement?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. member specifically. There are a number of complications. There have been several formulas worked out, which I am not yet satisfied will solve a number of the problems in the very small municipalities. I know they are pressing problems. We have a group working on this at the moment and I hope I will be able to tell the hon. member, and a number of other hon. members who are concerned about this problem, what our changes will be in the near future.

Mr. Yakabuski: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that the change in the formula is very, very vital to a number of small municipalities in this province? It is a matter of life and death really. These municipalities will really be in grave trouble if this new formula isn't put into operation shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Question please, the question?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am aware of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

INCOME SUPPLEMENT PROGRAMME

Mr. Cassidy: A question of the Minister of Social and Family Services, Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the minister, in view of the decision by the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to undertake a pilot programme for income supplementation—the first such project in the province—whether the province would now reconsider its apparent refusal to share in any costs of that income supplementation?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): The hon. member will realize that this is a very complex subject. Our planning and research branch is doing research in this area. I would be pleased to look further into it and into the specifics as it concerns the Ottawa municipality.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that three ministers on the government side have given promises that the government would come up with an early answer in response to requests from the Ottawa area for assistance with an income supplementation project, could he not stop researching and take some action?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, our people have been working on this for some time and they will continue to work, and some time in the future I will have more definite

information on this very important and complex subject.

Mr Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the federal government's very great interest in the first pilot project in income supplementation in Canada, would the minister at the very least turn on the tap so that federal money, which is eagerly being offered under the Canada Assistance Plan, could flow in order to help the Ottawa scheme rather than blocking it, as is the case at present?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Well Mr. Speaker, there are federal funds, as the member has indicated. I believe it is on a 50-50 sharing basis. We intend to make use of the Canada Assistance Plan and this subject is being actively pursued.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that a yes answer or a no answer, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I have just indicated our people are working on this.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Cassidy: It doesn't cost the province a God-damn nickel.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member is sounding like Pierre Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Let the record show—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish the remark to remain on the record? The hon. member will please be seated.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will please be seated. I directed a question to him. Does he wish the remark to remain on the record? Is he going to correct it or withdraw?

Mr. Cassidy: I think I had better withdraw. Although the sentiment was well founded, I will withdraw the word.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Come on, it is in the finest parliamentary tradition.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Ottawa Centre indicated he had a point of order. Does he still have a point of order?

Mr. Cassidy: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CITY OF ST. CATHARINES

Mr. Eaton, in the absence of Mr. Johnston, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, yesterday you will recall I made a few preliminary remarks before beginning my address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to begin today, sir, by accusing one of the hon. members—I hope he doesn't leave—the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Shaw), of misleading the House.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Shulman: I have just been informed by the Clerk I am not allowed to accuse a member of deliberately misleading the House. I will let everyone draw their own conclusions after the evidence is presented.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Come on back!

Mr. Shulman: Just a few moments ago, sir, a question was asked by the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) which sounded frivolous at first—but it's a small matter of rather serious import—as to why press releases from this particular minister's department—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): It is so interesting I will come back.

Mr. Shulman: —begin, "The Hon. Allan F. Lawrence has been advised . . ." or "Mr. Ronald K. McNeil has been advised. . . ."

The minister replied that he is always happy to give information to any member of the House. Sir, that is not the answer to the question. It is not the fact.

I have two sets of news releases here, both from the minister's department. There are two types; there is the type that comes from Conservative ridings and there's the type about developments that occur in non-Conservative ridings. We've broken them down and here's how they read—and instructions have been given to his department that this is the way they are to be released. If it's a Conservative riding it reads as follows: "Mr. Ronald K. McNeil, MPP for Elgin has been advised [has been advised; he didn't ask] that the Hon. James W. Snow, Minister of Public Works, has awarded a $45,236 contract" to so and so. I have a pile of them; there's no use reading them all.

Here is another group. This is when it's in an opposition riding. Instead it starts out quite differently. "The Hon. James W. Snow, Minister of Public Works, has awarded a $27,300 contract to"—and there's no mention of the opposition member. Well, I don't think it's that important. It's a little bit of cheap politicking which we expect from this particular minister. But what I find more important is that—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): How can the minister possibly smile?

Mr. Renwick: And this government.

Mr. Shulman: —he has come in here and misled the House. There is a proper word for this which I'm not allowed to use, but he knows what it is and I know what it is and you know what it is. And he shouldn't be allowed to sit in that seat.

Mr. Renwick: Resign!

Mr. Shulman: I wish the Premier were here because I would like to think that with their 85 members over there, they've got enough of a majority that they don't have to play these cheap, little political tricks. If the minister wants to do his politicking, fine, but at least be man enough to own up to it. And don't come in here and lie to us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I stated, I think—I will check the Hansard—a few moments ago in reply to the question, that I would be happy to include any member's name in the press release on a project if that member had made inquiries of my office or my department regarding the project in his riding.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is not the point.

Hon. Mr. Snow: And I will continue to do so.

Mr. Renwick: The minister does it automatically for the Tories.

Hon. Mr. Snow: That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. In these cases these members have made contact with me regarding these projects.

An hon. member: Oh, come, come!

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Shulman: On the same point of order, if I may, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand correctly that I heard the hon. member for High Park accuse the hon. minister of lying?

Mr. Renwick: No!

Mr. Shulman: No, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Right! Point of order.

Mr. Shulman: My point of order is, sir, there is absolutely no way, and the minister knows it is nonsense to suggest there is a way, that we can know in advance that he is going to award a project. So how can we ask about it?

Now, there is no suggestion in these statements that any asking was made. In fact I happen to know for a fact, and I challenge you to bring your deputy in here and say it isn't a fact, that there is no question in the case of the member for Elgin—here is the one, and there are several others here—they didn't know about it either, and they did not inquire. And the minister has given blanket instructions in his department that in Conservative ridings the Conservative member is to be mentioned in the release. Now deny it if you dare!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is now very obvious, then, that the minister misled the House. Have you any particular action that you think would be appropriate?

Mr. Renwick: Call him before the bar of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The only thing I would say at this point is that there has been no real accusation that the hon. minister deliberately misled the House.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am about to make it.

Mr. Speaker: He may have inadvertently misled the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, no, the facts are there. We now have the facts.

Mr. Speaker: I do not undertake to judge on whether he inadvertently misled the House.

Mr. Renwick: What is the procedure for judging?

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member has information that he has presented the House. It is up to the hon. minister to refute the information if he can. As far as I am concerned, I don't think anything has been indicated that the minister deliberately misled the House and therefore I see nothing wrong with the discussion.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of order, the minister knows that this procedure went on in his department. It isn't inadvertent that he got up and said, "Every member is treated the same." It's been going on for years and it has certainly been continued under him. Now if he knows it happened and he got up and made that statement, how could it be inadvertent?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Further on the point of order, why do you allow yourself to play these games? Why do you allow yourself to do this with the opposite speaker? You know the minister deliberately misled the House so dress him down the way you do the opposition so willingly.

It was quite clear and calculated. It's a pork barrel portfolio and he is once again giving it that description by his own conduct. Why is it necessary for him to play these preposterous games with his department? If he is putting out a press release, he should mention the members of the opposition as willingly as he mentions the members of the government and not mislead the House.

Mr. Renwick: Or drop all of them.

Mr. Lewis: And smile in self-gratification afterwards.

Mr. MacDonald: A cynical smile. He is sitting on the pork barrel and he knows it.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, you don't have to reinforce that kind of behaviour in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me on a point of order, I hope that you are not going to allow yourself to be established as some sort of a judge between allegations and reputations.

Mr. Renwick: What is the procedure?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is not your responsibility. The last thing I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is come to the defence of this particular minister, because he is simply carrying on the old Tory traditions of trying to get political mileage out of the dough that they spent. I don't believe it does them any good. It makes them look ridiculous but, please, sir, do not allow yourself to be drawn into a position where you have to act as judge simply because of the points raised by the people to my left.

I would continue with the point of order, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the member for High Park is making a formal presentation and a speech. If the minister is silly enough to involve himself in it then of course it is for you to decide who is in order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the Leader of the Opposition has really confused the issue in his inimitable way.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member is not the leader any more! He had better sit down.

Mr. MacDonald: That raucous noise! Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: The Liberals don't have a leader! Which one of the 20 over there is leader today?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York South has the floor.

Mr. Ruston: He is not saying anything.

Mr. MacDonald: Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in spite of what the Leader of the Opposition has said, you are in the painful position where you have to involve yourself. You are the person who enforces the rules of this House. Therefore, if we have clear evidence—not only not disputed; even more, it can't be disputed—that this is the procedure and if we have clear evidence on the record that the minister came in and mislead the House you are in the painful position as the

impartial arbiter on the rules of this House of expressing a view; indeed, of involving yourself. Otherwise—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The committee on privilege can hear this sort of thing.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The committee can hear this sort of thing.

Mr. MacDonald: A committee to hear this thing? If there are rules in dispute in the House, the Speaker is the arbiter of the rules. This is the traditional place! Unfortunately what we should have is a Speaker who is appointed with complete independence so that he can act and doesn't have to suffer the consequences if he happens to take an action that some member in the government thinks is not in the government's favour.

Mr. Lewis: We will support you if you are not in government favour any longer.

Mr. Speaker: I must say to the hon. members of the House that I listened to the remarks made by the hon. member for High Park. In fact he stated that he was not accusing the hon. minister of deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Shulman: No, I didn't! On a point of order, I did not say I was not accusing the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Because the Clerk—

Mr. Shulman: I had not got to that yet!

Mr. Speaker: Because the Clerk had indicated to him that he was not allowed to do this.

Mr. MacDonald: He now has the evidence so he can make the accusation. The minister confirmed it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park submitted to the House during his comments what he deemed to be evidence that the hon. minister had deliberately misled the House. The hon. minister has denied that he has deliberately misled the House. I did suggest to the hon. members that perhaps there might be some degree of inadvertence.

I am not certain one way or the other, nor will I attempt to rule whether or not there was any deliberation whatsoever in the words of the hon minister when he replied to the question. If the House wishes me to examine the evidence, to review it completely and to attempt to make a ruling on it, I will do so. I assure the hon. members I will not rule on the basis of what has been submitted at this moment.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue. I am not at all disturbed by the minor pork barrelling that is shown by this particular minister. I think the member for Brant, the Leader of the Opposition, is quite correct. It does the Conservatives no good whatsoever. It doesn't bring in a single vote.

What I am disturbed by is the fact that this minister would come in here, make a fool of himself and all of us by deliberately and foolishly and blatantly attempting, with a big smile on his face, saying "We treat you all the same. You know that we don't; I know that we don't. Everybody knows I don't but I am going to play this big joke." He came in here and he deliberately—and I say it now—he deliberately misled the House. The evidence is first of all the new releases. The further evidence is—and I challenge him to appear before a committee on ethics to substantiate this—further evidence can be produced by secretaries within his department where instructions have been given. Furthermore, I ask—

Mr Speaker: Order, please! The standing rules of this House specifically state that a member may not accuse another member of deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Even if he does?

Mr. Speaker: I state this to the hon. member for High Park. He may not accuse, in this chamber, another member of deliberately misleading the House. It is against the standing rules and I would ask him to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, in that case may I withdraw the remark? I accuse the minister of deliberately dissembling the House.

Mr. Speaker: In that case I am again going to have to reserve an opinion until I consult my dictionary to see if, in fact, there is such a word.

An hon. member: They have no original ideas.

Mr. MacDonald: Better take a look at that rule! When you have the facts, look at the rules.

Mr. Shulman: Dissembling to the House, it should have been; deliberately dissembling to the House.

Mr. Speaker, we can laugh about this but it is serious. It indicates a certain mentality within the cabinet which I find frightening and I am sure I can see by the expression of at least one of the members of the cabinet that he, too, is upset by it and he should be, quite rightly so. We expect more of this cabinet. It is the most powerful cabinet in this country. We are the most powerful province. We expect a little more than the childish behaviour that is displayed by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, to go back to the speech which I was provoked out of by this display.

Yesterday, as you recall, I was chastising you gently about what has happened to our question period and how the private members have more or less disappeared from the question period. It has now become a sort of debate between the two leaders and the cabinet. It is very interesting to listen to but rather frustrating for the backbenchers who do occasionally have questions they would like to ask. We can't do much about the leaders unfortunately but we can do something about—

Mr. Ruston: The member can take over as leader.

Mr. Shulman: We can't stop them asking as many questions as they wish—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Yes, we can.

Mr. MacDonald: No, the member can't, because we tried to change it and the member's leader wouldn't play ball.

Mr. Shulman: But there is one thing that you can do. In defence of my own leader, let me say this, sir. It is very difficult after the Leader of the Opposition has taken 20 minutes, for the leader of the NDP to get up and ask one question because it gives too great a political advantage to the Liberal Party. I say this to defend the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberal leader wants to—

Mr. Shulman: He is trapped into this situation. The situation now is that every day the Leader of the Opposition gets up and asks questions for 20 minutes, the NDP leader, in defence, feels he must do something similar and the backbenchers have no opportunity to ask questions. Let me suggest to you, sir, that—

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Are there not supplementaries to those questions?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, it is very true, we are allowed to go in on their coat tails and ask supplementaries, but a few of us—the Liberal backbenchers may not understand this—have other matters of our own that are of interest to our constituents which we would like to bring up. I can understand why the Liberals do not understand it.

Mr. Reid: Does the member ever think that is why his leader asks so many questions so he does not get the chance?

Mr. Shulman: No, certainly not.

Mr. Reid: It is something to think about.

Mr. Shulman: That is a point, although since the pattern is set by the leader of the Liberal Party, one must wonder whether that applies to my right!

Mr. MacDonald: We have tried to change that pattern.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: However, sir, I would like to suggest to you that there is one thing you can do. You will recall when we were ruled by the sergeant major who came before you, that he had certain characteristics that didn't exactly endear him to us. On the other hand he did one or two things which perhaps were for the better.

He did not allow debates to develop in the question period. He would not allow more than two or three supplementaries. He would not allow 10 minutes to be spent on one subject. I must say in mild criticism that perhaps this was better because it allowed many more people to participate in the debates. I suggest to you most humbly, sir, that perhaps you should consider being just a little bit tougher. It is not as easy a route but I think for the benefit of all and for the sake of the backbenchers of all three parties, you should do this.

I would like to add one other word about the subject which I was discussing yesterday, the campaign in High Park, in relation to my Liberal opponent, that delightful lady we were discussing, Laima Svegzda. I was informed that the very difficult time that we in the NDP had from the opposition during that campaign was also shared by the Liberal

candidate: Mr. William Clements, who I believe was the Liberal campaign manager in St. George, came to me and said that he was carrying some function in attempting to help Miss Svegzda. He said that she was incredibly harassed night and day, particularly at night, by obscene and upsetting phone calls to herself and her mother, trying to force her to withdraw from the race and suggesting that she was splitting the anti-socialist vote. It wasn't just the NDP who are subject to this type of campaign when the Conservatives get worried.

Sir, I am going to turn to a rather unpleasant subject now and it is difficult for me as a member of the NDP to bring this up, but there is a little difference between our party and the other two parties. When we see something is wrong we don't hesitate to expose it, regardless of where it hits.

In this case I am about to talk with some reluctance about a trade union. I feel that my position is similar to that if I were a Tory backbencher and I found that there was something wrong at International Nickel. In that case I wouldn't be allowed to discuss it, of course. But there is a difference in this party.

We believe in democracy and we believe that if something is wrong, regardless of where it is it should be exposed. There is a flaw in the law in relation to trade unions which has been brought to my attention and which involves a very serious matter of, in effect, a crooked trade union. I wish to go into it in some detail.

The union I am referring to is the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Local 128.

A few months ago, sir, a delegation from that union came to my office extremely upset by what was happening within the union. They asked me to look at certain documentary evidence which they had with them and which they left with me, and which I have here now to present to you.

I was quite upset by what I saw at that time, and I wasn't quite sure how to proceed because, quite frankly, my party receives considerable help from unions—not this particular union—but from unions, and I didn't want to attack them until I was absolutely certain that every other private means of clearing up this mess could be found.

I went to this union's headquarters with Mr. Terry Meagher of the Ontario Federation of Labour and with the approval of Mr. David Archer, from the Ontario Federation of Labour, and Mr. Louis Lenkinski of the Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto, all of whom I believe were as upset as I was by the things that came out. But the meeting was quite fruitless. In a rather polite way we went through the motions but absolutely nothing took place.

I will start at he beginning. The very first complaint that the members of the union had was that they are not allowed to vote on collective agreements. They are told "You will take the collective agreement; we have come to this conclusion." If there be any questions that this is true I have here the minutes of the regular monthly meeting of this union held at 258 Church Street, Toronto. They are dated August 25, 1971. I quote from the minutes:

> Brother Petronski read out the new contract and explained changes. Brother J. Carroll gave his interpretation of some of the wording in the contract. Brother Backer asked Brother Carroll if a vote would be taken to accept or reject the contract and Brother Carroll replied that no vote would be taken.

Some of the members of the union felt this was wrong and that they should have some kind of a democratic say in what was taking place there and they pressed at a meeting that a vote should be taken, but they were overruled by the people who rule that union. They say, "No, we don't take votes on collective agreements."

I found this a little peculiar, so I got in touch with Mr. J. Carroll, the international vice-president of this union for Canada. I called him up and he told me—to quote him—over the phone that this was a matter of internal union affairs and was none of my business. That was the end of the conversation.

It isn't just on matters of collective agreements where the membership is not allowed to speak out. The union decided they wanted to have a health plan. A certain company was chosen by the leadership of the union and the members wanted to know if they could approve this particular plan. Again they were told, "No." I have here the minutes of the executive board's meeting with Brother J. Carroll, international vice-president, held at 221 Victoria Street on December 1, 1969. I quote from those minutes:

> Brother Carroll was asked if any progress had been made concerning the health and welfare plan. Brother Carroll informed

the meeting that the plan would start on Jan. 1. On being asked if the plan would come before the members for approval, brother Carroll said no. He was asked why not. Brother Carroll said that the plan was too complicated for the members to understand. Meeting closed.

That is almost the way our Conservative government runs things. They are not quite that bold or bald, but that is the way leadership of this union works.

In this particular union, as in many other unions, trustees are elected to watch over the finances. This, like so many other things, is window-dressing. There are trustees, it is very, very true, but if they don't approve of something that is going on, or if they find something wrong, just look out.

The trustees in this particular union were an honest group and they did discover that there was something going on with the finances, which I shall come to by and by, and they refused to sign the quarterly financial report. What happened then was very interesting. I have here the minutes of the meeting held on December 1, 1969, and I quote:

> Brother Carroll asked why the trustees had not signed the quarterly financial report. He then went on to inform the trustees that it didn't matter whether they signed it or not because he would sign it himself if they didn't.

And, in effect, that is exactly what happened. The trustees are there to look over the finances but when they find that people inside are stealing money, look out. If they won't sign the report, "Too bad, we will get somebody else to sign it."

Well, it is a funny union. They don't like to keep financial records there. For many years they found it was simpler to keep all the money in cash—for reasons we will come to by and by.

But in 1970 the trustees, who unquestionably were honest, became very upset by the fact that money was disappearing out of union coffers and they called in a chartered accountant. His name is Sydney J. Posner; his office is at 215 Victoria Street. They asked him to look over the books of the union.

On March 23, 1970, he issued a report to the trustees on what he had discovered. It is very brief and I would like to read it in full, because it is of some importance.

> To the Trustees,
>
> International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Local 128,
>
> 221 Victoria Street,
> Toronto 2.
>
> Gentlemen:
>
> Pursuant to your request, I attended the offices of the above named for the purpose of performing an audit of the books and records for the year ended December 31, 1969, and a perusal of the books and records for the five years ended December 31, 1968, and I am pleased to submit this preliminary report.
>
> Because I was unable to obtain sufficient information and supporting data for the years ended December 31, 1964, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, I am unable to perform an audit of the receipts and disbursements for the year ended December 31, 1969, nor make any comment with regard to the period from January 1, 1964 to December 31, 1968, and I am unable, at the present time, to confirm the assets which were on hand as of December 31, 1969.
>
> During the course of my inspection of the books and records which were made available to me, I was able to ascertain that the gross wages, as filed on the 1969 T4 summary, were understated for certain employees with respect to the amount these employees were entitled to receive as authorized by the membership. With respect to the above, I recommend that an amended 1969 T4 summary be prepared and filed with the Department of Internal Revenue.

Well, what does that mean? It means that for some reason these union officers were being told they were to be paid a certain amount of money. But, at least on paper, they were drawing considerably less—in fact, about half of what they were supposed to be drawing. This indicates at first full blush that they were working for less, but unfortunately that is not the situation.

It started off, apparently, as a simple income tax swindle. They decided they would take half their money in a pay cheque and the other half they would take in cash. There is no question about that. Unfortunately, it grew beyond that to deciding they would take a little more than their pay cheques and what was due to them on top.

In any case, when this report was issued and it was obvious that something was very wrong with the books—what was left of them, because there were very few there to be examined—the trustees of the union became very upset and on April 28, 1970, they decided they had better have a full-time auditor to see what was going on in this union. So on that date, April 28, they wrote a letter to Mr. R. K. Burr, the International President of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, at Eight State Avenue, Kansas City, Kansas, which reads as follows:

> Dear Sir and Brother:
>
> At a meeting held on April 9, 1970, in the presence of International Vice-President J. P. Carroll, assistant to International Secretary-Treasurer R. Legler, the trustees of Local Lodge 128 and the undersigned, a decision to engage a full-time auditor was made. I respectfully submit for your approval the name of Sidney J. Posner, chartered accountant, 215 Victoria Street, Room 301, Toronto 205, Ontario.
>
> Trusting this will meet with your approval.
>
> With best wishes and regards,
>
> I remain,
>
> Fraternally yours,
>
> President, Lodge 128.
>
> Copy to Mr. J. D. Carroll, international vice-president.

We needn't be too surprised that four weeks later when the international answered—in fact, strangely enough the man whom this was sent to down in the States—and I am coming to American control—I am sorry the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) isn't here because I have something to say to him—the letter was not answered by Mr. Berg, the international president. Instead, guess who answers it? The answer came back from John D. Carroll, one of the people who is into this to his ears. He wrote back on May 21, a lengthy letter, but, in effect, he said: "We don't approve of your hiring this fellow Posner. If you want to have an accountant, send me the names of two other people and we'll pick one of those, but we are not having this guy, because look at what he has already discovered."

At this point the trustees and the honest members of this union became quite upset because, obviously, here they are writing a letter to their international about something that is crooked up here and the international doesn't even answer the letter. They referred it back to the people who are being complained about, who answered them by saying, "Carry on, boys."

So they thought at this time maybe they should send someone down to the United States to explain what the problem was. In the meanwhile, they started going into the books to see just what was happening to the money. It was a really difficult job, because the books were practically non-existent. The practice had been in this particular union to take the money in in cash and disperse it in cash whenever possible for reasons which will become quite obvious.

I have here a statement from a Mr. J. Quesnei. This particular union has an initiation. They charge $150 for initiation, but the initiation money doesn't always get to where it is supposed to go. I'll read you Mr. Quesnei's statement:

> I worked as a probationary member from October, 1966, to March 21, 1969, when I was asked to pay $150 for initiation. I paid this to Mr. Mickey White.

Mr. Quesnei continued:

> I worked until June of this year. The week of August 25 I came to the union office and wanted to have my name put on the out-of-work sheet. I was asked if I was a member of Local 128 and I said yes. But I didn't have any proof of it—no card of any kind—so my name wasn't put on the out-of-work sheet.
>
> I had a receipt for the $150 that I gave to Mr. White in March. I brought this back again to the office, but they still couldn't find any record of my being on the list or of the money ever coming in.
>
> I was told to come back on Tuesday, September 2 when the office manager, Mrs. Halaban, would be there. All she could find was a probationary card. She phoned Sudbury three times that day but wasn't able to find out from Mr. White what happened to the $150.

This goes on at some length. The man was a little upset—not so much at having paid the $150 as he understands that the rules require that a probationary member pay initiation fees, but at the fact that the $150 had just disappeared; that it hadn't reached the union headquarters, and more important than that, that now he was out of work he was unable to draw any of the benefits that he should have been entitled to as a member of the union, because, as far as the books of that

union went, he wasn't a member. It wasn't just initiation fees that were disappearing.

I have another statement here from a Mr. Clinton Mitchell, which reads as follows. It is dated, Monday, March 9, 1970:

> I was sent to work as a probationary member on November 5, 1968 for Combustion Engineering at Lambton generating station. I worked until November 11, 1969. Each month I had $12 deducted from my cheque for union dues. As yet I have not received any receipts whatsoever.
>
> (Signed),
> Clinton Mitchell.

One of the trustees attempted to check into the office. There was no record of this man's union dues ever arriving at the office.

There is also a certain matter of some bonds that were supposed to have been owned by the union. The executive trustees were told at one time that the local had over $50,000 invested in bonds. However, when they went to look for those bonds they couldn't find them In fact, when they went to the Bank of Nova Scotia where the bonds were supposed to be placed, all that was there was some $27,000 worth of bonds, with their numbers listed here. They were a little upset about this, so, after a union meeting held in April, 1970, they asked, "What happened to our bonds?" and I quote:

> Brother Duchesnay asked Brother Petronski how much savings the local had in bonds. There was a discussion over this issue, because at an earlier meeting the executive board had been led to believe that the local had over $50,000 invested in bonds. However, at the meeting with Brother Carroll last week, the trustees were informed that we have never had $50,000 in bonds at any time and that we had been mistaken.

Well, something funny happened then. The membership started complaining rather bitterly and informed the executive that they were getting in touch with me. A few weeks later—no, it wasn't, it was just a few days later—they received a letter addressed to the trustees from the Bank of Nova Scotia with a list of bonds, saying that "the above-mentioned government of Canada bonds were deposited in this branch on"—and note the date—"May 11, 1970, by Messrs. Petronski and Carroll. On these bonds were $2,001.15 in unclipped coupons. Where those bonds were all this time and why they didn't clip the coupons might be something worth looking into.

How much money was disappearing from the union? It is very hard to tell. We do know that from the time when all this heat was generated, in May, 1970, until the next year, May, 1971, during which period of time there was a very, very careful look kept by the trustees on everything that was coming in and out, the assets of the union doubled. They went from $25,000 to $55,000 in one year. The assets went up about $30,000 in one year! One wonders what was happening in the time before that.

Well, what was happening in the office? It is rather interesting to look at the payroll and see just what was occurring—to see what one could learn from the payroll.

The office manager was a Mrs. Carmen Halaban and she had a daughter by the name of Gloria. Gloria came to work there for six weeks in the summer and I got in touch personally with Gloria Halaban to ask if she had worked more than the six weeks. She said no, she had just worked there the six weeks in the summer.

But, for some reason, her pay just came right on rolling through on the books. They started paying her in the summer and they paid her for the six weeks, and then they kept paying her. There are cheques here up as late as Dec. 12. But she, by her own statement, was nowhere near the office and did no work for them.

What about the office manager herself? Her name is Carmen Halaban. Her salary is supposed to be $134 a week. Well, she started off drawing $71.19 a week. I am not sure how she arrived at that particular figure, and that is the figure she shows on her income tax, but by going through the petty cash receipts, one finds that she took out another $65 a week in cash, which she didn't bother reporting to anyone.

What about Brother Petronski, the business manager of the union? Well, he is an interesting case because I have got his cancelled cheques here. Now, this fellow is a crook. That is the only way to describe him. He is a plain, ordinary crook.

He was entitled to certain pay, which he drew part in cash and part in salary—the cash part he didn't bother declaring—in addition to which, he was entitled to $30 a week in general expenses and $30 a week in car expenses, which seem fairly liberal; he didn't have that much car work to do. But this was not enough for Mr. Petronski.

I have been going through all the cancelled cheques from the union, and they

didn't bother paying cash. This pile of cheques, if you can believe it, was paid from the union for parking tickets that Petronski picked up over a period of two years. This inch and a half thick pile is parking tickets. After all, I guess he figures, "I can park anywhere. I don't have to pay for it anyway."

Let me say quite clearly and quite flatly that I have been in touch with the union officials and there is nothing whatsoever in the union bylaws, or in the union laws that allow such payments to be made. There is a flat allowance of $30 a week car expenses, out of which he is supposed to pay all his car expenses.

He didn't stop there, however, he had other little expenses which I have here somewhere. Another little interesting trick is that he would deduct $34 weekly from his salary cheque and add it to the expense cheque so no income tax had to be paid on that. But that is between him and the income tax department. But what is more important, he was drawing money out of the union, not just to pay for tags, but also to pay for all sorts of interesting things.

I have a cheque here for Thorncrest Motors for $134, another to Elgin Motors for $171, and I checked with these people to see what it was for and he was renting a car. We don't know what he was renting the car for. I have another cheque here for $199 and one for $293 and one for $417 which he was paying to H. H. Ingle and Associates. He was paying his insurance to them through the union.

Well that is all very interesting. In other words, the union was being looted, and there was no one who could do anything about it. When the trustees came in and found something wrong and refused to sign the statement, the international vice-president, his name is J. D. Carroll, said: "If you don't want to sign it, that's just too bad; I'll sign it for you." And, in effect, that is exactly what happened. We have no idea how much money was taken out from this union treasury. I have a number of statements here from various members saying where money went, but as I am unable to prove those, I don't wish to put them on the record. But its a fairly wild group of places.

Well, I called the accountant, Mr. Posner, and said what in the world went wrong there? How could that happen? Why was there no supervision, from the international union, or from the government, or from the Department of Labour, or from somebody? And I quote him; re replied:

> The problem is control in this union rests in the United States and the trustees made complaints to the central head office but the US persons in charge refused to do anything about it because they backed up the local management who, in my opinion, should have been removed.

Well, the trustees were trusting people and they decided they had better go down to the international head office, way down there in Kansas City, and have them look into this mess up here because all their money was being stolen by these people in charge of the union.

And the trustees had a meeting, and according to the rules of the constitution of this particular union, if you have a complaint you don't go first to the international head office, first you have to go through—like the army—you have to go through channels. So they followed the channels and on May 5, 1970, they wrote a letter, as they were supposed to do, to the business manager and the secretary-treasurer of the union, Mr. Stan Petronski, the gentleman I referred to earlier, and I will quote you that letter:

> Dear Sir and Brother:
>
> We the undersigned, on behalf of the membership of Local 128 hereby charge you with the following violation of the international constitution of Local 128 bylaws.
>
> Under article 17, section 17, subsection (a) of the international constitution, we charge you with failing to keep a proper record and account of all financial transactions of Local Lodge 128 from May 5, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive, as specified in article 23, section 7, subsection (a) of the international constitution.
>
> Also under subsection (a), section 1, article 17 of the international constitution, we charge that you failed to retain such records and accounts for the period of time as required in article 23, section 7, subsection (d) of the international constitution from May 5, 1969, to December 31, 1969, inclusive.
>
> Under subsection (a) and subsection (g) of the international constitution, we charge that you Brother Petronski did use the funds of Local 128 for the payment of personal bills incurred by you, which is contrary to article 34, section 1, of the international constitution, article 16, section 1 of Local Lodge 128 bylaws.
>
> The alleged violations (payment of such bills), occurred on the following dates:

May 12, 1969; June 9, 1969; July 29, 1969; September 30, 1969; October 24, 1969; November 5, 1969.

Under article 17, section 1, subsection (f) of the international constitution, we charge that you brought discredit and dishonour to your position as an officer of Local 128 by allowing Mrs. C. Halaban, the former office secretary of Local 128, too much latitude in the performance of her employment with the union. You condoned and approved many hours of overtime work, supposedly worked at her home after office hours for the purpose of doing the monthly statement and quarterly audit.

Mrs. Halaban averaged 85 to 90 hours a month overtime, which we were told was necessary to keep up the records of Local 128. Since Mrs. Halaban terminated her position with the union, a new office secretary has been hired. It has not been necessary for her to work any overtime in order for her to maintain the records and accounts of the local.

For the purpose of clarification all above charges are made to go back one year immediately prior to the post date of this letter. The above charges are made without prejudice and to the best of our knowledge are deemed to be true. For the members of Local 128, we remain,

Fraternally yours, The Trustees.

With copies to R. K. Berg, the international president, J. D. Carroll, the international vice-president, and A. J. Cormier, the president of Local 128.

They might just as well have not bothered, because they were just wasting their time. Let me read you the reply—they finally got a reply from the international. This is dated May 14, 1970. It didn't take them too long; it came back within a week. It is signed by Mr. Harold J. Buoy, the acting international president, and he replied:

Gentlemen and Brothers:

I am in receipt of a communication dated May 5, 1970, in reference to charges filed by you against Stan Petronski, which has been directed to my attention. President Berg is at present convalescing from a recent illness and for the period of the convalescence has designated me as acting international president.

Be advised charges must be specific, with constitutional references, and must state clearly and in detail the actual occurrence or action, including the time and place allegedly constituting the violation or offence. Therefore, in filing charges it is mandatory that you do not deviate from the outline put forth under article 17 of the international brotherhood constitution.

Be further advised the aforesaid charges in their entirety are herewith ruled as not being timely, in accordance with article 17, section 2(a) of the international brotherhood constitution, and are declared invalid. By means of this communication the lodge is herewith instructed not to proceed in any way with the processing of these alleged charges.

Trusting you will be guided accordingly,

Fraternally yours,

Harold J. Buoy,

Acting International President

Well, what were the trustees to do? What was the membership to do? They find the leadership is crooked They appeal to the international, and also, incidentally, to the Department of Labour—nothing came of that either—and the international writes back: "Your charges aren't timely and we instruct you not to do anything about them." What does it mean "not timely"? I looked up "not timely" in the constitution, and for a charge to be brought it must be brought at the time it occurs or as soon as you learn of it. These men brought the charge as soon as they learned of it, so it was timely. But they still hadn't learned that you don't get justice from this international and they tried again. On June 12, 1970, they wrote back to the international as follows—and let me point out they are still trying to work through the constitution.

Gentlemen and Brothers:

Re File L12870-6.

Please be advised that pursuant to article 5, section 2, of the international constitution we are lodging an appeal against the May 14, 1970, letter from Acting International President Harold J. Bouy, which set aside our charges against Brother Stan Petronski dated May 5, 1970. We consider that in accordance with article 17, section 2(a) of the international constitution the time limit of 60 days does not apply, because the basic facts and evidence pertaining thereto could not be accumulated or made known within that period of time. We were unable to properly check the expenditures of the local from the time of our appointment to March 16, 1970, for the following reasons:

1. Denial of access to the safe by Brother Petronski where the cancelled cheques and the other data of the local were lodged.

2. Deficiency in bookkeeping system and maintenance of records.

Due to the above, we authorized the recently appointed auditor, Mr. Posner, to attend at the offices of the local to perform an audit on the books and records for the year ended December 31, 1969, and a perusal of the books and records from January 1, 1964, to December 31, 1968, as per out letter dated March 13, 1970, and copy of which is enclosed. Please find enclosed copies of other letters with respect thereto, dated March 17, 1970 and March 18, 1970.

Therefore, March 17, 1970, was the first date at which time anyone had access to the evidence of the cancelled cheques. The auditor's preliminary and final report independently confirmed number two above.

In order for the charges to be considered specific, we hereby enclose a letter from Mr. Posner, outlining in detail the status of the books and records of the local and photostats of cancelled cheques and paid insurance invoice with respect to the payment of Brother Stan Petronski's personal bills out of union funds, these photostats being too numerous to list.

We trust the above information will be satisfactory to proceed with charges against Brother Petronski. If it is decided not to proceed with any charge against Brother Petronski, we will consider that we have exhausted all internal remedies, as per article 17, section 1(r), of the international constitution.

(*Signed*)

The Trustees

They got an answer back very quickly on June 17 from the international president:

Dear Sir and Brother:

Receipt is acknowledged of your appeal to the international executive council from Acting International President Harold Buoy's letter, dated May 14, setting aside the charges filed against Stan Petronski, business manager of Lodge 128, as not being timely and declared invalid.

Be advised that the appeal has been docketed for the consideration of the international executive council at their next regular meeting.

—which took place four months later. The four months passed and the international considered this. Guess what they said. Here is the letter which they wrote on October 26, 1970, to Mr. A. J. Cormier, the president of Local 128:

Dear Sir and Brother:

You are advised that the international executive council, during their meeting in Kansas City, Kansas, October 20 to 21, 1970, had before it as docket No. 8 the appeal from the decision of the acting international president, dated May 14, 1970, in the matter of charges filed against business manager secretary-treasurer, Stan. Petronski, by trustees Bruce Bedard, James R. Hunter and R. J. Duchesnay of Lodge 128.

In compliance with section 3(b), article 17 of the constitution of the international brotherhood, the international president absented himself from participation in the meeting of the executive council during consideration of docket No. 8 and international vice-president, John Sender acted as chairman.

A subcommittee of the executive council was appointed to review the file and report to the executive council, and you are advised that it was the decision of the executive council that:

Action to be taken—The appeal from the decision of acting international president Buoy and the charges filed by the trustees of Lodge 128 against business manager secretary-treasurer Stan. Petronski be denied and that the decision of the acting international president be sustained.

Fraternally,

Harold Buoy.

The trustees had come to the end of the road. There was nothing more they could do. They couldn't believe that crooks could take over a union in this way and they could do nothing about it. They appealed to the Department of Labour, which for some reason—apparently because the law is so worded—found there is no action they could take. Finally, at that point, they came to me and said: "What can be done?"

It was then I went to the AFL-CIO leaders who, may I say, I believe were as appalled as I at the evidence which I presented to them.

Let me stress at this time that the vast majority of unions are straight and are honest

and do not have this type of problem but, obviously, this can occur.

It isn't just in this union. I have got another union here where something very similar is taking place. This is good old Charles Irvine's union. You may remember my talking about him when we were discussing the Mafia last year. I will come to that in a moment, but obviously there is a problem in these small craft unions where the money and the membership are under the thumb of the persons in charge.

Some form of supervision or remedy is required from our Department of Labour. In a situation like this the membership should be able to go to the Department of Labour and have an audit forced. They should, if necessary, have a trustee sent in, not from the international, because obviously the International doesn't give a damn how much money is being stolen. They should have some remedy.

Let me say right now, I know I'm giving aid and comfort to the enemy in this speech, which gives me some regret. I disagree absolutely and completely with everything that has been said on this subject by the member for Scarborough Centre. I disagree absolutely and completely with the bill which he has brought in.

It would result in the crippling and the impotence of the unions in this country to cut them off from the parent unions in the United States, while at the same time the international companies here can still get help from their parents in the United States when there's a strike here. When an international union here strikes an international corporation, what the member for Scarborough Centre would do is cut off the aid that that international would extend to our unions. He wouldn't do anything about cutting off the aid that comes from the parent corporations.

He didn't suggest in his bill that there be a law passed forbidding the sending of Canadian money to these international parents. What he suggests is no Canadian money should be sent from unions to the union parents which, in theory, is great if you do the other side. But you don't lop off one adversary's head and say to the other side: "Go to it, fella, fix 'em." This is the voice of big business speaking. I would have expected better from that member.

However, this doesn't mean that everything in unions is perfect. Obviously there are problems and these problems have to be cleared up—not by chopping off their heads as the Conservatives would do; not by chopping off their power to strike back and fight back against the big international corporations, as the member for Scarborough Centre would do; but by bringing in some aid through the Department of Labour so that when a crooked situation like this develops they can get some help.

There's another one. I want to take a moment and talk about good old Charlie Irvine. Remember him and his machinations with the Labourers' Union, with the Mafia? Just two weeks ago I got a letter from several people who work in his field—it's in the plastering field—who unfortunately are members of his union. They wrote to me as follows; perhaps I should leave out some of the adjectives:

> Dear Dr. Shulman:
>
> Due to the [blank—blank] behaviour of Charles W. Irvine, international vice-president of the Operative Plasters, we, the undersigned members in good standing of the Operative Plasterers Union, are forced to ask for your help in solving a problem created in this union. The following letter is a description of the events leading up to our present action.
>
> We spent a portion of 1971 plastering in New York City. Part of the union plasterers' pay packet in New York City were stamps worth $2.05 per hour. Ordinarily, these stamps are turned into the plastering industry welfare and pension trust fund. The out-of-town plasterers can obtain a refund, after due process, by the PIW and PIP. During 1963 and 1964 we obtained, directly, our own refunds after working in New York City.
>
> However, starting in 1970 the Canadian union hierarchy decided to distribute these refunds through the office of Local 117 in Toronto after proper deductions were made. Our return to Canada in July 1971, has allowed plenty of time for the refund processing. Each of us has over $1,000 due in refunds. We are very anxious to receive this money as we have been out of work since January 3, 1972, and have not received any unemployment insurance whatsoever. In Local 117's office, February 8, 1972, we were assured everything was in order. The only thing needed was Charles W. Irvine signing the cheques. He was not in his office that particular day.
>
> After a delay of 10 days we went to Toronto to see Irvine in person. Upon entering the union headquarters, Irvine's opening statement was: "There is no use

talking to me, as I do not speak Italian." We are not Italians and we couldn't understand his comment. Before we could reply, he left us and closed the door to his inner office. During our morning's wait for an afternoon appointment we came to the conclusion the office procedure was a farce.

After informing E. W. Russell, the business agent of Local 48, of our conclusions, he finalized a series of insults by saying: "Get the — [there is a four-letter word] out of this office." Please inform us if you can help accelerate the payment of these stamp refunds. It would also help a large number of plasterers in Toronto who are having the same problem.

Your attention to this matter would be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly.

It was signed by two union members in Brantford. I am afraid to use their names because I am told that if I do they will be blacklisted and would be unable to get work in the industry.

I wrote to Mr. Irvine immediately and I asked him if he would please look into it because these men really needed their refunds very badly.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): They're going to be very hard to trace after that anonymity the member promised them.

Mr. Shulman: He knows who they are now but if their names are made public—apparently you're allowed to do something as long as your name doesn't get in the paper. If your name gets in the paper you've had it.

Incidentally, regarding the other union I spoke about before, Local 128, I have a letter of theirs here too in which they sent out to the hiring halls a list of men who were not to be hired for the following reasons. One reason was they thought they were Communists, so that is all right I think. Reason No. 2 is because they are troublemakers, and that is all right I think. But reason No. 3 is because they have been involved in strikes, and I found that rather strange for a union. Anyway, that is Local 128. Somehow I have the feeling that the people who run that union are more interested in the corporations than the union members.

Anyway, Mr. Charles Irvine wrote me a letter on Feb. 29.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of Feb. 28 regarding unsigned cheques. Please be advised that any and all cheques emanating from New York which have required, as you say, my signature, have been handed to the principals involved or mailed to them at their homes immediately on receipt of same from New York with no complaints to this office as of this date.

Yours truly,

Charles W. Irvine.

I found that in come contradiction to the facts. I wrote Mr. Irvine immediately on March 2.

Dear Mr. Irvine:

Thank you for your letter of February 29. I understand the following individuals have been unable to receive the moneys owing to them.

And I gave him the names of three persons.

Furthermore, I am told on their last attempt to do so two of these men were ordered out of your union's Toronto Office. May I hear from you again.

Yours sincerely.

That was over a week ago but there has been no reply. I checked with the men and they still haven't got their money.

There has to be somewhere these people can go and the answer obviously isn't just in setting up a Canadian union as some of the Conservatives have suggested, because one of the worst possible unions is a Canadian union. The one we had mixed up with the Mafia last year, which was making the deals with the construction people, was a local Canadian union.

The problem doesn't come from American affiliation. In a few unions—and let me stress again, very few—the crooks are in charge and something has to be done about it. This has to go to the Minister of Labour. We have a new Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon)

I am sorry that the member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) lost the job. He was really a magnificent Minister of Labour, if I may say so. He couldn't have been better unless he had come from labour ranks himself; he had a feeling for the human beings who were involved.

I am going to tell you a story about him in a minute; I think this praise is due to him. I have to criticize so often here and I want to say something nice about someone. Unfortunately, the new Minister of Labour—and I say this with all kindness—is a lovely gentleman. I don't think there is a nicer gentleman in this whole House than the member for Stormont. I have the greatest personal affec-

tion for him and I can't imagine a more decent human being. But quite honestly, I don't think that his training and his background and his ability are such as to fit him for this particular post.

I would have hoped that the Premier (Mr. Davis) would have placed him in one of many other fields which, I am sure, he would handle with distinction. But in the field of labour where he really has no background and no knowledge, I fear we are going to have a few very bad years of labour strife because he is just not qualified to handle the problems that are going to develop.

I am digressing just for a moment. I want to tell you about the problems that can develop. There was a firm out my way that went on strike late last summer. It was a small company at the corner of Dundas and Runnymede and employed perhaps 85 people. The men went out for reasons they felt were legitimate, asking for more money and better working conditions. The owner of the business, who had built that business up from nothing, was an immigrant. He felt very paternal and took this, their striking, as a personal slight and he swore he would break the strike.

He hired this terrible Canadian Driver Pool, who sent in their strikebreakers, their trucks, their photographers, their thugs, and in effect they broke the strike. They put that company back to work. They hired men, most of them new immigrants who weren't aware of the situation, and, gradually, over a period of months, the company began to approach normal production and the men out on the picket line became desperate.

Many of those men are patients of mine. They are all of very modest means. It began to dawn on them that they had lost the strike. The Department of Labour had been unable to do anything about it.

I went to the president of the company and asked: "Please give the men an offer they can live with. You have beaten them, let them at least come back to work." The offer that had been given was: "We will hire you back under the terms we offered you before, except we are not going to hire you all back. The following men we are never going to hire back because they have been too active on the union picket line." They gave a list of the five union leaders. Well, no man could go back with self resepect under those terms and they had to refuse it.

I went to the president of this company and I begged him, literally I begged him; it was just before the election. I said: "Please, as a human being do this." I said: "There is just an outside chance that the NDP might win this election and if they do people like you are going to be in trouble." He said: "Let's wait and see for a week or two." He stalled until October 22 and then he decided there was no need to make an offer to the men and he went on a holiday somewhere.

It looked like those men were just out of work, out of luck. A lot of them had worked there 20 years.

I have to give tribute to the then Minister of Labour (Mr. Carton). I phoned him up and he said: "Come and see me." I went down and I told him this story. I said that as the member for High Park, as the member representing that area, and speaking for these men, if as a personal favour, for no other reason, do something for these men—get them back at work.

I don't know what he did, but I have to give him a tip of the hat, because the very next day he phoned and he said: "There is going to be an offer made to the union by the company tomorrow. For goodness' sake make sure they don't haggle on it."

I phoned up the union leader and I said: "You are going to get an offer and it is going to be a decent offer. Don't try to change a comma. Grab it, because the company would like you to reject it. They would like you to haggle so they can turn it down." The union men were desperate and said: "Don't worry, we will accept it."

That offer came through and it was a decent offer. They hired everyone back; they gave them a reasonable raise in pay. My head is still swimming and believe me, as long as the member for Armourdale stays in politics, I will be one of his great supporters.

He did something that a Labour minister should be able to do in a situation like that. He was able to step in and I don't know what pressures he was able to exert, but whatever they were, he exerted them. He literally saved the lives—the financial lives and the home lives—of some 85 men and their families.

It is not too often we get something great coming out of the opposite side but when it does come out, credit should be given. The minister did a great job there; I am sorry he was moved out of the post.

To come back to these two unions. My appeal to the present Minister of Labour—and I trust he will hear my appeal wherever he is—is that some further control has to be put on to the craft unions particularly, as to

their financial handling of funds. There has to be an annual audit required as a minimum. A report must be filed with the Department of Labour and when obvious evidence of crookedness is produced, the department should be able to step in.

I would like to leave that and move on to a matter affecting the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

If I might, the conversation at the console is quite audible. I wonder if they could just speak a little lower so we can hear the hon. member.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to turn to a matter in the field of apples. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) isn't here because he is the one I would like to talk to on this particular subject.

I came here to this House five years ago and I knew nothing about farming. I still know nothing about farming. I knew nothing about the marketing of food; I am learning a little about that. Periodically—as recently as last week I believe the seconder of the Speech from the Throne gets up and says something about marketing boards and marketing commissions and that we've got to do something to push the price of eggs up, we've to do something to strengthen the position of the farmers in the peach field or the pear field or whatever it is.

Quite honestly I didn't really have any knowledge of what this was all about whatsoever. But my curiosity has now been piqued and I have been looking at this particular field. It surprised me that in these five years, although we hear a great deal from the people representing the farmers in this House about their particular problems, no one has ever spoken up for the consumer—and perhaps it is time someone did. Since I represent very few farmers in my riding and most of my people are consumers, I think it is only fit and fair I should do this.

I don't want to set myself up as an expert on marketing; I still haven't even looked in most fields. I began, of all places, with apples, which is a relatively simple field—they are marketed in a relatively simple way without any processing being required—and what I've seen boggles my mind from the consumer's point of view.

I think it's been generally accepted by all parties and all governments for many years that the farmer needs certain protections and certain aids. I accept without question that if there is unfair dumping of manufactured goods from Japan, we should put duties on those manufactured goods to protect our manufacturers. I accept the same if there is unfair dumping of grown products on our farm market; there should be duties to protect the farmers. I accept the fact that if subsidies are needed for mines in order to keep the men working in those mines, we give the subsidies.

Similarly, if there are subsidies necessary to keep our farmers farming economically, we should give those subsidies. But I do not accept the insane way that our money as consumers is being wasted in at least this one particular field, which I would like to go into in detail.

Two months ago a man came to my office. He sells apples; he goes around to farmers and buys the apples, then trucks them up to northern Ontario and sells them. He said: "I've received a letter from the Ontario Apple Producers Marketing Board saying I'm selling my apples too cheaply, and I'm not making enough profit. I have to charge more or they're going to take me to court, and I might go to jail for as long as five years."

I said: "You've got to be putting me on; that can't be right." But, by golly, he produced the correspondence—I have it here—and they did actually accuse him of selling the apples too cheaply—not to the consumer, because there's no law about how cheaply you can sell to the consumer, but to the stores.

Now what they've done—and get this—is they have not set a minimum price that must be paid to the farmer. Apparently you can pay the farmer as little as you want; to buy the apples for as little as you can is perfectly okay. But there is a minimum price that the retailer must pay the middleman. Figure that one out!

What that means in effect is that we are not safeguarding the farmer but the middleman, the packer, the guy who trucks it around, the guy who acts between the farmer and the retailer. Once the retailer has it, he can sell for anything he wants. He can sell for less than cost, more than cost, mark it up double; that doesn't matter. But there is a minimum price that retailer must pay.

This seemed a little strange, and I got in touch with the secretary-manager of the Apple Producers Marketing Board—his name is Mr. W. E. Bond—and I said: "This sounds a little nuts." He said: "Well, everybody is happy with the board. It isn't just the apple middleman and the apple grower who are on the commission; we have representatives of the retailers on the commission and, not only that, of the consumers."

I said: "Really? Who is the representative of the consumers?" He said, "Why, we have someone from the Consumers Association of Canada, a Mrs. W. Brechin, who sits on the board. Everybody is happy on the board. Nobody has objected at all, and obviously if nobody objects there can't be anything wrong with our system."

I found this a little strange, so I got in touch with Mrs. Brechin. She was attending a consumers' conference down in Ottawa, and I finally got her down there, and she said:

"Well, quite frankly all marketing boards are against the best interests of the consumer, and I sit on it as a representative of the consumer in the hope of least getting our viewpoint across and I hope that my input in some way affects the actions that they take. But quite frankly," and I quote her now, "the apple Marketing Board is an illogical system that has built up over the years. After 3½ years I still don't understand it. Frankly, the whole concept of a marketing board is contrary to the consumers' interests and approach."

I gathered at this point that everyone wasn't completely happy with the commission. But then, I found something that really surprised me. There are four grades of apples. They start with Canada fancy, and they go down through Canada commercial to C grade, which is good only for making juice. And retailers must be charged the same minimum price for apples regardless of which grade it is.

So I said: "How could that be?" I mean, obviously, if an apple is full of worm holes and is a C grade, or is badly deformed, is crushed, and you can't sell it, it shouldn't be worth as much as an apple that is highly polished and in perfect condition.

I couldn't quite figure that one out, so I got in touch with the Minister of Agriculture and Food and he said: "Well we tried that. You know it does sound logical, perhaps reasonable, that if an apple is a second we should charge less for it, but we found it didn't work. You see, unfortunately, we found that some firms would go and pack apples and call them A grade and they were really C grade; and the system didn't work."

You know, that's strange, they do have inspectors who go around and they grade these things. I went down to the Queensway, to the place where they sell these apples and these little inspectors were there running around and chopping away at the apples and looking at them saying: "That's A grade, that's C grade, that's fancy." And his answer left a little bit to be desired, but apparently what it finally boiled down to his department was so inefficient that they were unable to grade the apples. Figure that one out.

Well, all right. We debate with the Minister of Agriculture and Food, but it's a losing battle since he knows his subject far better than we do. He is a farmer and we are poor consumers. Besides, once he starts talking, he talks a lot and by the time he comes to the end of it we have forgotten what the original question was anyway. So I saw no point in continuing the debate with him.

But here is a situation where the apples are graded all right, and then the retailer is told he must pay the same price whether he buys the good ones or the bad ones. Well, this causes a little confusion to the retailer. But if you think this is bad wait till you hear the corker.

The Ontario Apple Marketing Board has passed a law saying there is a minimum price that must be paid for apples by any retailer in Ontario, unless—and this is the real corker —unless the apple is grown outside of Ontario, in which case there is no minimum price.

Now this big apple in Ontario is the McIntosh, and fortunately, or unfortunately for our growers, we grow McIntoshes that look exactly the same on this side of the border as grow in Quebec. The McIntoshes here look exactly the same as the ones that grow in New York. So what happens is, because apples are so much cheaper in value than the minimum price set by our board—now, because the Ontario apples cannot be sold to the retailers—people truck the apples in from Quebec. So we buy Quebec apples. This, of course, helps our growers a great deal.

I went down to Mr. Bond's office and said that this boggles the mind. "How can you people be so stupid? All you are doing is ruining the market for the Canadian growers, for the Ontario growers and the Ontario farmers. What is happening is, the chains will bring in apples from Quebec, which can be brought in for half the price of the Ontario apples, the same apple, and they will sell them here and you are just going to put our farmers out of business."

He said: "Oh, no, that won't happen."

And I said: "Why won't it happen?"

He said: "Because, first of all, the chains have great loyalty to our Ontario producers

and they won't do that. Secondly, the secret in any marketing"—and I accepted this because I am not familiar with this field"—"is continuity of supply. If they deal with our people, they are guaranteed continuity of supply."

I said: "Well, I happen to know one man at least who is trucking these apples in by the truckload from Quebec and selling them all over Ontario to the small stores."

He said: "Well, that doesn't matter, what is a few truckloads in the apple field. There are so many grown, a few truckloads, 10 truckloads, 20 truckloads, that really doesn't touch the market."

I said: "What about Steinbergs? They have now brought in Quebec apples into all their stores in Ottawa because they can bring them in so much cheaper."

He said: "Well, that is just one chain, in one part of the province. It really hardly affects the market, but most of the chains are still using Ontario apples, even though they cost them twice as much and even though you can't tell the difference."

Well I staggered away from there a little confused. I began to realize this whole marketing thing which we have been hearing so much about was not quite as all-knowing as our farmer members would have us believe. It was not quite all right.

There is a magazine called "The Grower" which is sent out to every member of the Legislature. I must confess that for the past few years I haven't been reading it, but I have now developed an interest in farming so I read this month's issue, and I have to quote it to you because it is really quite beautiful. The board is very proud of what it is doing and I want to quote this to you:

> Prices were maintained at the best possible levels consistent with adequate movement. Pressures were exerted all fall from nearby markets. For example, while fancy grade McIntosh were selling store-door delivered at $4 for 8x5 poly bags in central Ontario, the same variety and package in the Hudson Valley, New York State, were 75 cents f.o.b. storage. Store-door-delivered price in Quebec City was $2 for the same package and western New York and Michigan prices were in the $2.25 range during the same period.

So here they are boasting that while people in Quebec and in the surrounding states paid $2 for apples, we paid $4. Well, perhaps they have a right to boast. They are doing a little good for the farmer, I think—although I suspect they are putting a lot of them out of business—they are doing a lot of good for the distributors and the packers, because if these distributors are smart, and some of them are, and they want to make a buck, what they do is drive 25 trucks over the border into Quebec, buy all the apples there—and one can't tell one apple from another apple once you have bought it and it is off the tree—and they come back and say: "These are Ontario apples." So when they sell them to Dominion Stores or to Loblaws, nicely packaged up in their little poly bags, they say: "The board says we have to charge you a minimum of $4 for an 8x5 bag.

So this doesn't do anything for our farmers—it puts them out of business maybe. It doesn't do anything for our consumers—it raises the price of living a little bit—but by God it's good for those apple packers. Instead of making a profit of one or two or five per cent, it lets them make a profit of a little over 100 per cent. And this is our Apple Marketing Board set up by this government in order to raise the cost of living in this province, and for this I give you full credit. Well I am learning about apples.

I understand there are also boards in other fields and I am next going to look at the peach board. Apparently all these boards work in the same way. The idea is, push the price up as hard and as fast and as high as the market will bear, but not so high that it becomes economic to ship the stuff in from the surrounding provinces. The only problem with the Apple Marketing Board is that they sort of went a little beyond that. If they had settled for 50 per cent higher than the cost elsewhere they would probably have got away with it, but they had to shove it up to double the cost elsewhere, so that is what got them into slight difficulty. Apparently these marketing commissions' aim is to raise the price to the consumer. It is time someone spoke up for the consumer and it is time there was some proper representation on these boards from the consumer. This particular board, the apple board, has 22 people on it with one representative from the consumer, so you can imagine how much voice the consumer gets on that board.

Well—I'm sorry, was there a comment from the farmers?

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): If they want to buy some apples, send them to Picton, we have a lot of them there.

Mr. Shulman: There are a lot of apples—

Mr. Taylor: Direct from the growers.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I'm glad I received that interjection from the Conservative benches—

Mr. MacDonald: If Quebec apples and New York apples are being marketed here, sure they are going to have a surplus down there.

Mr. Shulman: The comment from the farming benches is that there are a lot of apples in Picton; there are a lot of apples everywhere and the reason there are a lot of apples everywhere is that you have pushed the price up so they are no longer economic and you are not competing with the apples from the States and out of the province. The law as supply applies to apples as it does to every other food and everything else; when you start tinkering with it in the way you are doing you ultimately ruin the growers.

Mr. Taylor: And the member has an Instant Hansard there.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very much.

I would like to turn to another matter, which comes under the Department of Correctional Services. It is an incredible story and it doesn't apply to a lot of people, it applies to one family who have been literally done in by our system of justice. I have been requested to make an appeal for them and I am going to do so now, because I cannot get anywhere through appeals to the minister and to everyone else responsible.

Some months ago, I received a letter from a Mrs. Barbara Everly and it was a most incredible letter and I am going to read it into the record. The date on it is December 9, last year:

Dear Mr. Shulman:

I am writing to you with great hopes of receiving some kind of advice or assistance from you. Although our story is quite a long one, I sincerely hope you take time to read it.

My husband is Michael L. Everly, an American from Ohio. He is 23 years old. He has been a drug addict since the age of 16 and he has served a jail sentence in the United States for two years because of his problem. He was convicted and sentenced for fraud and false pretences. At the present time, he is in Lindsay county jail. He was arrested December 18, 1970, and sentenced March 1, 1971, for two years, less one day, for the same reasons.

At the time of his sentencing, I was four months pregnant. The presiding judge, Dr. Stewart, Windsor, Ontario, seemed very concerned for Michael and myself and the situation of our coming child, Michael's rehabilitation and our future together. He recommended that Michael be given treatment and a rehabilitation programme during his incarceration.

Since that time, Michael has spent approximately eight months at Millbrook Reformatory, three months in Windsor County Jail awaiting his sentence, which was not included in his sentence of two years, less a day.

While in Millbrook, he was given no treatment, learned no skills and had no full-time job to occupy his time.

My husband has been a heroin addict and he needs help badly. He needs to have some treatment and some understanding and something more to do than read and write letters.

I wrote to Queen's Park for help, spoke to psychologists, psychiatrists, superintendents of the institution and received little or no concern or understanding. Everyone involved realizes Michael has a problem, but no one will help.

He is wanted in the USA for the same charges previously mentioned. The USA have made no effort to take him back, but naturally, because he is an American citizen, he has a deportation order against him. This fact seems to be our albatross.

The reason for not giving him a fair chance at rehabilitation is a little more complicated. Every institution which offers programmes for inmates is medium or minimum security and he is not allowed there because of his immigration status.

We now have a five-month-old daughter whom Michael has never seen or touched. Our visits for the last year have been through windows for one hour a week. Needless to say, this doesn't help either of us, especially Michael. Of course he is upset about himself as a father and his fate when he is released and how he can support us and make a better person of himself.

Well, all of this is quite common. We receive this kind of letter every day and you can't get too sympathetic over drug addicts, particularly one who has come up from the States. But now we come to the meat of it.

While in Millbrook, he was approached by the RCMP in connection with a guard who was smuggling heroin in to the prisoners and who was pushing drugs in

the institution. The RCMP promised us both that if we would help them convict and arrest this man, they would in turn have Michael transferred to a medium or minimum security institution and would help rescind his deportation order.

Michael and I were sure we were doing the right thing, both for ourselves—it gave us a chance for him to form a new life—and for the institution, because it certainly is not proper to have guards pushing heroin in Millbrook.

In our dealings with the RCMP they told me to obtain the drugs, pay the guard $100 for his risk, and deliver the packaged drugs to Michael personally. I did all of this with the belief that Michael would receive the help and that the RCMP would keep their promises.

She took the money, she paid the guard, he gave her the drugs.

We have never done anything like this before, Dr. Shulman, and we won't again because the RCMP didn't keep their word. We have received nothing from them.

When the guard was arrested, the only result was that the inmates at Millbrook immediately began to harass Michael and his environment there became very dangerous and unbearable for him, as they threatened they were going to kill him. The superintendent then had him placed in solitary confinement with two guards at his side at all times for a period of three weeks until, finally, an inspector from Queen's Park, Mr. H. Hughes, came down and learned of the situation.

Michael was then moved to Lindsay County Jail. He has been there six weeks now and there doesn't seem to be any hope of having him transferred to a minimum or medium security prison. The RCMP have backed down on all of their promises and the constable involved is now in another location.

After much telephoning and arguing I finally received $100 back, which I had given as instructed, because I am on mothers' allowance and I had borrowed the money. It took them two months to give back my money, and only when I was almost being evicted from my room and I pleaded with them.

So here we are. Michael is in a worse position now than when he was at Millbrook. A county jail such as this is almost impossible for guidance or rehabilitation. I can feel our marriage slowly coming apart and nobody seems to want to listen. I don't know what else I can say now. We have been used badly by the RCMP and by the authorities.

What can we do? How can we help ourselves now? Who can we talk to or trust? Who can we ask for help? Our lawyers don't seem to be able to get anything done. The RCMP no longer even answer my letters now that my usefulness is gone to them. The superintendents at the institution say they must only follow instructions. Nobody wants to get involved, everyone is too busy or too blind. Can no one help? The people who have the authority don't want to do anything.

I am sorry. I will stop there. I hope I haven't been too emotional. Is there anything that can be done? I really feel we have been badly treated.

I agree, I think they were badly treated. The man was in Millbrook; and Millbrook, bad as it is, has some amenities. In return for helping the authorities, he is put in solitary confinement and then shipped to a county jail, which is what you do to the very worst troublemakers in Millbrook.

The name of the constable who made the deal with Mrs. Everly is Constable Jenkins. The date the exchange took place was October 6, 1971. I have confirmed all of these with the RCMP and elsewhere. There is no question of the facts; the only question is, what is going to be done?

I was not able to get anywhere with the RCMP so I made an appeal to the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps). After failing everything else, I wrote him on January 12. I enclosed a copy of the letter Mrs. Everly had sent to me and I finished:

> As this couple have done their best to co-operate with the authorities could you investigate this matter and see if Mr. Everly could receive some consideration in return? Thank you and I shall look forward to hearing from you.

The minister, as is his practice, replied to me putting "Personal and Confidential" on top of the letter so I can't quote it. There is one sentence I am going to quote because it is the sum and substance of it and because it represents such a callous attitude I think it should be noted. I quote it:

> While it is true that Mr. Everly and his wife worked with the RCMP in effecting this arrest, I am sure you will realize that this department was not involved in these arrangements nor did it enter into any agreement on Mr. Everly's behalf.

I am not going to quote the rest of the letter. He says: "I am not going to do anything for him."

He says: "I am very sympathetic. Just too bad about him; part of the flotsam and jetsam that we have come into our jails. So what? What if the RCMP made a promise? What's that to me?" That's what he says.

I am surprised, you know. This is the sort of thing we expected from the former Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Grossman). We know this minister to be a kind man. At least I thought so, but the callousness that he has shown here and the callousness that everyone has shown here is incredible.

I am telling this story in the House not because I hope to affect the minds of the ministers who are not here; not that the designate Minister of Public Protection (Mr. Winkler) who is paying attention will do anything about it—I see him smiling at me—but in the hope that someone sitting up in that press gallery will hear this story and print it and shame them into doing something because that is the only way these things get done. We are only too well aware of how it has to be done.

I am going to leave that there. I hope that someone will do something about this case because here is a man who literally risked his life in one of our jails to help improve things in Millbrook and everybody says: "Well he did it, so what?" I am appealing to the government for this drug addict, for this piece of flotsam and jetsam.

I would like to go to another matter, Mr. Speaker, and this is the Americanization of our economy. Let me start by saying I am not a nationalist; I am an internationalist. I do not stand with the Mel Watkinses of this world. I believe we must have international trade and international investment unless we wish to go back to wigwams. But I do resent when entire industries, particularly key industries, are taken over by the United States, by Americans, quietly, without any option being given, without any notice being given. Such an industry has just been taken over without any word of it reaching the press. I think a word should be reaching there and I think people should be aware of what is happening.

The former member for Humber, George Ben, raised a very serious problem last year when the control of security guards was taken over by the United States. Two months ago a man came to me who was in the field of burglar and fire alarm control, the burglar and fire alarm industry. He said he had seen quite a bit in the paper about this takeover of security guards but what isn't realized is that in the last few months the burglar and fire alarm industry has also been taken over by the US. It goes back over a period of 15 years, but the final step has just been taken in the last few days.

It started 15 years ago when the Dominion Electric Protection Co. was bought out by American District Telegraph Co. Dominion Electric Protection is still the largest alarm company in Canada and includes Alberta Alarms out west. American District Telegraph at the same time bought out British Columbia District Telegraph. So here we have the largest company now American-owned. A few years ago a Canadian company by the name of Night Security began installing alarms with connections to their own central office. They were bought out by Phillips Alarms which, in turn, were bought out by the SIS Protection Co. It, in turn, was bought out by Burns Protection Co. of the United States. This was the second largest alarms company in Toronto.

American District Telegraph is basically an equipment manufacturing firm. After gaining control of a firm it sells its own product to them. That is why it is trying to get control of all these alarm companies, because the whole idea is that there is not that much money to be made in monitoring the alarms, but once it controls the companies then it makes them buy American-made equipment. They have control of companies in Britain and Europe as well as Canada and the United States.

> When I was an employee of this firm [and this is a statement from this person] I witnessed cases where equipment was destroyed in order to be replaced by new equipment which the parent company forced them to buy. This new equipment was exactly the same as that which it replaced but we were not allowed to save any of the old equipment, even plug-in relays, which were exactly the same in the new equipment and worth $25. They put up an assembly plant in Rexdale but the components are all imported from ADT in the United States of America.
>
> The latest, and I believe the most serious development, is taking place right now. Most of the smaller alarm companies that do not have the capital to set up their own central offices across Canada installed their receiving panels in the Telephone Answering Service offices—TAS—to be monitored by the operator.

In Toronto these companies include Sinclair Alarms, National Alarm System, Automatic Alarms, Northern Alarm Protection Co. Ltd., Bell alarm systems and several other small firms. Suddenly, a few weeks ago, TAS informed them that they were going to instal their own receiving panels in all their offices across Canada. All the other panels now installed will be removed and their subscribers will have to pay TAS for the monitoring service.

This is very good business for TAS. TAS is owned by International Utilities Corp. of the United States and is associated with ADT. So the situation now is that the alarm system companies are now all either owned or controlled from the United States. The equipment installed in them is practically all made in the United States or by a branch plant.

In effect, quietly and without any notice another industry has gone south and we weren't even aware of it. I got in touch with Robert Harwood; the president of TAS; we reached him down in Montreal. Before we did that I called Automatic Alarms, Northern Alarm, Bell alarm, and they all confirmed this. The man from National Alarm said: "Yes, it is a squeeze but there is nothing in the law that says they can't go into the alarm business." And so on down the line; they've all confirmed the facts.

Finally I got in touch with Mr. Robert Harwood, who is the Canadian spokesman for TAS, and said: "What about it?" He said: "Well, yes, but we don't dictate to anyone. We didn't make them use our alarms. We merely asked if they would like to use our alarms, because actually there is a little problem: Our alarms are a little smaller and when we are putting them all in"—and let me read you this line—"they can still keep their alarms there if they want, provided there is space, but it doesn't look as though there is going to be any."

They didn't tell them, they asked them: "Would you like to stay in business or would you like to go out of business?" They were very polite. In effect he confirmed that that is what they've done; they've put in these new panels. The small companies are all being forced to go along with this American payoff or else get out of business.

So another industry has gone south. I don't suppose anything can be done about that now, but periodically when there's publicity on matters of this nature, the government jumps up and says: "Oh, my God, that industry mustn't go; the publishing industry mustn't go; the security industry mustn't go." Here is another industry that is perhaps of some importance in this country —of growing importance, considering the political situation—and I suggest to the minister responsible, who I guess is perhaps the designate minister of Public Protection since he is the only one here who is responsible, that he should take a look at this particular industry.

Mr. Speaker, speaking of the Americans, I would now like to take a moment and speak of a little racket involving Americans—only it's the other way around now. This is a Canadian racket involving Americans, in which we steal from them It's sort of nice to reverse things occasionally, and perhaps we should strike some sort of medal for the people involved in this.

I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, I am bringing this up only to commend the gentlemen involved because I'm sure they are stealing this money only to help our balance of payments and with no ulterior purpose in mind. They have worked out a scheme whereby many hundreds of thousands of dollars can be extracted from Americans and brought up here to Toronto—and they deserve credit for this, I guess.

The name of the company is Reed and Zellsman Ltd. Their office is at 3768 Bathurst Street in Downsview; that is, the land corporation division of their office, but I should think that's the whole office. They very cleverly have taken the office up above the United Trust, and as you drive up you think you are coming to United Trust but actually it is just an office upstairs.

They have been running an advertising campaign all over the United States, advising Americans how to make a lot of money. Here's the folder that goes out; it's a beautiful multi-coloured folder. The heading is, "Make Money in Canada Lands," and they're advertising great bargains in which Americans can participate in by buying up Canada.

Well I was under a misunderstanding; I thought the Americans had already bought everything that was to be sold. But they've discovered something that hasn't been sold yet; so they want to get that piece of business done too, so they can get on with some other country.

What they've done is they have gone up north of Cochrane and Timmins and bought up hundreds of thousands of acres of mining claims. They've paid as high as $3 an acre

for it, mind you. Most of this is bush, with no access except by parachute, but it's advertised in the United States. Let me just read the heading: "There's Profit in Canada's Natural Wealth and Vacation Paradise." And there are picture of beautiful vacation lands and girls in bikinis. The land is described as being "north of Toronto," but it doesn't quite say how far north. "North of Toronto, that metropolis of two million people."

It goes on: "You can't lose if you buy our lands." That phrase upset me a little bit.

> All our land parcels are outstanding buys, whether you are planning to buy and hold your land for investment or actually build your dream house, your dream cottage for a lifetime of happy vacations. Either way or both you can't lose when you purchase these nominally priced Canadian lands.

And it goes on:

> The management and ownership of our firm has had long, successful experience in the fields of real estate and land development and enjoys a well-earned reputation for stability and integrity.

That's all very impressive. There is a picture, believe it or not, of our building, the one we are in right now to indicate the type of lands that are available. There it is, looking up University Avenue, showing one of the typical Canadian buildings.

An hon. member: It is available?

Mr. Shulman: It doesn't say whether it's available or not. But it says it's increasing in land value. So, I don't know whether they have attempted to sell this particular building, or not. But they sure attempted to sell a lot else. We answered the ad. We got an American address and answered the ad. And they sent us down some beautiful brochures with pictures of people having wonderful times and describing in some detail the lands that were available.

Here is their first folder. It is a beautiful folder. It contains oh, some 20 pages, with a map of Ontario, showing exactly where it is in relation to New York, showing how close the lands are to Toronto itself, and how far it is south of that lake. I think it's Lake Superior.

It says here it's fun to travel over 80,000 miles of good road. "Easy to enter. Fun for the whole family. Year-round sporting and entertainment. Hunting, fishing, camping." Every possible advantage that you can find at home is here, plus the fact that you can buy it as cheap as $25 an acre. Some of it a little more. For some of them they want $400 or $500 an acre. That's the better-located stuff.

So we looked up some of these locations on the map, and I got in touch with a real estate salesman up in Timmins. I described the parcel to him and I asked what that parcel would be worth? This is the one they're asking $1,500 for.

He laughed and he said: "Worth for what?"

He said, and let me get his exact quote: "Why would anybody want to own land like that? There's ice until May. The blackflies come in June. The mosquitoes arrive in July and the freeze-up is November 1. Anyway, if there are no roads how are you going to get into the property?"

As I said, most of these properties also have no lake, although one of them has the edge of a lake in it.

He said: "You could parachute somebody in but how would you get them out? In the winter perhaps we could snowmobile them out but if anybody went in in the summer, they'd be eaten by the blackflies before a helicopter could go in to get them."

He said: "Actually, companies like this have been in existence for some time and, periodically, they sell oodles of land down in the United States and people make the payments regularly for a period of a year or two and then come up to see the land and then, of course, they drop the payments and the companies repossess and they start all over again."

Well, it's straight dishonesty. I was delighted to see that it was brought to the attention of the designated Minister of Public Protection and he said, "Yes, that's bad, it really shouldn't be done and I really sympathize with all those poor Americans who are being taken." And that was the end of that. He didn't do anything. No legislation came in and there was no effect made to put this firm of Reed & Zelsman out of business and they're still churning out the sales.

I sent my secretary up to visit the Reed & Zelsman office and see about purchasing some land. They offered her a really great piece for $2,800 and said, "You've got to move fast because the land is going so quickly." To prove it, he had a great sheaf of cheques on his desk from all over the States. Most of them seemed to be coming

from California, of all places, and were buying up these advertised pieces.

And in the sheet that we had originally received, here is the list of all the properties they have for sale, representing some tens of thousands of acres. I was quite interested that of the first six parcels, five had been sold within the one week from the time we received this and the time that this Miss Page went up to attempt to purchase some land. There was only one left. So obviously this is a very big, very important swindle.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Very lucrative!

Mr. Shulman: A very lucrative swindle, which the government doesn't seem interested in doing anything about. Now there's a certain justice in this, Mr. Speaker. If you recall a few years ago the Americans were selling our suckers their Florida ocean-front land, which you had to visit at low tide, because otherwise it wasn't too usable.

So there's a certain justice when the Canadians sort of turn things around and swindle the Americans and try and get some of our money back.

But somehow I have the feeling this is not the way to do it and sometime in the future—it may be a long way in the future—but sometime in the future, we are going to want to develop those northern lands and the minister is going to wake up. I know the minister is not interested in this, but he is going to wake up one of these days and is going to find the whole north—yeah, the minister—to find the whole north—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Well, I cannot deal with the whole NDP at the same time.

Mr. Shulman: Well, pay attention to me.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am trying to listen to the hon. member and he is talking to me. I cannot help that.

Mr. Shulman: Well okay, the minister hasn't been aware, so I'll just reiterate.

We were talking about northern lands being sold to Americans through an advertising campaign. I am sorry the minister is not aware of this. He made a comment in the press that it is too bad this is taking place, and that he did not approve of it.

So I'm telling you, while the minister is not approving of it, they are selling it by the hundreds of thousands of acres and he is going to wake up one of these days and the whole north is going to be owned by the United States of America. They own the south already; let's try and keep part of the north.

Now unless the government does something quickly, these crooks—I am referring specifically to the firm of Reed and Zelsman; and specifically to Mr. Reed who is the brains; in fact, I guess he is the firm—are going to buy up the whole north and sell it in the United States of America.

There is a very, very simple way to stop this. I brought in a bill two years ago, which couldn't get second reading unfortunately, which would have stopped it then. You could bring it in in a minute as an amendment—you could even bring it in as a regulation, added to the present bill, saying that a prospectus has to be filed.

Right now they don't have to pay any attention to any governmental body whatsoever. They go down in the States—they are very careful, they don't advertise in Canada. They are careful not to sell in Canada. They are selling it all to Americans; they are swindling these Americans. They are selling the land for much more than it is worth.

Surely it is against public policy, forgetting the swindling part of it. The minister is the Minister of Public Protection and I know he is not too good at that aspect of it. But surely it is against public policy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Mr. Shulman: The minister is welcome.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I always like kindness and kind words. They soothe me.

Mr. Shulman: Well, it is going to get worse.

Surely it is against public policy to allow our north to be sold off through a deliberate campaign of misrepresentation. I leave this with the minister. Perhaps—I am not too hopeful—but perhaps he will do something.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Why doesn't the member come up and buy some?

Mr. Shulman: I am afraid the Americans have all bought all the stuff that I might want. I like the south.

Mr. Gilbertson: He is not interested, you see.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I am trying to save it for those fellows from the north, if they care.

Well Mr. Speaker, that completes the preliminary remarks which I wished to make. I would now like to come to the subject matter of my speech, which is the insurance companies.

I think in the brief time I have remaining for me in these next three years that is something on which I would like to concentrate, because unquestionably the things that the insurance companies in this province get away with are beyond belief. There are things done which, if attempted by an individual he would end up in jail very quickly. The only possible explanation I can give is that huge payments are made at every election time by the insurance companies to the governing party.

There is a radio programme that you can hear today—an advertisement. It is on every hour on the hour and on some stations it is on every half hour, from the Allstate Insurance Co. I asked the designate Minister of Public Protection just a little earlier today if he had done anything about this particular misleading advertisement and he said: "Yes, I phoned them."

Well, he may have phoned them. He may have been in touch with them, but he sure hasn't had any effect on them, because they know what their power is. The programme is still continuing. It is on today. It was on yesterday, and if that minister in his position as Minister of Public Protection thinks he is going to curtail the insurance companies, he'll soon be with George Kerr in Colleges and Universities—where one sends ministers who begin to take their jobs seriously.

Let me tell you about Allstate.. This is without doubt the bête noire of the insurance industry. They are all bad, but this is the worst.

Allstate is that terrible company that is always looking for ways not to pay off on claims. They are the company, which, if you have a policy insuring you against wind damage and a tree falls over and hits you in a windstorm they will say: "We won't pay because there was ice on that tree and the tree fell over, not from the wind, but from the weight of the ice." I had a case like that, believe it or not.

They are the company which if you become ill and try to collect from them on health insurance will say: "We won't pay because you had a pre-existing trouble with your stomach." When you ask them what that was they say: "We questioned him and he said he had gas once or twice before." You will recall that fantastic instance. With all the pressures put on here with that outstandingly ridiculous case, the minister wouldn't do anything about it. The minister was Arthur Wishart.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What case? Oh I see; the member is not talking about me.

Mr. Shulman: No, I am coming to the minister in a moment. I am talking about the past. I'm coming up to Allstate now.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Quite a bit of gas around here too, I can tell the member.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, probably; there is going to be more and worse. Allstate has learned nothing from all this. Four years ago when I came here I said: "For goodness sake, if I do nothing else for as long as I come here, let me prevail upon the government to do something about the Allstate Insurance Co. who are ripping off the people of this province." I didn't succeed in that so perhaps the whole thing has been a waste. I have seen two Attorneys General come and go since then. Let's try again with this Minister of Public Protection.

The Allstate Insurance Co. has a very expensive advertising plan. It's on right now and you can hear it every day on the radio, every hour on the hour.

> Buy Allstate insurance. Now you can have really great insurance protection. Here's what we give you. We give you 10 per cent discount if you have a two-car plan. If you're accident-free why should you pay as much for your car insurance as those people who are having a lot of accidents? We'll charge you less than the people who are having a lot of accidents. We'll give you a discount, a driver-training discount for persons under 25 who have taken an approved driving course. Not only that, we'll give you lower rates for younger marrieds and lower rates if you use your car very little; if it's low mileage. Allstate finally offers you a plan where you have protection.

That is all very lovely except what the Allstate doesn't—they do give all this so they are not lying—but what the Allstate company doesn't mention is that so does every other insurance company. None of this is new. This is given by every insurance company, always has been. It's standard and mandatory in every plan and they are misleading the public in trying to suggest that they are offering something extra, that they are offering something new. The designate Minister of Public

Protection says "Yes, I am aware of it. We have been in touch with them."

He may have been in touch with them and we see how much attention they are paying. They are still doing it. I am sorry the Minister of Public Protection doesn't wish to make any comment on this company. Surely, with their long record—and we have files and files of cases from Allstate—of misleading advertising, failure to pay off claims properly, failure to pay off claims promptly, failure to pay off claims period, should not be in business in this province.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Shame!

Mr. Shulman: At the very least let them defend themselves in a public hearing. Call a hearing—I have been asking for this for four years—call a hearing in the minister's department. A public hearing before one of the committees, people who have had bad experiences with Allstate. See whether they should be allowed to continue. See what the facts are. That is a reasonable request and we can't get that either.

The sad impression that comes through is it is not the Department of Public Protection that controls the insurance companies; it's the insurance companies that control the government.

I want to give a flagrant example of the way the insurance companies ignore what, in effect, is the law of the land and set up their own laws. There is a man by the name of Anthony Raimone and he was, until last month, a driver for the Dependable Messenger Service He had not had a car accident in 15 years nor has he received a single demerit point for bad driving in the last five years—not one point—and yet he is no longer able to drive a car. He has lost his job as a result.

How can you not be able to drive a car if you don't have a single demerit point, if you never had an accident? The answer is very simple. The insurance company said he isn't allowed to drive a car. How can that be? Again the answer is simple. Mr. Raimone had a number of minor traffic offences, small things like going three or four miles over the speed limit which got him tickets; but so minor that they didn't get him a single demerit point on his driving licence. The insurance companies have a pipeline to our Department of Public Protection and our Department of Transport, and they are notified immediately anyone gets not only demerit points, not only accidents, but any time anyone gets a ticket. Why? This is beyond me. They received information that Mr. Raimone had received a number of tickets which he had paid and therefore they decided that he shouldn't be allowed to drive. So what did they do? They got in touch with the Dependable Messenger Service and they said: "Now, look, if you want to have your policy continued for the whole company, you had better fire Raimone, because if you don't, we are cancelling your whole policy." Well, he had worked for some years there and the man who owns Dependable Messenger Service is very appreciative of the work being done by Raimone so he said: "Look, we want to keep Raimone. We don't want to fire him. We'll pay you a higher premium. How much would the higher premium be? "And they said it would be about 185 per cent higher, so he said: "Okay, we will pay the 185 per cent." Then they phoned back and said: "No, we are sorry. Even if you pay the 185 per cent, you can't keep him. You have got to fire him" Shame! "We aren't going to insure your company if he is a driver for it."

Here is a man without an accident in 15 years. Not a single demerit point. Well, the messenger service cannot be in business if they can't have insurance and they had no choice and they fired him. The man is now a public charge because of this insurance company. I upbraided the insurance companies in general and I attacked them and said: "Who sets the penalties in this province? Is it the insurance companies or is the Department of Transport? If they had decided that a minor penalty that doesn't even require a single demerit point shouldn't stop your driving, how can you, the insurance companies, say: 'We are going to decide.' How can you give a second punishment over and above the first one, which is the penalty which is paid, the $10 or $20 fine?"

And the insurance company said: "We certainly can. We have our statistics and they show that people who drive over the speed limit have more accidents than those who don't. Therefore, they shouldn't be insured. Now, stop and think about that one for a minute.

"If you are likely to have an accident, we don't want to insure you. There is no question of surcharge. We don't want to insure you."

Insurance used to be a business where people all got together and pooled their risks, the idea being if there are 117 people in this chamber and we all pay in $10 a month, if one of us had an accident, that $10

a month will cover that one person's damages. Well the insurance companies were set up to do just that, to pool risks, but they don't like doing that any more. They just want to insure people they are sure are not going to have accidents; which is very good business, I suppose, but it is not insurance. It's a rip-off and they should not have the right to penalize people in such a cruel and unusual way, by taking away your means of livelihood, saying you are a bad driver when you have never even received a single demerit point.

The answer is so simple. Agreed the insurance companies are powerful in this province. Agreed the government can't really take any substantial move against them, Mr. Minister of Public Protection, because they might cut off the funds for the next election. But there is one little thing he could do. There is one little thing he could do, and this suggestion comes—of all places—from an insurance agency—the Hackett Insurance Agency. He was upset by this. He said the government should not supply the insurance companies with records of traffic violations where no points were lost.

All right, let them know where the points are lost so they can pick out the bad driver. If we are going to have double jeopardy, at least let it be the people who are really bad drivers. But what right has the government to give out that other type of information where no points are lost to the insurance companies so the insurance companies will decide who will or who will not have insurance in this province? You know what that leads to? That leads to government-run auto insurance and we don't want that, do we?

Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Martel: Did I hear the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs say he agreed with it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I said for the member to speak for himself. That is what I said.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I see it is five minutes to the hour and I am about to start another subject. May I—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Go ahead. The member has five minutes. We have got lots of time.

Mr. Shulman: —suggest that we adjourn the debate at this moment and continue on Monday.

Mr. Shulman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:55 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 10, 1972

Summer employment programme—additional opportunities for youth, statement by Mr. Davis 237

Summer employment programme, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 238

Order in council designating Spadina cut for rapid transit, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis 238

Salary of agent general in London, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lawlor 239

De Havilland dispute—departmental contacts with management and labour, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 242

Harbour City cost prior to abandonment, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 242

Police protection at Gull Bay reservation, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Deans, Mr. Stokes 242

Removal of trees from dune area in Prince Edward county, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 243

Artifacts stolen from memorial—posting reward, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Givens 244

Protection for cleaned building at Queen's Park, question of Mr. Bales: Mrs. Scrivener .. 244

Company's move from Ontario to Quebec—federal grant, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Cassidy 244

Summer 72 programme—commission report, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Roy 245

Regional government in Sudbury district, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Germa 245

Location of new airport near Pickering, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deacon, Mr. Cassidy 245

Misleading advertising by insurance companies, questions of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Roy 246

Disposition of cattle at correctional institutions—dairy and beef herds, questions of Mr. Apps: Mr. Worton, Mr. Nixon 247

DWP news releases on contract awards, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Burr, Mr. Shulman 247

Assistance to municipalities—new formula re water and sewage installation, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Yakabuski 248

Income supplement programme by regional municipality, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Cassidy 248

City of St. Catharines, bill respecting, Mr. Johnston, first reading 249

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Shulman 249

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Shulman, agreed to 275

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 275

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, March 13, 1972

No. 9

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 13, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us today. In the west gallery we have students from St. Thomas More Separate School of Mississauga and also students from Holy Family School of Bolton. There will be students in the east gallery from St. Christopher's Separate School of Oshawa.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, a point of order. My point of order, sir, is that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Snow) on Friday deliberately misled the House. I would like to draw your attention to three points in reference to that, sir.

You will recall, sir, that on Friday the member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) raised the matter with the minister during the question period as to the different treatment of members of the House by his department, depending on whether or not the member was a member of the Conservative Party or otherwise. The minister then had the choice of admitting the situation and of promising to correct it, or just saying, "That's the way we do it, and you can go jump in the lake." And those literally were the two choices. Instead of which, sir, he chose to deny the situation and misled the house.

The second point I want to make, sir, is that after reading Hansard, there is no question that this could possibly have been inadvertent. The matter was not just asked and replied to. It was brought up and debated at some length and the minister was perfectly aware of what was being brought out.

I suggest to you, sir, that there is a very simple way to conclude the matter. The minister should apologize to the House and promise that the practice will be changed and that every member of this House will be treated equally in the future.

I want to stress, sir, it isn't the very minor politicking that is bothering me; it is a matter of misleading the House. Finally, sir, I would like to suggest to you that it would be a travesty of the rules of this House if a minister could come in and mislead the House in this way and behave in this way, and the only punishment that could then be meted out would be to the member who points out the fact it took place, sir.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): It is called a snow job.

Mr. Speaker: The remarks of the hon. member are almost identical to the remarks he had made previously. I did at that time undertake to investigate the matter and to reflect the results of my findings to this House.

It was on Friday, I believe, that I undertook to take into consideration the allegations made by the hon. member for High Park and some others respecting an answer of the Minister of Public Works in the oral question period. At the outset I feel that I should point out to the House that the rules governing the conduct of members are based on the assumption that all members are ladies and gentlemen. As Lewis says at page 24, "The conduct of members in the House is based on an etiquette of mutual consideration," and the 18th edition of May at page 418 says, "Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of Parliamentary language." It is for this reason that the standing orders and precedents specifically provide that no member may accuse another of a deliberate falsehood or of deliberately misleading the House.

The hon. member for High Park is again out of order having done so today. The hon. member for High Park attempted to circumvent this standing order by changing his expression to "dissembling to the House."

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It is a new word.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A word in high repute in this chamber. Used by the most distinguished authority.

Mr. Speaker: In the 1958 edition—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Invented only last week as a matter of fact. A great word.

Mr. Speaker: In the 1958 edition of Funk and Wagnall's Standard Dictionary—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Funk and Wagnall? On a point of order!

Mr. Speaker: That's the copy I own.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That's an American dictionary.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The sales of Funk and Wagnall will go up now.

Mr. Speaker: I find that the word "dissemble" is defined in part as "to conceal or disguise the true nature of intentions, feelings, etc., so as to deceive, to dissimulate." While I feel that this comes very close to offending the standing order, it is not so clearly an accusation of misrepresentation or falsehood that I feel it incumbent on me to deal further with that expression.

Referring to the minister's response to the accusation, I can only say that based on the presumption heretofore mentioned, parliamentary practice dictates that one member must, as far as his conduct in the House is concerned, accept the explanation or denial of another member. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) was quite correct in his observation that the Speaker cannot set himself up as a judge between two members as to who is telling the truth; he cannot and should not.

All members are, of course, entitled to their own opinion but as far as the procedure in the House is concerned the accusation having been made and answered, that is the end of it.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I may.

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled. There can be no more discussion on that particular ruling. The hon. members may challenge it if they so wish.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, I am not challenging you. I am raising a point of order, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I will listen to it.

Mr. Shulman: My point of order, sir, is, I refer you to a time when you yourself were in the chair on April 9, 1970, page 1348 of Hansard, when you made exactly the opposite ruling. When a member at that time suggested that a minister had inadvertently misled the House, you replied, "This is not a point of order unless the member is prepared to allege that the minister deliberately misled the House." You go on, sir, and say, "I have checked with the Clerk and it has to be a case of deliberately misleading the House." I also refer you, sir, to Hansard, page 1547, April 15, 1970, when at that time a member did accuse a minister of deliberately misleading the House and the Speaker—you, sir—accepted that.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear! Now whose rulings are we to follow?

Mr. Speaker: I'll refer to the references made by the hon. member for High Park. I was just Deputy Speaker then.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Now that is a clear word.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PROVINCIAL RESPONSIBILITY IN PAYMENT OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer and the soon-to-be Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs if he has had any discussions with Ottawa about the possibility of the Province of Ontario taking over the responsibility for the payment of family allowances, as has apparently been approved for the Province of Quebec? Are we interested in the transference of this responsibility or will it be used as a bargaining point in, perhaps, the transference of other responsibilities?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and of Municipal Affairs): I think it would be fair to say that we've had discussions from time to time, but I would think it would also be fair to say that we have come to no conclusions in terms of the latest offer made by the government of Canada. This is contained, as we understand it, in a letter to the Prime Minister of Quebec from the Prime Minister of Canada with a copy to the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis).

As of about an hour ago, the copy of that letter had not yet been received either in the Premier's office or in my department. Until such time as we have received the letter and analysed it I don't think we would have anything particularly illuminating to say.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit a supplementary: Might it be fair to say that it is not part of the policy of the government to attempt to get the responsi-

bility for these payments transferred, that is, from Ottawa to Toronto?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It has not been a part of the policy of the government, although I think we must say that we recognize the interests of several provinces, including our own, in so arranging various income-support plans so that they suit the needs of that particular province or region of the country.

If I can put it this way: Although I don't think this has necessarily been something which was near the top of our priority list, on the other hand we understand the reasons why the Province of Quebec perhaps feels it is more important in that province.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: At the Victoria conference, were the specifics of the Quebec plan under social allowances laid out before the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No; I think it would be fair to say no. There was some discussion but they had been laid out at bilateral meetings prior to Victoria. I don't think they were specifically discussed other than in very broad terms at Victoria. I am given to understand that the federal proposals which have now been advanced perhaps vary somewhat from what was being discussed at Victoria.

Mr Lewis: By way of further supplementary: If I recall rightly, at that time Ontario's position was that the special considerations Quebec was attempting to define for itself on manpower allowances, social allowances and youth allowances, were not, in fact, supported by Ontario, which means that we are now on the verge of possibly formulating a new policy?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think it would be correct to say that we either supported it or did not support it.

Certainly so far as we were concerned at Victoria, more than anything else we were interested in attempting to arrive at some solution whereby the constitution could return home to Canada and there would be provisions within that constitution to amend it within Canada. I think that was our priority at that time and perhaps we were not as concerned one way or another with the specific proposals being advanced by the Province of Quebec.

On the other hand, what I have to say, as I have said to the Leader of the Opposition, is that certainly we have a large interest and we have made our views known on ensuring that there is an integration or rationalization of the various forms of income support—family allowances, unemployment insurance, etc.—whether through tax credits or some sort of negative income tax.

ARREST OF U OF T STUDENTS BY METRO TORONTO POLICE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General, who is just now taking his seat: Can he explain to the House the status of the students who were arrested on Sunday by the Metropolitan Toronto police and who were removed from Simcoe Hall at the University of Toronto? Are they under charge and is this charge preferred by the university officials or by the Crown?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): The students, I believe, are out on bail at the present time. The intervention was requested by the university authorities, but the charges arose out of circumstances after the authorities came.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: According to a recent press statement by the acting president, charges are not going to be pressed. Does this mean that the charges would be dropped or would the Crown proceed with it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I can't answer that at this moment. The member has just said it's a recent press statement; it hasn't come to my attention as yet.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Surely it's not up to the officials at the university to decide the disposition of the charges but, in fact, the disposition of the Crown?

ACCESS TO ROBARTS LIBRARY

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Do I take it that the department has repudiated the position of Douglas Wright, publicly calling for open public and student access to the Robarts Library?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: How does one mesh the views of the man who is now Deputy Provincial Secretary and was the author of the Wright commission report with the apparent policy of the department? How will the policy be reconciled in terms of his public statements?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't think there is any difference between the statements of Dr. Wright and the policy of the department.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister wants an open policy?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, as I understand it, Dr. Wright has said—and it is now printed and public knowledge—that access to the Robarts Library, which the University of Toronto has now specifically denied, should be provided by law or whatever. That is the position of the department, and in effect, the University of Toronto on its own is then denying access. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The leader of the New Democratic Party is obviously confusing the question of access to the library with access to the stacks. There has never been any indication in anything that has been written—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Oh, I see. You can walk in the front door but you cannot get any books.

Mr. Kerr: —by Dr. Wright or in the COPSE committee report recommending free access to the stacks of the library.

Mr. Lewis: I see. You can enter the library but you can't use the books. Is that the general distinction the minister is drawing?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary question on this general theme, has the minister anything he wants to say—perhaps one shouldn't push him—about the use of police on university campuses and the degree of provocation or circumstance that he feels would require it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr No, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to comment at this time because obviously I would be referring to a particular incident that happened over the weekend. I have read the newspaper reports; I have read, as the hon. member has read, the statement of the acting president, and unless I hear something to the contrary, I think the president acted in a responsible way.

EXCLUSION OF UXBRIDGE TOWNSHIP FROM PITS AND QUARRIES REGULATIONS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: How is it that Uxbridge township was excluded from the list of those townships brought under the regulations of the Pits and Quarries Act, effective March 1?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the reason Uxbridge township was not included in the last number of delegated townships was because that township now has a request before the Ontario Municipal Board for certain zoning and area regulations controlling the gravel pits and quarries within the township itself, and we have a communication now with the township to find out if there is some way that we can impose the designation of the Pits and Quarries Act as quickly as possible.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, can the hon. minister explain to me why that situation would preclude the department from bringing the township, which probably has the largest number of pits and quarries, under its law? Or are these particular matters arranged with the OMB?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I have just explained it to the hon. member. The matter is before the Ontario Municipal Board—the township's request for a certain zoning.

Mr. Lewis: And the hon. minister cannot move until that matter is resolved?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are dealing with the township right now to see if we can impose the Pits and Quarries Act as quickly as possible. If the township will rescind its request to the Ontario Municipal Board then we will move in with the designation.

Mr. Lewis: I see. Thank you.

REPORT ON CONDUCT OF ELECTION

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, for someone—I am frankly not sure to whom it should be directed. I would direct it to the Premier, if that is appropriate. Has the Premier's office received the report required under the Election Act of Ontario to be filed by the chief election officer—a report to the assembly—whether or not in his opinion the conduct of the election was free or otherwise of any of the actions which are declared to be offences or corrupt practices under this Act? Has that report been received?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether it has been received, but I shall check with the chief electoral officer very shortly and find out whether it has been sent or whether, in fact, it has been received.

Mr. Lewis: Right! Perhaps by the end of the question period, if the Premier is artful, he could gather the information and perhaps even answer it.

By way of supplementary, if it were found that it had not been received, has the Premier any idea of the time limits intended or whether he thinks enough time has elapsed since the election to require it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the exact time required or the traditional procedures. I shall discuss that with the chief electoral officer. I am not sure whether the Act, in fact, specifies any time limit. It may, but I shall endeavour to give that information to the leader of the New Democratic Party.

ALLEGED RESCINDING OF COMPENSATION BOARD PENALTIES

Mr. Lewis: My last question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, in the absence of a minister I very much hoped would be here. Would the Premier be willing to direct the committee on resources development—I believe that is the requirement of the motion—to call before it Wednesday next the Workmen's Compensation Board to allow the members of the Legislature to inquire into the questions raised in various journals, primarily the Globe and Mail, or initially the Globe and Mail, around the rescinding of penalties applied to General Motors Corp., Ford Corp., and others?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) will be here shortly and if the House would agree and the member for High Park were to agree to revert to statements by the ministry, I believe he will have some observations to make on that point.

Of course, under the orders already passed by this House, the Workmen's Compensation Board has, in fact, along with other boards, been referred to the various standing committees. Probably in this instance the proper committee would be the resources development committee, and I believe the minister, Mr. Speaker, will be having some observations to make on that point when he arrives.

Mr. Lewis: I gather, Mr. Speaker, that a providential dispensation will be allowed on this occasion when the minister returns. And I would hope that he returns before the question period is over.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Don't count on it!

Mr. Lewis: That is all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Send the whip up. He will look after it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): If the hon. member is artful, maybe he can ask him.

Mr. Lewis: I did!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

DISMISSAL OF DOCTOR FROM ADDICTION FOUNDATION

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Could the minister tell this House what the circumstances were surrounding the recent dismissal of Dr. Andrew Malcolm, a staff psychiatrist with the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the Addiction Research Foundation, as you know, was established by a special Act with its own board of directors. I am not involved with the day-to-day operation of the research foundation. They do report to the House through me and I am asking the chairman of the foundation if he would give me a report on the action that was taken last week. When he does, I will be glad to bring it to the attention of the members of the House.

REPORT ON CONDUCT OF ELECTION

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might answer a question. After very careful research with respect to the filing of the report, this is the first time that the tabling of a report has been provided for in the Act, Mr. Speaker. I was able to ascertain in that short period of time that the chief electoral officer is in the process of writing this report. There is no time stated, as I understand it, within the legislation, and I expect we will have a development in the near future.

LAND ACQUISITION IN THE BRUCE PENINSULA

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Minister of Mines, or Lands and Forests—how many titles does he have?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That will do.

Mr. Sargent: Where does the minister get the authority to move into the Bruce Peninsula and acquire 90,000 acres of land, without consultation with the reeves, the warden or the county council? It's a two-part question—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): What about the local member?

Mr. Sargent: We're not important any more. And that's a good question. Why in the hell aren't we notified too?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that many thousands of dollars are owed for years past to these municipalities and that money is honourably owed by the province to the municipalities? Why hasn't that been paid before the province moves in again and what arrangements is the miinster going to make in the future? I did phone the minister's office and his deputy said the minister couldn't give me a guarantee that he would hold off, that he would meet with them. There should be some kind of consultation first.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The question has been directed; the hon. minister may now reply.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I might reply to the hon. member for Grey-Bruce, I would point out to him that at this point in time we have acquired only 29,000 acres of property in the four townships to which he referred. I would point out that about 17,000 acres belong to the Crown; 10,000 acres belong to the county forest, which is managed by the Department of Lands and Forests; 1,300 acres are owned by the conservation authorities; and about 495 acres are within the national park.

It is our intention to move into that area eventually and to acquire approximately 90,000 acres, but this will not be totally for a provincial park as I informed the House at some earlier point. But I can assure the hon. member that we will have sessions with the various municipal leaders in that area, as I agreed to in the member's recent telephone call to my office.

Concerning the matter of payments to municipalities for taxes owing on this property, of course, is a matter of government policy and possibly the policy minister would like to comment on that matter.

Mr. Sargent: Who is going to comment on that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is a matter of government policy and perhaps the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development has something to add to it.

Mr. Sargent: Does he know it?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He is thinking.

Mr. Sargent: Does the provincial secretary know what is going on?

Mr. Lewis: Naturally.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): That particular point has not been discussed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF DON JAIL INMATE

Mr. Lawlor: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), may I ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice, since every question asked in this House, as I understand it, is a policy question anyway. Does the minister not feel that it is a trifle questionable to place in solitary confinement at the Don Jail a certain inmate, Karleton Lewis Armstrong, because he complained and circulated a petition among prisoners objecting to the solitary confinement of another prisoner?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: No, I do not feel that it is injudicious that this should occur.

Mr. Lawlor: Supplementary—

Mr. Shulman: Shame!

Mr. Lawlor: Would the minister be prepared to look a little bit into the issue to find out about the details and if as the Provincial Secretary for Justice, he feels that some injustice has been done, to make haste to rectify it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, I would be glad to do that.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is not thinking often enough. He didn't think that through very carefully.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

FACILITIES FOR HANDICAPPED IN BRONTE CREEK PARK

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Is it correct that the Bronte Creek Provincial Park will be open this summer? Is it also correct that its facilities have been designed for the use of handicapped people as well as physically capable people, and if this is correct, why hasn't ALPHA—the Action League for the Physically Handicapped Advancement—been consulted as to the design and the types of recreation facilities that should be available in that park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think I will take those questions as notice and I'll endeavour to get all the answers for the member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

DRAEGERMETER TESTS AT FALCONBRIDGE NICKEL

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Has the minister instructed the Falconbridge Nickel Co. as yet to provide Draegermeter tests when requested by the employees?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I think we have, Mr. Speaker, I think we have instructions.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister be so kind as to provide us with a copy of that so that the men know that when they ask these tests, they will be granted, as they are not being done at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I will certainly get the information the member wants and make sure it is made available to him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ALLEGED RESCINDING OF COMPENSATION BOARD PENALTIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Labour: Does he choose to make a statement on the situation involving the Workmen's Compensation Board, General Motors and Ford, or would he be open to questions on that subject at this time?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): I am quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to reply to the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition. First I—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Before the minister answers, surely if he has a prepared statement he should ask for permission to revert rather than take the time of the question period.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Let's try it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth is quite correct. If the hon. minister wishes to seek the permission of the House to make a ministerial statement, if he will so indicate I will seek that concurrence. Does the hon. minister wish to make a statement?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do I have the unanimous consent of the House to revert to ministerial statements, so that the statement then itself may be subject to question during this question period?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Agreed. The hon. minister may proceed with his statement.

Mr. Shulman: Don't take this as a precedent.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps I should thank also the hon. member for High Park.

An hon. member: The new leader of the NDP.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: In anticipation of the questions from the members opposite I have prepared the following statement:

The Globe and Mail published on March 11, 1972, this heading: "Ford and GM scuttle lobby, $560,000 in safety penalties dropped." The clear inference was that the Workmen's Compensation Board had agreed to drop penalties for poor safety performance in exchange for Ford and General Motors' withdrawal from an alleged lobby criticizing the board.

The news article recited that a lobby of eight manufacturers had been formed; that a secret report had been drafted for presentation to the Minister of Labour; that following Ford's and General Motors' withdrawal from the lobby they were relieved of penalties and the report was, therefore, never presented to the minister.

The allegations, inferences and innuendoes are false. There was not, and never has been, any connection whatever between the remission of penalties imposed under the provisions of section 86, subsection 7, and any representations from industry to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, well, they already said that.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The only way in which a penalty may be relieved is for the employer to demonstrate a corrective accident prevention programme. The purpose of this section is not to raise funds through penalty assessments but to compel employers to improve their safety practices. Any employer may appeal a penalty assessment and the board grants appeals where objective evidence supports the employer's improved safety activity.

In the years 1968, 1969 and 1970, assessments were levied against some 4,000 firms whose accident cost and frequency did not meet the necessary standards of safety.

The regulations provide for an additional assessment where an employer within his rating classification:

(a) has incurred in two of the last three complete years of operation a deficit accident cost experience;

(b) has incurred a life-time deficit accident cost experience; and

(c) has incurred during two of the last three complete years of operation a frequency rate of compensable accidents at least 25 per cent higher than the average rate in the industry in which he is classified.

During that three-year period, the total of additional assessments was some $12 million. Of the 4,000 employers subject to additional assessments, 1,500 appealed and 1,100 of these appeals were successful. Some $6.5 million was relieved, including the $260,000 which had been levied against the Ford Motor Co. in November, 1960.

Since the penalty programme began in 1965, a total of $11 million has been paid by employers whose safety programmes did not meet the criteria.

As to the Globe and Mail's allegation of disagreement among the employers, the fact is that a brief to the board was presented by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association on June 30, 1970. A year later, the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, on May 31, 1971, presented another one to the executive manager of the board. Full discussions took place in both instances.

Concerning the Ford Motor Co., as a result of their experience in the years 1966, 1967 and 1968, at their plant in St. Thomas, a penalty assessment of $260,000 was issued by the board on November 7, 1969.

Ford appealed this assessment and an inquiry into their accident prevention activity was carried out through the Industrial Accident Prevention Association. Following review, the levy was confirmed and on June 12, 1970, a further appeal was received from Ford. The matter was then referred to the board's review committee and further investigation by the Industrial Accident Prevention Association indicated that senior management and supervisors were fully involved in meeting the company's corrective accident prevention programme. Because this is the purpose of the section, the review committee granted the appeal.

Because of their record in the years 1968, 1969, and 1970, the Ford plants at Oakville and St. Thomas were also eligible for additional assessments which were issued on November 12, 1971, in the amount of some $500,000 which was appealed by the company in their letter of January 12, 1972. Again, the Industrial Accident Prevention Association was asked professionally to investigate the programme in effect. It was clearly established that management was involved in an active and effective safety programme which had reduced the compensation cases in one plant from 432 cases in 1970 to 272 in 1971; and in the other plant from 338 cases in 1970 to 189 cases to September 30, 1971. In view of the proved effectiveness of their programme, the appeal was granted.

As to General Motors, their large plants have never qualified for penalties under the section 36, subsection 7 programme. The Globe and Mail allegations that General Motors were eligible for and relieved of a $300,000 penalty are completely false.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this deals with the alleged problems of the Globe and Mail story. In due course, the proper committees of the House will deal with estimates of the Department of Labour and, as always,

the members of the compensation board and their leading staff will attend the committee for direct questioning.

Mr. Speaker: Nine minutes will now be added to the question period. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ALLEGED RESCINDING OF COMPENSATION BOARD PENALTIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he or his predecessor were in any way aware that these large industrial concerns were co-operating in some sort of a lobby to attack the efficiency or at least the decisions made by the Workmen's Compensation Board, and have in fact either of the two ministers—the present minister or his predecessor—been approached by these companies on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, the hon. member will realize that I was certainly not aware since I assumed this portfolio just a little over a month ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By way of supplementary: Can the minister assure the House, however, that he is not aware, from any information from the department or from his predecessor, that such an organized lobby existed and, in fact, was preparing a brief critical of the Workmen's Compensation Board policy?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing I was made aware of—and this is as early as this morning—was the fact that some committees, safety committees for instance, have had discussions with the Canadian Manufacturers Association, which I am told is a normal thing. There is no brief, to my knowledge.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Can the minister explain to the House specifically what the complaint was that was supposedly being put together by this inner organization among the manufacturing concerns? Surely, from their record they weren't worried about safety matters? Did they feel that they had too high rates imposed upon them? Was that their complaint?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would not like to go into details at this time. I was only made knowledgeable about this late yesterday afternoon. I would think perhaps it would be preferable if these questions were asked at the committee stage. I can give assurance to all the members of this Legislature that all of this matter will be aired and all members will have ample opportunity to ask all the questions they want.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary, for clarification on what the minister has already said to the House that the imposition of penalty was by the board. It was then appealed to the Industrial Accident Prevention Association which upheld the original decision to impose special payment. It was a second appeal to the board itself hearing an appeal on its own decision which resulted in the remission of the special payments. Is that a clear understanding of what the minister said?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The appeal was made to the review committee as I understand it, Mr. Speaker. Then after representations by IAPA, or rather the safety committee of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, the appeal was granted.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is it not true that an appeal directed to a source which provided some independent judgement, namely the IAPA, upheld the original decision but an appeal to the review committee of the board, sitting internally, remitted the fines? Is that not in fact the process?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I think, Mr. Speaker, in very complex matters, such as this one which has come upon me so quickly, I would prefer to have all these matters and questions asked before a standing committee of the House. As soon as possible.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since these matters have come to the minister so quickly, is it not fair to say that the response he read to the House just now was in fact prepared by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I started it myself and certainly I had to ask questions and get information from the board.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: I take it that the department, since late yesterday afternoon, has not conducted an independent inquiry into the operations of the board, but has accepted the statement which the minister has now read to the House, prepared for him by them? I take it that is fair?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Not quite, Mr. Speaker. I worked on this since I came in late last night. That is the statement which I have agreed to tell the hon. members here today.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. minister be prepared to draft for "Motions," which is almost upon us, a resolution which would then have government backing, directing the committee on resources development to hear the Workmen's Compensation Board at the earliest opportunity—which presumably would be this Wednesday—and subsequent Wednesdays on precisely these matters, giving the committee the authority to call not only the normal submissions but representatives of Ford, GM and others who were directly involved.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Martel: Is the Premier bailing the minister out?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand the resolution already adopted by this House, the boards and commissions of the government have, in fact, been referred to the standing committees already. It doesn't require an additional motion from this House to have the boards referred.

Mr. Deans: It would help.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in that this Wednesday is a committee day, that it would be appropriate probably for the resources development committee to have its initial organizational meeting and, of course, it then makes its determinations. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that one of its obvious priorities would be discussions with the Workmen's Compensation Board related to this issue. Perhaps it could take place as early as the first Wednesday when we return from the mid-term break.

Mr. Lewis: That's good. It should make for a very active vacation. The Minister of Labour will be working very hard in that interim break.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why not? He usually does.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if I may, given the obvious urgency involved in all of this, given also the enthusiasm of his minister, would not the Premier be willing to accept a motion? I would be pleased to draft it. Others would be pleased to draft it. The motion would simply indicate to the committee, as the motion specifically said when we constituted the committee, "matters directed by the House," giving to the committee the authority to call before it this Wednesday the Workmen's Compensation Board to begin an inquiry into these matters, because some of us would like to question the Workmen's Compensation Board without having them read a recitation into the record without comment?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not to belabour this point, as I think the motion is really very clear. Any further motion at this moment would be redundant. The Workmen's Compensation Board—

Mr. Renwick: Except for the delay.

Mr. Lewis: Except the Premier delays it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, listen, Mr. Speaker, we all want to hear it. At least a lot of members want to become involved in these discussions. It is a very important issue but the issue is not going to disappear, if it is not dealt with on this coming Wednesday.

Let's be very factual about it. I think it is quite obvious that we should do it in the proper fashion. At this point in time, obviously, a further motion is not necessary. The Workmen's Compensation Board has already been referred to a standing committee of this Legislature by this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: But not to look into this specific matter.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is nothing to preclude that. There is nothing to preclude that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Would the Minister of Labour say it was a fair construction of the statements that he made that, if there has been a situation arise such as would give rise to such a fine in excess of $200,000, it is sufficient ground to remit the fine, if senior management is aware of the cause of complaint and presumably might be doing something about it?

Mr. Lewis: The whole thing is a farce.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I have no comment to make, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: No, I didn't think the minister would.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Martel: Yes. Did I understand the minister correctly when he stated that we would be able to obtain the figures on the companies which were assessed penalties by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out from the hon. member—I didn't really get his question—is it the figures from the two companies involved?

Mr. Martel: No, from all of the companies, or figures from the Workmen's Compensation Board on the companies which were assessed penalties last year, in view of the fact that we were unable to do this with the preceding Minister of Labour.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would expect the board to give the member all the information he would like to know.

Mr. Martel: Thank you.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary of the minister: Would the minister consider recommending to the cabinet that a select committee of the Legislature be set up to investigate, not only this, but other matters pertaining to the Workmen's Compensaion Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this would be a matter of government policy, but I wouldn't recommend it.

Mr. Reid: By way of a further supplementary, does the minister not believe that the Workmen's Compensation Board is more important to the province and to the working man in particular than a select committee on snowmobiles?

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I think the Workmen's Compensation Board is certainly very important to all segments of our population and every member, as I have said earlier, will have ample opportunity to question its actions.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the minister not yet have a copy of the report which was to be submitted by the eight companies? Has no one given the minister a copy of that report yet —the brief?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the brief never reached the minister.

Mr. Lewis: And to this day the minister still does not have it?

Hon Mr. Guindon: I don't think there was any brief submitted.

Mr. Lewis: We will be glad to lend the minister our copy at some point. But the Workmen's Compensation Board might have brought that to the minister's attention over the last 24 hours while it was working so assiduously at the statement.

May I ask the minister also what his executive assistant means when he says that the Workmen's Compensation Board is a totally autonomous body akin to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or Canadian National Railways, that it is a power unto itself. Is it not right that the Workmen's Compensation Board operates with the authority of this Legislature, and that we should call it to account in this and other instances?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: The Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, reports directly to the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Lewis: I realize that!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: As for the first part of the hon. member's question, I'll have to ask my executive assistant.

Mr. Lewis: Good! Good!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

INVESTIGATION OF STRIKE-BREAKING FIRMS

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Attorney General—or perhaps the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Can you report on the present state of the licensing of Canadian Specialized Services, a subsidiary of Canadian Driver Pool? In the session last December, the former Attorney General reported that the application for licence had been withdrawn because of the criminal charge facing Mr. Richard Grange?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to take that matter as notice and obtain the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

PAYMENT PLAN FOR NURSING HOMES

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Health: Has the minister found a nursing home operator or operators who is or are prepared to turn over their books to the department officials in order to assist in the development of a payment plan which will allow for the wide

difference which exists in quality of service and accommodation, as well as costs, such as taxes and return capital, which are faced by private homes but not by municipal or charitable homes?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, when I met one week ago with the executive of the nursing home association, at that time one or two of them intimated to me that they would be considering this and coming back to me. I haven't heard from them since.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

MEETING ON ENVIRONMENT WITH MAYOR OF HAMILTON

Mr. Deans: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Has the Premier been contacted by the mayor of the City of Hamilton, with regard to a meeting which he —the mayor—desires to have with him, in order that he can discuss what he calls the "dictatorial actions" of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld)?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker. First of all, there are no "dictatorial actions" on the part—

Mr. Deans: Those are his words, not mine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know they're his words and not those of the hon. member, who would never use those words.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if there has been any communication, it would have been as recently as, perhaps, early this morning. I haven't had an opportunity to check that yet. Quite obviously, if the mayor of Hamilton is anxious to have a visit, I'd be delighted to see him. But I don't think I have received, as of this moment, an official request.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

LUNCH HOURS AT LCBO STORE

Mr. Shulman: A question of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister inform me why it is necessary for all of the employees at the Liquor Control Board on Freeland Street to take their lunch simultaneously—from the shipping department and from the department where packages can be picked up—so that the public cannot be served?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I shall be delighted to find out first whether the facts, as stated by the hon. member, are correct; secondly, the reason for that existence; thirdly, to see whether, in fact, the public is not being served.

Mr. Shulman: Well, as a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask the minister why he's unaware of what's going on in his own department? Or perhaps we should expect that by now.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, for the last month I have been eating lunch in my own office, so I haven't had the opportunity to be in all the places.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Social and Family Services. Is the minister taking advantage of the $5 million set aside by the federal government to implement a pilot programme concerning the guaranteed annual income?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): We intend to avail ourselves, Mr. Speaker, of that assistance.

Mr. B. Newman: Did the hon. minister say yes?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We intend to make ourselves available for that assistance, yes.

Mr. B. Newman: Where is the programme being implemented, or experimented with?

Hon. Mr. Burnelle: Where?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes!

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Our own planning and research branch has a programme which we will be implementing and we're also working closely with Treasury and Economics.

Mr. B. Newman: Would the minister care to name the municipality or municipalities or areas involved in the study?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: We have no specific ones at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

TITLE TO LANDS IN METRO CENTRE

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs: I'd like to know what the province plans to do with the 55 acres it owns in the Metro Centre site in Toronto now that it's been discovered that the title was never handed over to the railways on the particular choice spot of land?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think that has necessarily been found.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, could the minister—supplementary, Mr. Speaker—inform the House what steps are being taken by the province in order to establish title to that particular area of land?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The matter is being looked at, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: A final supplementary: Would he assure the House that the province will not quit claim on that particular area of land during the period while efforts are being made to establish exactly whose title it is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When our studies are complete, Mr. Speaker, I will be in a position to give the House assurances one way or the other.

Mr Cassidy: Could the minister give an assurance now, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough Centre.

LOANS TO UNEMPLOYED

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs: May I be assured that his department is cracking down on loan sharks or others who are attempting to victimize the unemployed because their cheques for unemployment insurance may or may not have arrived on time?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is no legislation in this regard because of the constitutional nature of the question that is raised.

We are aware of the programmes that are being carried out by some of the people referred to by the hon. member. I believe that the Minister of Social and Family Services has available the facilities of his department in a case of crisis, to people who find themselves in a very serious situation. I can assure the hon. member I am well aware of the situation because of the number of people who have approached me personally in the period of the last four weeks. But there is nothing in my department concerning this question.

CONDITIONS AT OLD CITY HALL COURT

Mr Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice: Would the minister advise if he knows what is going on in the old city hall courthouse in view of the fact I was there this morning and it is worse than the Black Hole of Calcutta—the chaos and confusion. We have 10 prisoners in a dock, 15 ft long, with policemen threatening youths to get out of the court because they were carrying skates and they couldn't chew gum. It is like something you wouldn't believe; out of this world! Does the minister know what is going on down there? What is he going to do about it?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the deplorable conditions that exist in that particular courtroom in the old city hall. I have taken steps to make sure that other ministers of the Crown are equally aware of it.

The situation really was brought to a head about a year ago when I first assumed the office of Attorney General. As far as long-range plans are concerned respecting the old city hall and a new court complex for downtown Toronto, the decision was made at that time that at the end of the 10-year lease —or whatever it is that we now have with the old city hall—no longer would we continue with the courtroom space down there at that time. It would cost far more to renovate and to put in those conditions and the type of thing we would like to have down there—or that would meet the demand of a central criminal court for this city—it would cost far more to do that in the old city hall than it would to develop a brand new central criminal-court complex in downtown Toronto.

We are now working on that. It obviously has to be a long-range plan. In the meantime we are doing our best within an old building down there to correct those abuses. Already the women's court has been removed from the area it was in on the east side of the basement. Other capital improvements will be taking place but in an old building

such as that we obviously cannot immediately effect the long-range improvements we would like to.

Mr. Sargent: If the minister cannot do it, why doesn't he resign?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Why doesn't the member?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: As a matter of fact, it would be a waste of the taxpayers' money to do so. Instead, we are working on something else. Government policy and the government decisions will be announced in this House in due course.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, would the minister agree that he should be ashamed to be Minister of Justice today in those situations?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I am ashamed of a lot of things that take place in this province, but not that we don't necessarily have the money to rectify a number of these things.

Mr. Sargent: That's a joke, that is; they're building Ontario Place down there.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the minister aware that this most serious complaint is not just with the physical facility; it is the whole approach of those in charge—the policemen who lock the doors and say, "You can't come in," or who say, "You with the skates get out of here"—or the confusion which exists in the corridors, the lack of a semblance of order, and the lack of respect that is exhibited to the people who have business to do with our courts? That is the most serious thing, and it doesn't cost any money to remedy that.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I think it has a great deal to do with the money. The policemen down there, the courtroom attendants, are labouring under very adverse physical surroundings; there is no question about that. When those courts were first built they didn't envisage by the remotest idea the volume of the traffic that would be going through. It is a very difficult situation. Already, as I say, improvements have taken place; there will be others. But this has to be a patchwork, temporary arrangement in respect of all of these things. The long-term answer is obviously a brand new central criminal-court complex, and in due course when the—

Mr. Bullbrook: That won't change the attitude one tittle.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It will change a lot of that.

Mr. Bullbrook: It won't change the attitudes at all. The attendants must learn to treat the public with dignity and respect.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

WRIGHT REPORT ON EDUCATION IN NORTHWEST

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. What is the current state within the minister's department of the final Wright Commission report on post-secondary education in northwestern Ontario? Has the department approved in principle the recommendations of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, Mr. Speaker. The final report, as the hon. member said, is ready; it is available and it is being distributed. I believe the members of the COPSE committee have attended a hearing in northwestern Ontario to discuss this particular report with representatives from both Lakehead and the community college there. There will be other hearings and more discussions on the final report before any of its recommendations are implemented.

Mr. Foulds: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to a point of order?

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all members of this House, I wish to extend congratulations to the honour brought to this province by the Richmond Hill Dynes in winning the world softball championship. It is to be regretted that the province could not find a programme under which it could encourage, even in a modest financial way, the team and its hardworking management, and Mr. Dynes, a civic-minded small businessman who has sponsored the team for many years. I hope this government will find a means of encouraging other individuals or groups who set an example of excellence by their hard work, as has this team.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Mr. Lewis moves, seconded by Mr. Deans, that this Houe direct the standing committee on resources development to call before it the Workmen's Compensation Board on Wednesday, March 15 at 10 a.m., and any subsequent Wednesdays as the committee may determine, specifically to inquire into matters raised by the Minister of Labour's statement of today.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order. With respect, I would say that motion is out of order. As I said earlier, the whole matter is redundant in that the Workmen's Compensation Board has already been referred to a standing committee. But apart from that, as I understand the rules of this House, that particular motion is not in order.

Mr. Lewis: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I scrutinized the standing orders of the legislative assembly of Ontario very carefully before submitting the motion—I did so prior to coming into the House—and find that it falls quite happily within the rules. I see nothing which excludes it; it is not a motion which requires notice as designated by the rules; I think it is perfectly in order. I would have other things to say in regard to the gratuitous asides which the Premier threw in, but speaking to the point of order as such, Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly in order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the point of order as well, since you are obviously going to be called upon to make a ruling in this connection, it has been my experience that the leader of the NDP in this connection is exactly right, since under "Motions" we can put forward motions dealing with the ordering of the business of the House and obviously its committees too.

It is unfortunate, however, that the precedent of the House here has established that this sort of motion is usually relegated simply to the notice paper. I believe this is most unfortunate, sir, and since you are new to the chair, I would urge you to rule that the motion is in order since it deals directly with the business of the House and since there is no indication in the standing orders that such direction has to come from the majority side or from any other side. I would submit to you, sir, that it is in order and that you would do the assembly a service by so ruling.

Mr. Speaker: With great respect to the hon. Prime Minister, I can find nothing in the standing orders that would cause me to reject this particular motion. I believe the motion actually is in order and should be placed before the House. Is there any further discussion on the motion?

The House divided on the motion by Mr. Lewis, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Bounsall	Allan
Braithwaite	Auld
Breithaupt	Bales
Bullbrook	Beckett
Burr	Bernier
Cassidy	Birch (Mrs.)
Davison	Brunelle
Deacon	Carruthers
Deans	Carton
Dukszta	Clement
Edighoffer	Davis
Foulds	Downer
Gaunt	Drea
Germa	Dymond
Givens	Eaton
Good	Evans
Haggerty	Ewen
Laughren	Guindon
Lawlor	Handleman
Lewis	Havrot
Martel	Henderson
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Hodgson (York-North)
Nixon (Brant)	Irvine
Paterson	Jessiman
Reid	Johnston
Renwick	Kennedy
Ruston	Kerr
Sargent	Lane
Shulman	Lawrence (Carleton East)
Singer	Lawrence (St. George)
Smith (Nipissing)	Leluk
Stokes	Maeck
Worton	McIlveen
Young—34.	McKeough
	McNeil
	McNie
	Meen
	Miller
	Morningstar
	Newman (Ontario South)
	Nixon (Dovercourt)
	Nuttall
	Parrott
	Potter
	Rhodes
	Root
	Rowe

NAYS

Scrivener (Mrs.)
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Snow
Timbrell
Turner
Welch
Wells
Winkler
Yakabuski
Yaremko—58.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker the "ayes" are 34, the "nays" 58.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may, sir, as I am sure you will agree, this again demonstrates the impotence of the committee system in terms of this House.

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is a suspicious and unwarranted attempt to prevent the Workmen's Compensation Board from an early and embarrassing hearing, and an opportunity to speak to GM and Ford in advance to make sure that everybody gets the story straight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The government didn't have to oppose this motion.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order that has been raised, along with a lot of editorial comment that was completely irrelevant and untrue, may I make this observation? The standing orders very clearly state, and with great respect to your ruling, sir, I still question whether it was in order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It was a relative response.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Minister of Labour has said, and I have said, on three occasions this afternoon that the Workmen's Compensation Board has already been referred to a standing committee of this House and the matter will be dealt with.

Mr. Lewis: Not when there is an issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member, the leader of the New Democratic Party, doesn't want to usurp the proper functions of the standing committee by actually directing it? The job has in fact already been done and he knows it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order. I for one feel, sir, that your ruling was correct but I do feel that you have been lax in the last few minutes in allowing a debate to continue under the guise of something called a point of order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the member is right.

Mr. Speaker: I did call the hon. member for Scarborough West to order. He paid no attention. The Premier continued to discuss it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: He questioned your ruling!

Mr. Lewis: You needn't be awed by that! You just order the Premier out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The Sergeant-at-Arms hasn't yet been used.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for Humber.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. Leluk moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to ensure that pharmacists and medical practitioners who dispense drugs in tablet or capsule form will dispense the drugs in child-resistant safety containers, and that patent medicines in tablet or capsule form which are packaged for sale in Ontario will be packaged in child-resistant safety containers.

Mr. Shulman: That bill has already been brought in.

Mr. Leluk: I can assure the hon. members of this House that the principle may be the same but the structure of the two bills is quite different.

Mr. Shulman: The wording is not as good this time.

Mr. Leluk: It is better!

Mr. Lewis: Thank God we disagree on the structure.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I have a matter to deal with. It has been alleged on two occasions in the House that there is a parliamentary tradition to the effect that any member who wishes to take part in the debate on the motion for an address in reply to the Speech from the Throne may do so. I beg to inform the House that no such tradition in fact does exist.

On the contrary, in the House of Commons of Canada, by standing order No. 38, section 1, the debate is expressly limited to eight sitting days. In the United Kingdom, the debate is, in practice, restricted to five or six sitting days, the average time spent being in the order of 35 hours. Members wishing to participate must get on their whip's list and the number successful in doing so is limited.

I was asked to rule on the application of our standing order No. 25. As the date on which the budget is presented to the House by the Treasurer is entirely at the discretion of the government, the application of this standing order is, I suggest, quite clear. Once the date of the budget presentation has been announced, the Throne debate must terminate not later than the sitting date prior to such presentation. I believe this was the express recommendation of the select committee whose report had led to the adoption of the present standing orders.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, may I say to the House I think there is a consensus this afternoon that we dispense with the private members' hour and proceed with the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Singer: Is there a debate on the motion?

Mr. Speaker: There is consensus that we dispense with the private members' hour, is this correct? Right.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I will be brief this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating you for your obvious courage in the face of the very large governmental group on the other side in making the ruling you did earlier today. I walk away from here today very impressed with the way you handled the chair, sir.

I would like to make a brief reference to a couple of matters that came up last week. First of all, you will recall, sir, I made some comments about the Boilermakers' Union and the unfortunate things that have happened to their treasury. There was a blanket denial of everything I had said in this morning's Globe and Mail, included in which was a comment from the international head of the union, a Mr. John Carroll, that he was referring all the matters to their lawyer, one David Lewis.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Shame, shame!

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The member won't get any flak from him.

Mr. Shulman: —you should be made aware that Mr. Lewis has sent a telegram to Mr. Carroll saying there must be some misunderstanding as he is not their lawyer, has not been for many years, and under no circumstances would he be handling this matter.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Honour retrieved!

Mr. Shulman: There has also, sir, been a blanket denial of all the comments made about the situation with the High Park Conservative Association.

I have documentary proof of all the matters I brought up here, sir, and if the Conservative Party should wish, I should be pleased to present that, and the witnesses, and the sworn statements, and the tape recordings—

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): And, and, and!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Somebody make the motion.

Mr. Shulman: —to any committee they would care to designate.

Mr. Lawlor: I'm waiting for the motion here.

Mr. Shulman: I would also like to make a reference to the member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) but I see he has fled the chamber, unfortunately. Oh there he is over there; good!

Last week I suggested that he was cabinet material. I was very pleased he made his great speech, members will all recall, telling us how we could catch drug addicts; you know, look for them with their sunglasses and watch how many phone calls they make. I really thought he was heading for the cabinet, because obviously he was thinking the same as they were.

Then he blew it all. He made another speech which I have here and the heading is: "MPP Demands Drugs Research Boss Be Fired." It ends up: "He said he is asking for the resignation of Dr. H. David Archibald, the executive director." But then the reporter asked him why; and he replied: "He's been there too long."

Obviously the member didn't think before he made that statement, because obviously if that type of thinking was accepted, the cabinet would have to go and so would most of the backbenchers. So he just blew everything—blew his chance of making the cabinet.

An hon. member: He made two speeches in two weeks—too much!

Mr. Shulman: In any case, Mr Speaker, I am glad the member is thinking, because I see today he brought in a private member's bill. It was the same bill that was brought in a few days ago. But at least he is able to copy and write down, so we know that we are going to get some ability from Humber.

I want to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on the phoney no-fault insurance plan that we have in this province. You will recall the great fanfare last year. The government, as a result of considerable pressure, brought in what they called a no-fault insurance plan. However, there is a little difference in the no-fault insurance plan that we have and the no-fault insurance plan that other jurisdictions have. The difference is that our rates are twice as high. In fact this year auto insurance rates are going up again in Ontario, with their so-called no-fault insurance plan.

I was very curious as to what was the reason for this. I wrote the insurance commissioner in Massachusetts to see how they had achieved their massive reduction in rates. He replied as follows, and I quote:

> No-fault insurance didn't come easily to Massachusetts. I took four long years of debate and the leadership of our governor, Francis W. Sargent, to put it on the books. The gain was well worth the trouble, for the plan has not only cut costs drastically but has, as predicted, begun to end much of the delay, red tape and inequity of the old way. In 1972 we are adding a no-fault property damage plan to complete the job.
>
> As to its effect on premiums, its enactment will enable us to cut 1971 premiums by 15 per cent and those cuts, which were unchallenged by companies, were in place of increases of some 20 to 30 per cent that would otherwise have been ordered had the plan not been put into effect. For 1972 our insurance department actuaries are recommending additional reductions averaging 27.6 per cent.
>
> In total effect then, the plan will have directly cut costs here by 42 per cent in one year and prevented increases as well. That, we think, is something.

I couldn't understand why, in Massachusetts and in the other states, if they brought in no-fault insurance, rates should fall so heavily, while here, while we have a plan called no-fault, insurance rates go up. So I got up in the House early last year, sir, and I asked the minister responsible, the member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) at that time, if the minister could explain why auto insurance rates have not fallen in Ontario as they have in other jurisdictions with no-fault insurance. And we got a very honest answer when he replied: "No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot." It's nice to have a breath of honesty, even if the minister doesn't know what is happening in his department.

The answer is very simple. I got in touch with the insurance companies and asked them why this is happening in other states and not here. I got a letter back—it's marked "private and confidential"—from the vice-president of one of the insurance companies. I'm sorry I can't read it into the record, but in effect what he's saying is we don't really have no-fault insurance. They call it that because it's a nice name, but it isn't no-fault insurance.

But he goes on—and this is the important thing—and says that in Massachusetts it's very true the rates have fallen, but the reason they have fallen is that there's far less money being paid out by the insurance companies. He also goes on to say: "You must remember that the lawyers have suffered a tremendous reduction in their earnings in Massachusetts, and this is one of the reasons why insurance rates are lower and we have to take that into

consideration. We can't really do this to the lawyers here."

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, and to the designate Minister of Public Protection (Mr. Winkler)—I believe insurance is now under his field—that if he isn't worrying too much about the lawyers and if he really wants to bring in a no-fault insurance plan, which he has the power to do if he's able to overrule the insurance companies—which I doubt very much—he could do so and we too would have a 40 per cent drop in our insurance rates; and we think perhaps the lawyers will struggle along anyway.

An hon. member: They'll think of something.

Mr. Shulman: I want to mention, very briefly, a case which has had considerable publicity in the press here in Toronto and up in the north. It's the sad case of Charles Dyer, who very foolishly bought a health insurance plan from Mutual of Omaha and then made the mistake of getting sick.

Now Mutual of Omaha specializes in putting little gimmicks in tiny print in their policies that allow them not to pay off. In this case, Charles Dyer became very ill, lost the use of his legs and never left his house, except to go to his doctor's office, for a period of some years. And they cut his insurance off because they said: "It says right in the policy that if you go outside of the house your policy becomes null and void, and you went outside of the house to go to the doctor's office; therefore you lose your benefits." And they actually cut him off.

He said: "Well, I don't go out for anything else, just to go to the doctor. He doesn't make house calls; so what am I supposed to do?" And they said: "Well, that's your problem. It says right in the policy if you go out of the house, you lose your insurance."

He appealed to the Superintendent of Insurance, who read the policy and said: "They're perfectly right. However, I'll call upon the company and see if something can be done." Then he called back and said: "Don't you worry, Mr. Dyer, we've fixed it up. They're not going to pay you, what is it, the $80 a month you are entitled to, but they're willing to give you $500 as a settlement. Now suppose you take that and be happy and move on." But Dyer is a stubborn man; he felt the money was coming to him.

Meanwhile, he's become so bad that he can't go to the doctor's office any more. He's got another doctor who has come in and he has a medical certificate saying he can't leave his house—in fact he has four certificates from four different doctors—so he is certainly entitled to the benefits now.

So I wrote a letter to the minister responsible a few months ago, and he said he'd look into it. Then we got a new minister, the new Minister of Public Protection; I didn't get a reply from him. The other day I was walking up the steps and I said to the minister: "What about the poor sad case of Charles Dyer-" He sort of clapped me on the back and said: "Don't worry, he's getting his money now."

I was so pleased the government had moved, that something had happened, I rushed inside and sent a letter of congratulations off to Mr. Dyer. I got a wire back immediately: "I didn't get any money; I haven't heard a thing from the insurance company. I'm not getting a cent." I was a little upset and at midnight I'm afraid, I phoned the Minister of Public Protection at his room down at the Royal York Hotel. I said: "You led me astray, Mr. Minister." He said: "I'm sorry. I mistook it for another case. But I have good news. The insurance company is willing to settle for $1,100 now instead of $500. Even if he is still disabled, even if he can't leave the house, even if he can't get his $80 a month. That's a year and a half's payment all in one shot."

So there we are. We know who runs this province: the insurance companies.

We know that even when right is obvious, when you have medical certificates up to your ears proving the man can't leave his house and he can't collect from his insurance company, we go to the Superintendent of Insurance and nothing can be done. I go to the Minister of Public Protection, make a private appeal, a public appeal, an appeal through the press and now an appeal in this House—and he still doesn't collect his money.

What do we have to do with these insurance companies? You're going to drive them out and you're going to force us in for good or for bad!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I'd like to ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker. Did his original physician in fact certify that he was able to go out of doors? I want to ask him that question.

Mr. Shulman: His original physician? Yes, his original physician said he was able to go out of doors, in his opinion; but he didn't go out of doors because he didn't feel he was able to. That's exactly what the certificate said.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: A further question: Did he, in fact, go out of doors?

Mr. Shulman: Only to go to the doctor's office—for no other purpose whatsoever.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Of course, it's not for me to pass judgement on that statement—I haven't talked to Mr. Dyer himself—but I know that is a fact so far as the physician's order was concerned. In regard to some other statements alleged there I would like to say this; that if the hon. member, or any other member of this House, feels that there is an injustice in cases such as these I would certaintly be prepared to look at them.

I think insofar as the law is concerned, and don't crowd me on that one, I believe that up until that particular point the right thing had been done by Mr. Dyer. I think the hon. member, to be fair, should state the amount of money the company had paid to Mr. Dyer. The fact of the matter is they did make him a settlement even after they had the evidence from his physician, and then they had increased the amount of money.

I would say that now—

Mr. Speaker: Is this to be a lengthy statement? Otherwise—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I am answering the allegations made by—

He doesn't want to hear them? It suits me; fine!

Mr. Shulman: It is all right. Please go on.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: All right.

As I indicated, I communicated with the officials of the company after looking over the entire file. It is the first time I have had the opportunity to do it.

Mind you the hon. member had, as is his custom, taken the matter to the press; that is his business, not mine. I called the officials of the company in and I had—I don't know if I can remember all of the names—I had a Mr. Whittaker, a Mr. Ellis, a Mr. Walton, and there was one other that I brought—

Mr. Shulman: Mr. MacKay!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: —and Mr. MacKay, the member is correct—brought into my office. I discussed the entire matter with them, and without any reference to the past they assured me that, on a sympathetic basis, they would reopen the case with Mr. Dyer. I think they probably will see him this week based on the requests that I made to them, and I am satisfied that the right thing will be done by Mr. Dyer. And, Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure the hon. member, and other hon. members, that that will be my method of dealing with such cases in the future. However, I like them being referred to me of course.

Mr. Shulman: Thank you very, very much, through you Mr. Speaker, to the minister. If the right thing is done by Mr. Dyer I will come down here and I will personally praise the minister, adore him, do all the things one must do to get—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I don't want any praise.

Mr. Shulman: If it happens; but a settlement offer of $1,100 is not going to satisfy anyone!

The man is now completely disabled; he cannot leave the house for any reason whatsoever, and we have all the medical evidence in the world to prove it. If the minister is able to fix it up, great; he is wonderful. We will wait and see what happens next week. We will leave it till then.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well that is different from the things the member has been saying about me—

Mr. Shulman: Okay, I will make it all up to the minister.

My final comment, Mr. Speaker; I just wish to make a few brief comments about a law which was passed under the Department of Public Protection, I am sorry to say. But I am not going to assail this particular minister because it was done before his time, in fact in the dying days of the last Legislature.

At that time a most incredible law was passed here, and to our disrepute the opposition, all of the opposition, did not notice it. It slipped through in the last days of the Legislature and we didn't see it happening; and without a doubt it is the worst law that has been passed anywhere in the world in the financial field, regardless of the jurisdiction.

What they have done is pass a law which makes it an offence for any person to give financial advice to the effect that you should turn in expensive insurance and buy term insurance. There is a law here—there has been for many years, and in certain other jurisdictions—where one insurance man cannot go to a person and advise him to turn in his insurance. There were certain reasons for that law, but not many.

But what they have done now, they have gone much further. They have said no one, no financial advisor, may come and advise you to turn in expensive insurance and buy term insurance. When I get up now and say to the designate Minister of Public Protection, through you Mr. Speaker, that I am aware he has some whole-life insurance, that he is making a big mistake in keeping it, he should turn it in and get his cash payment, his cash settlement, and buy term insurance for the same amount, I am now breaking the law. In giving him that suggestion, I have just broken the law.

Now have you ever heard of such a ridiculous law in the world? It is absolute nonsense. It is beyond nonsense.

Surely insurance and insurance companies and insurance salesmen should be able to sell on the merits of what they are selling; they should not require this artificial protection to try and keep the public ignorant of what is actually happening in insurance.

Term insurance is what most people should buy. It gives cheap protection; it gives a lot of protection at very little cost. Someone who is 35 or 40 can buy insurance for as little as $4 a thousand.

Insurance companies don't like selling it because the profit they make on it is very small. They prefer to sell endowments, which are whole-life policies, and charge you $20 or $30 or $40.

Well if they can do it, fine; more power to them. But imagine this government, or any government, bringing in a law saying that the public cannot be advised that this is not a good purchase. It is just as though they were to bring in a law and say no one may advise you to sell a certain stock, like Bell Telephone, or a certain class of stock. It is idiotic. Nowhere else in the world is there such—

Oh, I heard a minister over there say he agrees with me—it is the member for Halton West (Mr. Kerr). I thank him very much. I hope the Minister of Public Protection heard him, because it is common sense.

Now as one of his first acts the minister should repeal that law. They are making fools of themselves, because they are never going to take anyone to court on that anyway. It is just meant by the insurance companies as a weapon to be held over people's heads. I got up a dozen times since they passed that law and I advised the people in this audience to turn in their whole-life insurance and buy term insurance.

Now I am breaking the law, charge me! I am doing it again in this House. I am breaking the law.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Yes, but the member has parliamentary immunity.

Mr. Shulman: Well I'll step outside and do it then. I've done it a dozen times.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Don't be sure!

Mr. Shulman: I am breaking a stupid law, and of course they are not going to charge me and the insurance companies aren't going to charge me, because they are afraid to test this in the courts. They don't really want the public to know about this law. They just want to have this weapon over the heads of people who advise the public.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will get myself a good lawyer and the member will be in trouble—I'll have the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

Mr. Shulman: Okay. I wish the minister would charge me. It would bring a lot of attention to this law, and bring the insurance companies and these policies—

Mr. Carruthers: It would give the member a lot of publicity.

Mr. Shulman: It would give the government a lot of publicity—all of it bad—and that is what I would like to do very much. But they are not going to do it. I am just going to suggest to the Minister of Public Protection, who is new, and reasonable—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Affable!

Mr. Shulman: —affable, delightful mood—that his government made a mistake when it brought in this law. We are going to embarrass them about it for a long period of time. I suggest that very quietly—

Mr. Lawlor: The minister has a profound duty; he has to charge him.

Mr. Shulman: —very quietly and very gently, the minister should bring in an amendment and change the law back. He will gain himself a lot of approval from this side of the House and from his own members, because this sort of politicking does not help the Conservative Party. It does not even help the insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was so lengthy in my address. The reason, I may explain, was that I started my budget speech last

year, and for the first time since Confederation—I checked back—a budget address was stopped for an election. I sat down one day and was told I could continue the next day, and to my great dismay I was not allowed to continue because certain other business was called. Then before I could get back on the floor an election was called, and I never did finish my budget address, so I had to finish it these last few days. But in future I will not be quite as lengthy.

Thank you very much for your indulgence.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth.

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I am again most interested in joining in this Throne debate, and without any hesitation I will certainly support the amendment placed before this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon).

First of all I would like, as usual, to congratulate the Speaker. I know that he will serve the Legislature fairly and squarely, and I think this was proven here today. I know that he has shown this type of action during the last four years while he was Deputy Speaker and I know that he will continue to fulfill this office to the best of his ability.

May I also add my congratulations to the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) as the Deputy Speaker for this coming session.

I felt that some comment should be made regarding the changes in the cabinet structure. I know that many of the speakers thus far, and probably many of the speakers from here on in, will make some comments. I know that the Leader of the Opposition pointed out many of the pitfalls very ably, and I do not wish to deal with it in any depth because I don't see that there is any great advantage to reiterate.

However, for the record, so that the Premier (Mr. Davis) is aware of how the people in my area feel about this cabinet shuffle, I would just like to quote two editorials from the local daily paper, which made comments after the two press releases issued by the Premier in January and February of this year. I would like to quote first the editorial in the Stratford Beacon-Herald on Saturday, January 8, and I quote:

> George Orwell, the late British author, is best remembered for his book "1984" which paints a rather gloomy and frightening picture of future society. His lesser known work entitled "Animal Farm" has provided us with an expression that in its modified form is becoming more widely known than his books. The expression is: "All animals are created equal, but some are more equal than others." So we change the word from animal to people and we got the expression: "All people are created equal, but some are more equal than others."
>
> It's difficult to avoid thinking of this expression when looking at the most recent political move of Premier Davis. In a radical departure from previous policy, Mr. Davis has in effect created four super-ministers. The Premier himself has rejected this terminology as irrelevant but it is difficult to arrive at any other conclusion when examining the evidence.
>
> The appointments were unique in several ways. First of all, Mr. Davis was not even there to do the honours; he was holidaying in Florida. This absence may be relatively unimportant or it may be the Premier's way of drawing attention from the fact that the ministers appointed are super-ministers after all.

I will just finish the quote there. The editorial did go on and make some comments about the Minister of Education and the Premier, but I won't quote those at this time.

Now that was after the first press release. I believe in the early part of February another release was issued with another cabinet shuffle, and this was just about the time the federal cabinet shuffle took place. It was interesting to read an editorial in the same paper, the Stratford Beacon-Herald, in reply to the Premier's announcement. I quote:

> All cabinet-makers seem to be well versed in the art of card playing, for no matter how they shuffle the deck the cards come out looking just about the same. Change for the sake of change, but any changes for the sake of improvement are marginal in nature. Regardless of the talent the party has there is always such a thing as regional balance. One district could supply a wealth of talent, another nothing but political dunderheads. Nevertheless a balance has to be maintained and if it means appointing a couple of weak ministers in order to retain this balance that is exactly what is done.

Need I say more; because I am sure the people of Ontario will be watching very carefully to assess the most recent cabinet shuffle and the appointing of the super-ministers. There is no doubt that they are anxiously waiting for the government to come back closer to the taxpayers who really pay the bills.

Mr. Speaker, as this is the Throne debate I'd like to make a few remarks about the Throne Speech. I know there will be a lot of speakers and some certainly take more time than others; I would like to take just a few minutes of your time because of the time limit which is facing us.

To me, there is no doubt that the Throne Speech covered the waterfront, and as one editorial writer wrote in the Star—I would like to quote this because it is very well put:

> When the veneer of high-minded contemporaneity is stripped away from the Speech from the Throne we are left with an eloquent zero. Even when you've allowed for the vagueness permissable in this special political genre it's impossible to see the statement of legislative intentions unveiled at Queen's Park as one that levels with the people.

I want to underline that—"as one that levels with the people."

> There are hints to be sure of the beautiful symmetry of Premier Davis's elaborate government reorganization. There is a promise of good liberal law-making on relatively minor questions. But in five important areas—the economy, nationalism, transportation, the environment and housing—the Premier really hasn't told the people what he will do. When he makes a specific promise, it is of a select committee, a commission, "an evaluation" or a series of experiments.

There have been—and it has been stated many times in the press that there have been —many serious omissions which not only affect my own constituency but all areas of the province.

One omission about which I would like to make a comment, which spread throughout the province very shortly, is the police pension awarded by compulsory arbitration. Last year the city of Stratford was ordered to pay the entire cost of funding the police pension plan back to the day each man joined the force and 80 per cent of future contributions. To fund this plan up to this year, it is estimated it will cost $560,000 or $28,000 a year for the next 20 years.

The city council at the moment has refused so far to pass the necessary bylaws and as this matter is now before the courts, I really won't make further comments. But due to the correspondence received by myself and the Minister of Justice from municipalities, I would like to urge the Minister of Justice (Mr. Bales) to act as quickly as possible on this matter. I received a copy of a letter from him which he forwarded to the municipality of Listowel, stating that he would contact me in the very near future to discuss this matter further. I urge him to do this as soon as possible.

The next area I want to deal with is transportation. Really, all the government said was that the major roads will be constructed in a northwesterly direction from Pickle Crow and Red Lake. I can assure the people in that part of the province that this should be a major priority. I recall our tour in that area in 1968 when the government at that time said that was the thing it was going to do. I hope the comment in the Speech from the Throne will be carried out very shortly.

But as for improving the roads in the rest of the province, no mention was really made. I suppose this was because the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has been going around the province talking about fiscal restraint since the election. I have tried to impress on the government since I have been in this Legislature the need for better access for my area to highway 401, or Ontario's main street. I realize the extension of the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway will ease the situation, but I know the people in my area want to know the future plans for better highway facilities to move the traffic.

I must suggest to the new Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) that we must have faster action on improved access. Last year I tried to stress to the former Minister of Transportation and Communications the need for definite plans to serve the tourist traffic to Stratford and right through to Lake Huron.

In fact, in 1966 the Department of Tourism and Information did a study of this area that showed our tourist business flourished but travel by plane and train was very limited, which of course means that cars and buses were the main means of transportation. At the present time it is most difficult for a tourist to find his way if he relies on highway signs in our area.

I know the people now fully realize that the government has neglected them in their planning and they are ready to make their views known to the new minister at their earliest opportunity. There is no doubt there is a restlessness here that has been created—and created particularly since they have learned that Ontario Place, which is a tourist attraction, lost $2 million last year. It is

interesting to know that there is money available for this sort of thing, but not for the tourist areas in the other parts of Ontario.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, another topic I would like to mention, that was mentioned in the budget, is the environment. It was just vaguely mentioned there. I really wonder how serious the government is in this respect. I thought that the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) would surely be able to continue with his desk-thumping approach, but this seems to be all over now.

I know that in the past two years there has been much discussion on littering. It appears that in one area the government desires to act, but in the area of non-returnable bottles we don't seem to see much action.

Last year my colleague, the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) led the way by introducing a bill to this effect, but no action has been taken. In fact last year the questionnaire I sent out in my area included a question which asked: "Should no-deposit, no-return bottles be banned?" The results were: 2,004 said yes and 146 said no. In other words, 93 per cent of the people replying said they wanted no-return bottles banned.

I am quite sure that many other members in this Legislature have found similar results in questionnaires in their areas, and I hope that the minister just isn't setting up another committee to study this area of concern.

I was pleased to see in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that there will be an expanded programme in outdoor recreation planned over the next five years. This is to include the development of parks and land acquisition. It is an excellent idea and certainly will be helpful, but it could have been much more helpful 10 or 20 years ago.

We learned about the bungling of the Niagara Escarpment purchases recently, and hopefully the government now realizes the need for increased parkland and facilities for the people of Ontario.

I can't help mentioning again Ontario Place, because the original estimated cost was $13 million which then rose to $19 million; and just recently the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. White) or whatever the minister is called?—stated that the total cost was $28 million.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Not Industry—Trade. There is no Industry just Trade.

Mr. Edighoffer: At the announcement of Ontario Place I recall that the then-Premier (Mr. Robarts) said: "Ontario Place is planned as a self-supporting project. Profits from admission fees and concessions will be turned back to pay original investment."

Well, last year they lost $2 million and the estimated loss for next year will be between $275,000 and $650,000. One suggestion I would like to make is that they might reconsider the tender they accepted for the janitorial services.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Right!

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South). What is $100,000?

Mr. Edighoffer: What is $200,000?

Mr. Ruston: Over $200,000!

Mr. Edighoffer: Last year in the Tourism estimates I suggested that the increased cost of Ontario Place, which was approximately $15 million, would have gone a long way to stimulate tourism across Ontario. I will maintain that it would have been better to have used that money through the ODC for tourist operators, or to improve natural parkland and facilities.

It is most interesting to note here, when we talk about parkland and this type of facility, that the government can move quickly on purchasing parkland if the reason is right.

Mr. Paterson: That is right.

Mr. Edighoffer: To illustrate the point, I refer to Bronte Creek Provincial Park, which no doubt will serve many people of Ontario. But it is most interesting that the announcement for this park was made on October 8, 1971. The Premier made the announcement and he said this would be a development that encompasses 1,500 acres. He went on to state in the press release that much of the land is already under option.

On December 15, I asked a question in this House. I asked the Minister of Public Works if he could advise how much land was either purchased or under option on October 8 and I learned that at that time 269 acres were under option. I guess the Premier considers these 269 acres to be a great percentage of the 1,500 acres involved in the park area. Then on December 15 there were only 820 acres under option; and to date, I am told, there are still only 1,020 acres that have been purchased.

It seems to me that an election promise gets quick action; which is too bad because this is where the people of Ontario are suffering because of piecemeal and panic planning.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention agriculture. It certainly was mentioned in the Throne Speech, but I am most interested in maintaining family farms as this certainly affects my area which is one of the best agricultural areas in Ontario.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Hear, hear!

Mr. Edighoffer: This year, I noticed in the Throne Speech that—

Mr. Ruston: Got all the money up there.

Mr. Edighoffer: —the government, and I hope the minister, will pay closer attention to the agricultural industry. I am in full accord with his paying closer attention to the needs of the agriculture industry; with increasing emphasis on the business aspects of farming, particularly farm management. This is a change from a year ago when the minister wanted to close the satellite of Fanshawe College, located in Woodstock, which allowed farmers to extend their knowledge on farm management. I want to urge the government to review its past policies so that we can continue to maintain the family farm concept.

Mr. Ruston: Hear, hear!

Mr. Edighoffer: Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to make one or two comments about the recent election. As you will recall, it was held in October last year, and I was fortunate enough to have one or two members of the cabinet visit my area.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They realized it was a lost cause for them!

An hon. member: Great riding; great member!

Mr. Edighoffer: I want to thank the Premier and the then Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) for coming to my riding—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He just squeezed in 7,000 to 8,000 I am not sure!

An hon. member: He had no licence.

Mr. Bullbrook: The machine kind of sputtered.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I had the same problem.

Mr. Ruston: The blue machine got bogged down up there.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): The government won't get anywhere in Shakespeare country.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Much ado about nothing over there.

Mr. Edighoffer: At the time the Minister of Justice was in my riding he happened to come in for a wine and cheese party. He was there for a few hours.

Mr. Bullbrook: Very appropriate; easy on the cheese!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Short on the cheese and long on the wine!

Mr. Edighoffer: I didn't have an opportunity to talk with him, but I noticed in the press the next day that he had made a comment that he didn't realize there were so many problems in Perth. Now that he is a thinking superminister I hope he will use his time to help solve a lot of these problems and I look forward to great things for Perth because of his and my concern.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Things haven't changed either.

Mr. Renwick: There will be nothing done about those problems for four years. The member will have to do them himself.

Mr. Bullbrook: He will.

Mr. Edighoffer: I said there were two members of the cabinet who came to my riding. The other member was, of course, the Premier. He made a visit, I think it was a Sunday evening, to attend one of the sessions of the festival. I don't recall whether it was at the Festival Theatre or the Avon Theatre but he did make a visit.

Mr. Renwick: It would be the Avon Theatre for the farce.

Mr. Edighoffer: However, the next day, the press reported that he was in town and he drove through the streets practically unnoticed.

An hon. member: What a shame!

Mr. Edighoffer: I want to thank the Premier for coming to visit the festival; however I feel rather sorry that he wasn't recognized. I would certainly like to, at this

time, invite the Premier and his wife to attend the festival this year.

Mr. Bullbrook: And do you know what they'll say as they drive down the street? "Who's that fellow with Hugh Edighoffer?"

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They won't say "Jim Bullbrook."

Mr. Edighoffer: And, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested to know that I think this is an ideal year for the Premier to visit, because the title of the first play that will be given at the festival this year is, "As You Like It." As I look around here, I think this is most befitting, because I am sure that as the Premier sits here it's just as he likes it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: With the odd exception.

Mr. Edighoffer: But I hope that during the year, because he has it here as he likes it, that we can see more action, as I stated earlier, on the economy, housing, transportation and the environment, than we've seen demonstrated in the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. J. T. Clement (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I too, would like to participate in this debate somewhat briefly, and likewise add my congratulations to the hon. member from Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) in his appointment as the Speaker to this honourable House.

I represent the riding of Niagara Falls in this House and, unlike the previous speaker, the hon. member from Perth (Mr. Edighoffer), we had no difficulty in my riding on Oct. 21 last and we didn't require the presence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) or even an extra police officer.

Niagara Falls, Mr. Speaker, is a city of 65,000 people, 40,000 of whom are voting members of the public. It's comprised of several smaller communities—Clifton, Stamford Centre, Drummondville—and some two years ago it took into its midst the village of Chippawa, wherein resided my very good friend George Bukator who previously represented my riding in this House.

Within the boundaries of the city of Niagara Falls will be found heavy industries, lighter industries, tender fruit industries and the greatest backbone of our whole economy, the tourist industry. Contrary to popular belief, Mr. Speaker, the tourist industry is, in the main, owned and operated by permanent residents of Niagara Falls who have poured their savings, their sweat, their blood into capital investment to provide service and to provide facilities for the travelling public. Very few large corporations have tourist-oriented industries operating within my riding.

On the easterly side of my riding is the great Niagara River, 36 miles in length, dropping 323 feet from Lake Erie, from where it flows, to Lake Ontario, into which it discharges. It drops 161 feet over the falls.

I know, sir, that you hail from Northumberland and I'm giving you these statistics because I am not sure whether you have had the pleasure of visiting Niagara Falls. But it is one of the greatest rivers on the whole North American continent.

It is also, I think, one of the greatest sewers in the world. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the great cities of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Erie, Buffalo and Niagara Falls, New York, pour their filth into that great system and are fouling the waters of the Great Lakes. The city of Niagara Falls in the state of New York adds its contribution in the amount of some 75 to 80 million gallons of virtually untreated sewage daily.

I am pleased to note in the Throne Speech that it's been pointed out that the government will continue to press for the signing of an implementation of an agreement with the bordering states and the federal government of the United States to clean up this situation. The lifeblood of the people and the tourist industry of Niagara Falls is dependent upon this situation being corrected. It seems most peculiar to me that our neighbours to the south will spend thousands of lives and millions of dollars hourly in southeast Asia, and yet to date we have been unable to implement a workable agreement with them.

Some 14 million people visited Niagara Falls last year, Mr. Speaker, and according to the then Department of Tourism they spent an average of $14 apiece. According to my mathematics this would indicate a total expenditure of approximately $200 million in my city. And even if a small amount—say five per cent—relating to sales tax—came back into this building, that would demonstrate an earning capacity of $10 million. In addition moneys were earned, of course, on gasoline taxes, liquor taxes and so on.

I am pleased to note in the Speech from the Throne that trade and industry are to be promoted, encouraged and further develop-

ment permitted. I hope, sir, that this House, when considering the estimates for Trade and Industry will in fact be most generous. Niagara Falls more than pays its way, so long as we have an opportunity to do so.

I have three hopes for my riding, Mr. Speaker, in the immediate future:

1. I ask my government to continue to press for the implementation of the agreement I referred to.

2. I ask every member of this House to assist the Department of Trade and Industry of this government, particularly pertaining to the tourism budget when the estimates come before this House, to permit the implementation of moneys to be made available for promotion and development of the tourist industry. As the economy of Niagara Falls progresses, so does the economy of this province and the economy of this country progress.

I hope that the hon. Minister of Trade and Industry (Mr. White) and his departmental assistants will continue to innovate new programmes and extend offices and representatives in areas around the world to attract other people into my riding. I understand that the 14-odd million people who visited Niagara Falls this past year were in the main gleaned from North America. We must raise our sights to other markets—Europe and Asia.

3. I would like to think that in the immediate future the people who live in the city of Niagara Falls and in the area of Chippewa can enjoy the service that those of us who reside in the downtown area can enjoy; and that is the implementation of a liquor outlet in the village of Chippewa, now part of the city of Niagara Falls.

I will look after that aspect if I may, Mr. Speaker, so long as my friends in the House will assist me on the Trade and Industry budgets and the implementation of the US-Province of Ontario agreements.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, wherever you are, I would like to congratulate you upon your elevation to this high office. We built up a profound respect for you when you were Deputy Speaker of the House, and for today's performance—in spite of all the calamity that may fall around your ears when the Tory caucus meets next. We congratulate you for your courage.

Also to the Deputy Speaker, sir, we congratulate you upon your elevation and we wish you well in your keeping of order and harmony within this House.

I know that this House has been noted for harmonious relationships among the various parties, and particularly among the leaders of this House, and I don't suppose that will change very much; although I do recall one or two occasions when that harmony has been shattered rather vociferously and with a great deal of vehemence.

However, today, Mr Speaker, because of the fact that we are short of time in this House, I want to confine my remarks to one particular phase of our job over the next few years, and that is the readjustment of the ridings in this province

A few days ago we had placed on our desks the returns from the 1971 election in Ontario. It's simply a compilation of figures telling of the success or failure of candidates who ran in the last election. It has no recommendations at all, no suggestions for the future; just bare, stark, figures which those of us in this House read with some satisfaction —that is as far as our own ridings are concerned—but which at least twice as many others outside this House would like to forget.

It is when this report and the figures in it are compared with previous ones, Mr. Speaker, that facts begin to emerge about what is happening to the electoral picture in Ontario.

For example, in 1937 we had 2¼ million voters in this province. In 1971 we had twice as many, partly helped, of course, by the enfranchisement of 18- to 21-year-olds last year. Actually, the jump from 1967 to 1971, between the two elections, was 817,000, of which, of course, more than half would be the new 18- to 21-year-olds.

In 1971 we had the largest ever percentage of voters actually exercising their franchise, 73.12 per cent, up from 65.65 per cent in 1967. The next highest percentage turnout was in 1945, when 71.49 per cent voted. We might read some significance in the high votes in those two years, but I won't stop at the present time to point it out.

There is no mandatory legislation in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, as there is in the federal domain, which says redistribution of ridings must take place at regular intervals after the census. In this province it is a hit-and-miss affair when pressures build up to intolerable levels. Before the 1963 election we redistributed the Toronto suburban areas. Following that election the rest of the province was redivided for electoral purposes.

In the 1967 election we had an average of 31,500 names per riding on the voter's list. An attempt was made at the time of redistribution to set up each riding so that it had a reasonable figure near, above or below the average, taking into account ease of communication, size of territory in question, natural boundaries and similar factors. Unfortunately, at that time, Mr. Speaker, the rapidly growing urban areas too often were set at the top limit of the average, while slow-growth areas tended to wind up at the low end of those same averages.

The result has been that while many low-growth areas have stayed pretty close to the 1967 figure, the urban ridings have burgeoned in voter population until we have a situation such as Glengarry with 18,000 voters in 1971, while York Mills has 95,000; or Bellwoods, where the Solicitor General-designate (Mr. Yaremko) carved himself out a comfortable little empire of 21,000 voters, while the Premier's (Mr. Davis) riding of Peel North—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That's a lot of picnics and birthday parties.

Mr. Young: —has 69,000 and the whip's riding in Peel South has 74,000. This means that a voter in Glengarry has five times as much voting power as one in York Mills, and a Bellwoods "Yaremko" stalwart has almost four times the electoral power as the tory in the whip's riding of Peel South.

Or to use two similar ridings side by side in western Ontario: Kent 22,000 voters; and Elgin 42,000—about twice as many. In eastern Ontario there is Peterborough with 56,000, and beside it Hastings with 22,000. I am not using ridings in northern Ontario at this time for comparison; they are a special case and I will speak of that later.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and Lands and Forests): Why not?

Mr. Young: But the disparity between the size of the ridings in the province is just too great for democracy to have any real meaning at all. There is no question that the strength of the government lies in many of the small ridings, although government members, as I pointed out, also represent some of the largest ones voter-wise. All three parties in this House are represented by members who have few voters and by others who represent twice to three times the average number of voters in the ridings across the province.

The average in 1967—as I pointed out the first election after the last redistribution—was 31,502. In 1971, this had risen to 38,493. A select committee on election law last year recommended that for redistribution the average number of voters should be determined, and no riding should rise more than 25 per cent above that average, while at the same time no riding should fall more than 25 per cent below it.

I want to quote from that recommendation of the select committee!

> For the purposes of the redistribution of the province into electoral districts in accordance with the Act, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council shall appoint three redistribution commissioners, of whom one shall be the chief election officer who shall be the chairman.

I am not going to quote it all, but it says this too:

> For the purpose of this Act, a chief election officer shall determine the total population of the province as nearly as may be ascertained, and shall establish the average population of the electoral districts by dividing the number representing the total population by the number of electoral districts into which the province is to be divided according with the order of the assembly made under section 188.

Which simply is the section pointing out how this should be done. Then another section of the recommendation says this:

> The redistribution commissioners shall not depart from the average population to a greater extent than one-quarter more or one-quarter less. The redistribution commissioners shall notify the assembly through the clerk whenever in their opinion more than one-quarter—

And I emphasize that—"more than one-quarter"

> of the electral districts of the province vary more than one-quarter more or one-quarter less than the established average population for each electoral district.

Then the recommendation goes on to point out how the commission should make its recommendations to the House. It also provides for objections on the part of members of the House or members of the public, and then how the commission itself shall have the final determination.

Mr. Speaker, this government saw fit absolutely to ignore that part of the select committee's recomemndation. But those recommendations, by and large, are fairly good. The 25 per cent over or above the

average is perhaps too high, but that's the one that the federal government has adopted; and while we may not entirely agree with it, it might be useful as a yardstick here.

New Zealand, for example, has a redistribution every five years with a five per cent variation above or below the average, and other jurisdictions have 10 per cent or 15. The one suggested by the select committee was 25 per cent. Let's go along with that as we look at the future situation here.

Taking this as a general rule—that is the 25 per cent above or below—then even in 1971 we had 20 ridings in excess of the average, plus 25 per cent. We had 20 ridings in excess. That's 17 per cent of all the ridings. We had 32 below the allowable figure and that's 27 per cent. In other words, even in this last election we had 44 per cent of the ridings either too big or too small voterwise.

When we try to project the number of voters in the ridings in the next election in 1975 or 1976—I use the 1975 figure here—the situation gets very bad. In calculating the 1975 picture I've tried only to get a rough idea of the numbers without any careful study of the population trends. I've simply taken the difference between 1967 and 1971, subtracted the 10 per cent comprising 18- to 21-year-old voters added that year, in 1971 —a non-recurring bulge in the voters' list— and then added the difference to the 1971 level.

That's very rough, Mr. Speaker, but when this is done—I think it's on the conservative side if I may use that word in this regard—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Very much on the Conservative side!

Mr. Young: If we do that, we get total voters in 1975 of just under five million—4,920,000. From here on I simply want to use round figures without going too much into the detail. This is an average of 42,000 voters per riding by 1975, up from 38,500 in 1971.

Using the same measure of no ridings being more than 25 per cent above this or 25 per cent below it, we will have 26 ridings or 22 per cent above the permissible limit; and 33 ridings or 28 per cent below it. That's a total of 50 per cent of the ridings, half of them, above or below the permissible level of voters.

More than that the variation will run from about 115,000 voters in York Mills to 18,000 in Glengarry; from 91,000 in Peel South to 20,000 in Bellwoods; and from 80,000 in Yorkview to 23,000 in Huron. This means that in the next election, if the riding boundaries remain the same, great numbers of voters in the province will have five to six times the voting power of others, a situation that this House should find impossible to tolerate.

I would like to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, my calculation of what these ridings might be in 1975. These are the ones that will be over the 25 per cent above average: Carleton will have 62,000 voters; Carleton East 53,000; Halton East 60,000; Halton West 63,000; Kitchener 71,000; London North 60,000; London South 72,000; Oshawa 66,000; Ottawa South 66,000; Ottawa West 60,000; Peel North 84,000; Peel South 91,000; Peterborough 62,000; St. Catharines 59,000; Sandwich - Riverside 56,000; Waterloo North 60,000; Welland South 64,000; Wellington South 57,000; Wentworth 55,000; York Centre 55,000; Etobicoke 62,000 Scarborough East 55,000; York Mills 115,000; York West 60,000; and Yorkview 80,000.

When we look at those figures, Mr. Speaker, we are just a bit startled at the size some of these ridings are going to be.

On the other hand, I would like to put on the record as well the ridings which will be approximately 25 per cent under the average.

Algoma will be 17,000; Algoma-Manitoulin 20,000; Brant 24,000; Cochrane North 25,000; Durham 31,000—I am sure the member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) wouldn't like that few voters in his riding; Essex-Kent 26,000; Glengarry will be only 18,000; Grenville-Dundas will be about 27,000; Grey South 25,000.

An hon. member: A pocket borough!

Mr. Young: Right!

Hastings 23,000; Huron 23,000—for a minister of the Crown that is far too small; Huron-Bruce 24,000. Maybe those two ought to get together and make one good riding out of it.

Kenora 26,000; Kent 22,000; Lambton 27,000; Lanark 27,000; Middlesex North only 23,000—alongside the high population centre of London.

Muskoka will be 21,000; Nickel Belt, 26,000; Parry Sound, 25,000; Prescott-Russell, 30,000; Prince Edward-Lennox, 27,000; Rainy River, 18,000; Renfrew South, 24,000; Timiskaming, 28,000; Thunder Bay, 17,000—the biggest empire in the province.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Quite a man for emperor too!

Mr. Young: Victoria-Haliburton, 30,000; Wellington-Dufferin, 24,000; Bellwoods—cabinet minister—20,000, right in the heart of downtown Toronto; Dovercourt, 27,000; Parkdale, 25,000; St. Andrew-St. Patrick, 31,000.

Mr. Speaker, having put those figures on the record I would simply say that the rest of those ridings will run between 32,000 and the 52,000 which would be the allowable average.

Since redistribution is obviously due, an independent redistribution commission should immediately be appointed to review riding boundaries. I know this is not called for by Ontario law, but this is a recommendation I think all of us will agree with, because it makes sheer common sense.

There are several alternatives which this commission might consider. The first one would naturally deal with the size of the House and how many constituents each member should be expected to serve, taking into account of course such things as territorial size, communications within the riding and similar factors.

If the commissioners wanted to keep ridings with a present average number of voters and rearrange boundaries to make them more equal by 1975, we need 128 seats in this House to accomplish it. On the other hand, if they wanted to keep at the 117, or perhaps 119 figure, they need to carve out ridings with an average of 42,000 voters.

To accomplish this the commission would set its average of 42,000 voters with ridings varying 25 per cent up or down as conditions warranted. That would mean that ridings could vary roughly from 32,000 to 52,000.

The north would have to be considered separately from these. We have to face that fact, Kenora will have 26,000 voters by 1975; Thunder Bay, 17,000; Cochrane North will have 25,000.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Quality, not quantity!

Mr. Young: They are all empires with special problems of distance and communication. The present member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) of course, is all right now. He has a fleet of Ontario aircraft at his disposal—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Got a very good majority too, I would say.

Mr. Young: —and as a minister of the Crown he can drop in on his voters at any time he wants to on government business—and of course he would do a little politicking on the side.

Mr. Renwick: And a little fishing!

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Fishing for votes now.

Mr. Young: Just a little.

Now Cochrane North has exactly the same situation, with a minister of the Crown and one who knows how to use government aircraft. Bust most of the northern members aren't that lucky.

Thunder Bay, for example, runs from the border with the United States right up to Hudson Bay.

Mr. Renwick: From the United States to Russia.

Mr. Young: And it is a very great size. It is also true that the voters are limited to 17,000, but it is a size which I am saying deserves special consideration, as the other ridings in the north do.

Many of the other ridings are in the same situation, although boundaries in areas such as Sudbury should be readjusted, as well as those around Sault Ste. Marie.

In southern Ontario there would have to be major changes and I would like to outline some of these—just a suggestion of what might be done. Some of the hon. members here perhaps will not agree with me; some well might.

The large metropolitan areas could well average 44,000 voters per riding—2,000 above the general average—while the rural ridings might drop in some cases to an average of 37,000 to 38,000—4,000 below the average and 6,000 below the cities. I'm speaking only of averages.

What this would mean is that Metro Toronto and its surrounding area, London, Waterloo and so on, would have more ridings added to average 44,000. An area such as that along Lake Huron would average 38,000, but get fewer seats.

By 1975 in Metro Toronto there would be a net of two new seats—York Mills up to 115,000; Etobicoke to 62,000; Yorkview to 80,000. At the same time Bellwoods in 1975 will have only about 20,000; Dovercourt 27,000 and Parkdale 25,000. Now this means that the suburban areas will need an additional five seats. But the city of Toronto would have to be cut by about three seats,

making a net gain in the Metro Toronto area, that is Metro itself, of about two seats.

And there's no question that the City of Toronto is due for a complete revamping to get rid of the present strip ridings—the legacy of former gerrymandering. And of course this government would not be guilty of continuing gerrymandering practices. We give them the benefit of the doubt here.

These ridings, you remember, in their municipal sense, as wards, were recommended to the Ontario Municipal Board recently but the Board refused to carry on that type of gerrymandering at the municipal level. I would hope that an independent commission would take a close look at this and would cut out the strip ridings in Toronto and redraw the boundaries in a more realistic and proper way.

The present Hamilton seats, with readjusted boundaries, would average 42,000 voters; while the four ridings in Peel and Halton counties would be increased to seven —from four to seven. Unfortunately, there are two Tories in two of those seats—and I guess all of them—but it means up from four to seven if we're going to maintain an average of 42,000. North York with 45,000, York Centre with 55,000, Ontario with 32,000, Ontario South with 46,000 and Oshawa with 66,000, should be readjusted from five seats to six; with an average, there, of 44,000 voters.

The London, Middlesex, Elgin, Oxford, Brantford and Haldimand-Norfolk complex of nine seats should have readjusted boundaries and be given an average of 44,000 voters. What that does to the riding of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), of course, simply means that he has to take in a bit more territory and service a few more people.

The area covered by the Niagara Falls regional government should be upped from five seats to six. The four Windsor seats should be readjusted. The Essex-Kent, Chatham-Kent, Lambton, Kent and Sarnia corner should drop from five seats to four; while at the same time allowing their averages to drop to 38,000 instead of the 42,000 that I've been talking about. So I'm being very generous to that corner in the province.

The five seats in the Huron, Grey-Bruce area should drop from five seats to four—I'm talking in averages here. I point out again that this is 6,000 average less than the Metro seats. Those of the Waterloo-Wellington area should be increased from five to six. These would average 44,000.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Is the member trying to get rid of me?

Mr. Young: No! You can beat Charlie any time.

The Georgian Bay complex from Dufferin-Simcoe to Parry Sound, including Victoria-Haliburton, should have it's six seats reduced to five, and the eight ridings including Durham, Peterborough, Northumberland, Hastings, Quinte, Prince Edward-Lennox, Frontenac-Addington and Kingston and the Islands should drop from the eight to seven.

The five Ottawa and Carleton seats are due for readjustment and an extra seat should be added to bring the average to 42,000. The eastern seats outside Ottawa and along the St. Lawrence have a very low average vote. Prescott and Russell has 30,000, Glengarry 18,000, Stormont 35,000, Grenville-Dundas 27,000, Renfrew North 36,000, Renfrew South only 24,000 and Leeds 32,000. These eight seats can drop to six and still have an average of 38,000 voters.

If redistribution were carried out on the rough basis I have outlined, we'd come up with about 119 seats—two more than we have now. With a bit more squeezing, of course—particularly of some cabinet ministers' ridings, as well as those of some Liberal and New Democratic ones—we could keep the number down to the 117 that we now have. But it's going to take some squeezing and some real readjustment.

There is a practical alternative, of course, which the redistribution commissioners should carefully explore. There's a federal redistribution due during the next year or so. This should result in about 9 federal seats in the province. There would be a very real advantage if federal and provincial boundaries were one and the same.

Do I hear some screaming? This would immeasurably simplify election work and make polling subdivisions possible which would be the same at all three levels of government.

If such a redistribution were undertaken it would mean average ridings for 1975 of about 55,000 voters—considerably less than many of us have right now With the 25 per cent leeway both up and down, this would mean ridings varying from 41,000 to 69,000 on the average—again with some special consideration for northern Ontario.

This would, of course, mean a reduction of seats in the House, and I suspect a real scramble for nominations for the 1975 election. But it might well make for a more

efficient House. It would simplify servicing the ridings, since both federal and provincial members would be responsible for the same territory.

Along with it should go, of course, more help for the members at the riding level. I want to stress that—that a riding of that size would certainly demand a great deal more help at the local level.

Federal and provincial budgets could provide office and service centre space and staff in each riding which, of course, could be combined and offer a higher level of service if both members happened to be of the same political faith. If they weren't, I suppose there should be some problems that would have to be ironed out.

This contracting of House membership is not new in Ontario. I'd like to point that out to the members. In 1867 there were 82 members. This gradually grew until in 1929 there were 112 members.

In 1934, this 112 was dropped to 90, just about the figure that would hold if we redistributed according to the federal pattern. Then it went up to 98 in 1955; to 108 in 1963; and 117 in 1967. Perhaps we are due for another complete reorganization. Certainly ease of travel and communications has improved immeasureably in recent years making it possible for a member to serve more people more easily.

At the same time, however, we have to recognize that the services demanded of a member have dramatically increased so that his work load constantly grows. In any case, whether we go to the 90-member House or stay near the present number, there should be serious consideration by this House of the need for assistance to members at the local level which will give our constituents more efficient service. For the average member this might well mean the provision of an office at a central location which would be staffed and available for the people in the riding. In some northern ridings, this of course might not be the answer.

The member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes), whom I have mentioned would need many offices strung out for 1,000 miles across his territory and they likely wouldn't serve very well anyway. What he and others like him might need is more access to free transportation. I am thinking mainly of air transportation, since trains just don't touch the settlements in many of the northern reaches of this riding and the trip by car isn't yet feasible over that watery wasteland.

Perhaps arrangements might be made for northern members to have the use of provincial planes at times when the fire danger isn't acute, so they can at least drop in on the isolated settlements they are supposed to represent and yet find it impossible to visit unless they belong to the cabinet of the day with all the command that gives to free and unrestricted transportation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question about the need for redistribution in Ontario in order to get somewhere near the ideal of one man, one vote. We will never achieve that, of course, and no one would advocate that in a province like Ontario it is possible or even desirable. But to have voters in one riding with six times the voting power of those in another is inexcusable; or to have people with even three times the voting power of others—as a very large percentage of Ontario voters will have by 1975—is unthinkable in a democracy. I therefore take for granted that this government will move with reasonable speed to appoint an independent redistribution commission to examine this situation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The member is taking a lot for granted, isn't he?

Mr. Young: I beg pardon?

Mr. Deans: He is taking a lot for granted.

Mr. Young: I may be taking a lot for granted as the member says, but we would hope that in this day of enlightenment, when other jurisdictions are doing this very thing, this government will appoint the independent commission to look at this total problem.

If the commission decided in its wisdom to wait for co-operative action with the federal commission, which will come after the federal election, I suppose not for another year or so, then well and good. They can still complete their work well before the next provincial election in 1975 or 1976, and this House will be aware that the process of redistribution is under way.

I point out again, Mr. Speaker, that if York Mills achieves 115,000 voters, as appears probable by 1975, then there will be 54 ridings in this province in which the voters will have three or more times—up to seven times actually—the voting power of the York Mills citizen. And there will be 22 ridings where the voters will have three or more times the voting strength per person as those in Yorkview, with 80,000 votes.

The situation cannot continue; and I am confident this House and this government will take appropriate measures to cure it,

and that these measures will be taken with a fair degree of speed.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like first to be one of those to congratulate you on your position as Speaker here in the Legislature and I am sure that you will carry out the duties assigned to you fairly, as you have shown so far in this session.

I do not have a prepared speech to make today. I have a few items I would like to cover in passing. I will try to be brief.

With the election of Oct. 21, we have, of course, the new cabinet and new government and a new mandate given to the Progressive Conservative Party, as we all know. It seems rather interesting, I suppose, that it would appear to me that one of the most powerful ministers in that new superministry is a resident of my riding—the Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough). I suppose maybe it should help some, having a second-in-charge. As someone said the other day, they wondered who that fellow was sitting beside the Treasurer. Maybe he is right next to being in charge. Perhaps our area may be fortunate in getting some things that maybe some other ones aren't. So by having someone of this capacity in my riding, I always look forward to being favoured with some of the things that some other ridings don't always get.

Some of the things in the operations of the provincial election bother me a little. I think that we are due for some major changes in the operations of our election setup. The previous speaker was talking of some of the redistribution that was necessary.

I wanted to mention a thing or two on the calling of the election and the 37 days' notice that must be given returning officers prior to the election date.

The appointment of returning officers, according to my interpretation of the Act, is that they are appointed for life, but may be discharged if they commit any infractions of rules and regulations. I understand they are not necessarily civil servants under the Act, but do have permanent appointments.

As we know, of course, I believe all of them are true and faithful to the Progressive Conservative Party. In fact, the returning officer in my riding is so true and faithful he is even president of the riding. I don't know if this is really according to Hoyle or not.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He's impartial.

Mr. Ruston: Yes, he's impartial I suppose, but it is hard to look impartial under those circumstances. I am sure he is very fair; he's been very fair to us most of the time. I think the saying is that 'law must not only be adhered to, it must appear to be enforced or appear to be fair', and sometimes we wonder if it can appear to be fair under these circumstances.

I think he's under great pressure, though, at election time because he is notified of the people who will do the enumerating. In our own area, our party, having been in the opposition and holding the riding, had the opportunity to appoint an enumerator and a poll clerk. Our campaign manager submitted all the names of the enumerators a couple of days prior to when he wanted them and he went to be sworn in.

I think from half of the riding—it's a long, large riding—the enumerators went into the one area to be sworn in. Well, things were quite a conundrum! I went in for five minutes to walk around and look around. Our enumerators had been assigned to each poll that they were supposed to enumerate but the ones for the Conservative Party were all in a dither; they didn't know what poll they were doing.

The Conservative candidate was standing right behind the returning officer trying to direct him on who was going to go where and some of them were coming to me wanting to know where the boundaries were. Well, I left, as I didn't feel it was my responsibility, and left it to other people. They were given no directions on how they were to carry out their jobs; the papers and official documents were given to the Conservative, and they were to meet the next day and start their enumerations.

The next day or the day after, the same thing happened at the other end of the riding and it was even more confusing there. They didn't have their people lined up as to who was going to do the work. Maybe we were more fortunate; we had them all assigned but it's very confusing and I don't think we can really blame this on the returning officer.

What I really think we need is a voters' registration. This would probably be something similar to what they have in the United States. Someone says that we're not supposed to copy what the United States has but maybe this is what we need. At least I think it is something that needs reviewing.

With a voters' registration the responsibility is on the voter to see that he's registered. You make places more easily accessible to people so that they can register; certainly there are lots of places, such as post offices, municipal offices, police stations—any of these places could be used for voter registration. I suppose there are some disadvantages for people who are disabled and so forth, but those are minor—there are very few of them—and I think they could easily be taken care of by mail and personal delivery.

This to me is an area that we really should be looking into. I think in the rush to get the enumeration done people maybe have a habit of saying, "They don't check really for sure". If they're citizens they know the people, I suppose, in a lot of cases. We do, probably, in rural areas, there are some rural areas, I suppose, where most of the enumerators know the people and we don't have too much trouble there. I can see from reading a number of reports that in large cities enumerators, naturally, don't know the people personally, and some people get put on the list who shouldn't be put on; they're not citizens perhaps or they're not residents long enough to be eligible to vote. I think this is something very important that we should be thinking of in the near future.

I heard quite a resume the other day on election campaigning from the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman). Some of the things he said I suppose go on in other areas and we kind of slough them off and don't pay much attention. I don't worry too much about those things.

I think we had a few people coming in from one of the other ridings trying to get a vote, because that particular party didn't figure it had any chance in the other ridings, so it thought to bring them down to my riding. However, we don't mind a few of those things. We generally figure on having a big enough majority that we'll swing around anyway and win, so we don't worry about minor infractions like that. We understand that a few maybe did get in to vote.

However, I think with a voter registration that was properly done we wouldn't need the swearing-in thing that we have now in the rural polls. I think maybe that's been handy and it's been an advantage that we have in the rural polls. But I think if our registration was done properly that could be done away with. It is a bit of a problem because, if someone insists on being sworn in, then you cannot stop him from voting whether it is illegal or not.

So, I think there are two or three areas that I want to cover with regard to the election. As for my candidates, we had a real good election. I have what happened to the Conservative candidate. I guess that it would appear that I won the battle and lost the war and he lost the battle and won the war, because he's been appointed a judge already.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex-South): He is the real winner.

Mr. Ruston: I never could figure it out.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): A winner would be terrific.

Mr. Ruston: With all due respect to lawyers—the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) shouldn't go away—I never could figure out how it is that a defeated candidate always makes such a good judge. I think there must be a lot of other lawyers who would make good judges and not just a defeated candidate.

Mr. I. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Isn't that a federal area?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Who would be the leader?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: What about winners? They would be terrific.

Mr. Ruston: Oh, yeah! We have a lot of winners here, who I am sure, would be good judges, like the member for Downsview and the member for Sarnia and any number of them here who would make good judges.

An hon. member: Has the member for Downsview got his appointment yet?

Mr. Ruston: However, I guess those are pitfalls and those are the pleasures of being in election campaigning. We take it in stride and take it as it comes along.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Isn't the member disturbed by this appointment?

Mr. Ruston: Pardon?

Mr. Bounsall: Isn't the member disturbed by this appointment?

Mr. Ruston: I was kind of expecting it, to be honest with you. The member for Windsor West asked me if I was disturbed. No, I was kind of expecting it. I think that when the nomination came along, with one thing and another, I was kind of assessing the situation

and I kind of anticipated that this is probably what would happen. However, that is one of those things in a political campaign.

I should, of course, mention a few things with regard to agriculture since our riding in Essex and Kent counties covers a large agricultural area. There were about 30 or 40 farmers from Essex and Kent counties coming down on the train this morning to the annual Wheat Marketing Board meeting. They are all anxious to see how much money they are going to get from the new two-price system of wheat that Mr. Olson, the federal Liberal Minister of Agriculture announced only recently to give them some assistance. They are all trying to figure out, of course, how this is going to be assigned to them in this major change from what we have been used to. No doubt it will take a certain amount of time to get straightened out how much money should be assigned to each grower depending on the amount of wheat we export and the amount we use at home.

One of the things that has been mentioned a number of times—the Leader of the Opposition has mentioned it more than once—is the price of eggs for the past year or year and a half. In fact it is still a very serious situation. However, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) got around that prior to the election by appointing a royal commissioner to look into it. The Province of Quebec did not appoint a royal commissioner. It took a little action to assist the people who had been in the egg business for the last year or two. For 1971, the Province of Quebec is going to pay to each producer 20 cents for every hen that he had in production for the year plus 2½ cents a dozen for the eggs they produced.

I don't know if they have any limit on that because there would be a problem there with integrators, feed companies, hatcheries and so forth, that are in this business. I think that that could be done quite easily in the Province of Ontario. I am sure there is a record of the amount of eggs produced. This could be done, but I would think we would want to have a limit of $10,000 on it, otherwise it could be quite dangerous.

Of course, there is another recommendation by the Federation of Agriculture that people who were in the egg business for the last two years be granted a loan of $2 per hen, up to 20,000 birds, which could run up to $40,000 as a loan. There would be no interest on it for the first two years and then there would be five per cent interest to be paid off in six years.

This would, of course, help those who are in dire trouble right now, and some are in exceptionally bad condition financially. I think what we should have, probably, is both plans put in but modified. I think there is a way there that both of them should be put in, because really what we have done is that we have allowed the people of Ontario to buy eggs at what we would call depression prices while they were working and making an inflated price-wage scale. Well, I don't think a farmer should be forced to subsidize people who are working for $4.50 an hour, with many benefits being paid—and that's a general wage scale in Ontario—while a farmer is producing eggs for 19 to 20 cents and having them sold for 30 to 35 cents a dozen in the stores.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): They surely won't vote Liberal next time, after that. They want a national market.

Mr. Ruston: This can be fixed up by the Province of Ontario. The hon. member must remember the Province of Quebec already has taken action on this.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Ruston: So, you can't always blame it on to the other fellow, you know. Sometimes you have to grab hold of the bull, take hold of his horns and do it yourself. You can't always slough it off on the other fellow, you know.

Mr. Young: That is right. That is what you want.

Mr. Ruston: Corn production has, of course, been increasing all over Ontario and in other parts of Canada in the last year or two; the price of corn, as everybody is aware, is very low now.

It is an interesting thing to look at the price of corn in Manitoba. I had some information the other day from a farmer in Manitoba. In fact, I think he is a Progressive Conservative member in the federal House; he and his two sons have a large farm, so I have been told. They grew 350 acres of corn last year and produced 80 bushels to the acre. They dried the corn and delivered it 80 miles to the distillery and got $1.60 a bushel. Now, if a distillery in Manitoba can pay $1.60 a bushel for corn, I don't see why they can't pay it in Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: There is a New Democratic government in Manitoba.

Mr. Ruston: No, I am afraid the New Democratic government had nothing to do with the price of corn in Manitoba.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): If they did it would be lower.

Mr. Ruston: However, I think that this is something that involves, probably, a two-price system. Of course, the price of corn at $1.10 a bushel or at $1.60 a bushel doesn't make any difference to the price of the bottle of liquor that they are, in effect, turning out at the end of the line. I think too, it is the same thing with the price of a bushel of corn for the starch company or Kellogg's corn flakes, when you put out a 16-oz. box of corn flakes at 55 cents. If they pay $1.60 or $1.10 for corn, the price of the box of corn flakes is still the same, because most of its cost is in servicing and boxing and shipping and so forth.

Mr. Eaton: The member should get some of that federal freight assistance to move that corn east, too.

Mr. Ruston: There is a lot of corn throughout the country. Moving it isn't all the problem now.

Mr. Young: There is a lot of corn in the backbenches over there.

Mr. Ruston: I notice the member for Middlesex South is listening very intently and I am glad that he is. I enjoyed his speech the other day and maybe we can look forward to seeing him down here in the front rows before too long. Maybe he'll have some good points and maybe we can convince him over the next two or three years—and maybe he can convince someone else—to do some of these things that we are mentioning today.

I want to mention of a dairy farmer in our area who received the premier breeder's award for the Holstein Friesian Association. They have been in the purebred Holstein dairy business for 25 years and I think this is quite a feat in itself. This is a family farm, a father and two sons—Mr. Clifford Morris and his sons Jim and Jack.

Jack was a former president of the Junior Farmers of Ontario and has judged cattle in a number of areas in the province. I think he has judged—through appointments by the Minister of Agriculture—just recently in the Ridgetown Fair last year.

He has one other post he holds. He is a councillor in Tilbury West and he is also president of the Essex-Kent Liberal Association. Well, I mean that really sets him off in good standing, you know.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Eaton: The only thing against him.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I reckon.

Mr. Ruston: We hear a great deal about unemployment today and it is a serious problem in a lot of areas. It would take half an hour or an hour, I suppose, to discuss it intelligently and then, if we had six different economists and six different labour people and six different industry people talk to us about it we would all end up with a different answer after that hour.

However, I think there are some areas that we should be considering, and I think one is our educational system. I don't think we are training people to do the work that is available. I think we are educating them for work that maybe isn't available any more. We haven't changed our educational system to meet with our changing automation and trends of manufacturing.

Another thing, of course, that I often think about—and maybe I am a little more personally involved, having worked in immigration and customs for 10 years—I think of immigration as being at some time or other maybe to some extent a hazard to employment in a country. The United States, as you must remember, only two or three years ago put on pretty strict immigration rules because they were afraid of this happening to them; the employment situation, with the rising population and the rising work force. And they have pretty strict regulations that if you go into the United States to get a job, you must have a written job to go to or a signed agreement. In some cases even after six months, that agreement must be re-signed and the man must re-apply. In other words, the job could be taken by an American in some job positions.

Perhaps in the last two years or three that our country has let up or lightened up on the regulations of immigration, you will notice now you can come in as a visitor. You might stay for three months, which you are entitled to stay, or six months as a visitor—the normal time or the length of time that you can stay as a visitor is six months. Then you decide you are going to stay permanently. So then, of course, you apply for permanent residence and landed immigrants status and maybe the Immigration Department inquiry turned you down and you go

before an inquiry board; and really that's another immigration officer at a senior level who sits and assesses your application. And if he again says that you must go back to your country of origin, you can appeal that. Apparently from what I can gather, the appeals are now taking about two years before you can get a hearing.

In the meantime, the person stays in the country, he gets married, they may have children, so what can the appeal board do then when it has these cases come up to him: They have got a man probably born in another country who wasn't eligible to come into the country under the Immigration Act, according to the inquiry officer. He then is here. He has married a Canadian and he has a child. The child is born in Canada. So there you are, you almost have to let him stay or break up the family and send him back.

So it seems to me that we are going to have to change our immigration laws and go back to the idea that in order to gain admittance to the country as an immigrant, you must apply outside of the country for landed immigrant status. In that way, then, you protect your future jobs.

As you look over the immigration and labour book for the last year or two, I think there were about 45,000 people who came into Ontario last year in the labour force as immigrants and we have about 200,000 or 240,000 unemployment. I suppose about 100,000 of those 240,000 or 250,000 are what probably would be classed as unemployables to some degree. They may take seasonal work but not likely full-time work. I think we have a certain amount of that under even the best of conditions—we have people who move from area to area to work in seasonal work so they are unemployed probably a number of months of the year. So we are probably talking 150,000 jobs—150,000 people who are really unemployed because of lack of jobs in Ontario.

If we are taking 45,000 immigrants in a year, we are really only talking about three or four years of immigration to lift that up or allow that many people back in the work force—provided of course we train them for the type of work that many of our immigrants come in and do. Maybe this is really where we are falling down. I don't think we are stressing enough the work that industry and government need here and we should be doing that. In that way we probably could find much more work for the people of Ontario and Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said I would be brief. I wanted to mention one thing. I ran across just the other day. To me it is very important, and that's the rate of interest—and it was mentioned I think in the question period today about loan sharks charged by people who lend money to others for a few days or a few weeks because they are short. They have money coming in so they charge high interest rates. But you know there are other full-time companies that operate on a lending basis that I call highway robbery. General Motors Acceptance Corporation for example. I had a contract shown to me the other day for 22½ per cent, and that is on brand new merchandise. You know, 22½ per cent is an awfully high rate of interest. I think that this is an area all levels of government are going to have to take a look at really seriously. We know what happened two or three years ago when interest rates went really high for mortgage rates on homes and everything. It really is a serious situation. People can't build homes with high interest rates. An interest rate of 22½ per cent is really highway robbery and it is time that something was done.

We know that some of these contracts they take probably are high risk and, naturally, if you are in a high-risk lending agency you have to charge a little more interest than you do in a bank where they are pretty restricted. But heaven help us, they don't need that much!

I would mention an item or two with regard to the county board of education and since it is in the hands of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) here I think it is very pertinent right now. We have a director of education who was relieved of his duties by the county board of education. The board came down to Toronto before the previous minister (Mr. Welch) became a superminister. They came and met him and now he is a superminister. I guess he is so super he is not going to act on it. I guess the Minister of Education is going to have to take over. I don't know; he tells me he is not going to act on it because the director has filed a writ against the county board.

The thing about this legislation is it says that the director cannot be removed from his position without the approval of the Minister of Education. In the meantime, the director files a writ but is he really fired? If you read the Act one way it says he is not fired until it is approved by the minister and the minister did not approve it or he didn't reject it, so I don't know. It seems to me that we have one man here, a director of education, who

has kind of put a block in front of the Minister of Education, the superminister, and even the Premier (Mr. Davis) because he was a former Minister of Education. He was the one who brought this legislation in and now we have one man who has got them all stymied.

It would seem to me that they have got to bring in some new legislation pretty quickly and even make it retroactive to straighten up this mess because in no way can a board operate with one director of education staying home. I don't know if they are paying him or not. They have another one acting and the Minister of Education is here sitting on his fanny, not doing anything about it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Very good point, good point.

Mr. Paterson: School kids suffering at the same time.

Mr. Ruston: That is an interesting thing. The member for Essex South said about the school kids suffering. You know two years ago I got a notice, or my boy did which said: 'Dear Stephen, You will be going to the new Belle River public school in May." That was two years ago and they haven't even got the sod turned yet! It was signed by the director of education. He really knew what he was doing I guess. The board must have known what they did because they thought they had better get rid of him. Then they sent another letter last year that said he would be going in September but they still haven't got a sod turned.

Mr. Speaker, I think I had one more item I was going to mention a word or two about but I think I have used up enough time and I will carry on another time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Gaunt: No.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): The member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) is next.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes at this time to address the House and make some remarks on the Lieutenant Governor's Throne Speech.

No matter how many good things the Throne Speech contains I think each member feels there should and could have been more things that would have been beneficial to the riding which he or she represents, in my case the riding of Algoma-Manitoulin.

As the newly elected member for this riding, I feel it is my duty at this time to bring to the attention of the government some of the problems that confront the people of my riding and some possible solutions I feel would have a beneficial effect on the northern part of the province.

At this time I would be extremely remiss if I did not mention the very poor conditions of the roads and highways that run in and through my riding.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lane: Highway 17 from Sudbury to Sault Ste. Marie is fast becoming a death trap, with long lines of traffic, truck transport trailers, etc.—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the cabinet listening to this?

Mr. Lane: —sharing the same lanes as the passenger car traffic and not even a passing lane for many miles. It is small wonder that there are so many fatal acidents on this portion of the highway. It is a driver's nightmare to travel this road, especially during the months of July and August when there is much tourist traffic.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister listening?

Mr. Lane: Highway 540, the main highway in the district that runs the full length of Manitoulin Island, is a disgrace; I am sure that if this highway were located anywhere in southern Ontario it would not be classed as a road but just as a trail.

Many of the roads throughout the riding are being used each day to transport students to and from our schools. For the most part these roads have gravel tops, and in many cases there are sharp curves, corners, hidden intersections and dangerous hills. It seems to me it is only a matter of time, with so many school buses using this kind of road in all weather conditions and in some cases driving 75 to 100 miles per day, before serious accidents occur which could cause death or serious injury to many of our young people.

I urge the government to take action now that will provide the north with highways and roads that will compare in some measure at least with the roads in the southern parts of the province.

I realize that this kind of a miracle will not happen overnight and these problems cannot be corrected at once. However, I

would suggest that we set up a long-term programme that will continuously improve and upgrade our roads. And if we do this I am sure that many highway tragedies can be prevented and the economy of the northern part of the province will be greatly improved as we will then be in a position to attract industry into the area.

Mr. N. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I hope the member's colleague from Sault Ste. Marie is listening very attentively.

Mr. Martel: He is going to, too. I hope the cabinet starts to listen.

Mr. Lane: Another matter of great need in our area is housing for our senior citizens. The homes for the aged in our area—there is only one in my riding— are full to overflowing and have long waiting lists. I am sure that in order to provide proper accommodation for the pioneer people of our land, of whom we are so very proud, we would need at least one more home for the aged in the riding of Algoma-Manitoulin. In addition to this we would require many low-rental apartment units located in various small towns throughout the riding.

It is only fair that when our people reach the sunset years of life they can retire in their hometowns and take their proper place in the communities they helped to build. Only through the building of low-rental apartment units at various locations can this be made possible.

I feel I must also mention the great need for increases in grant structures to small towns and villages that have little if any industrial assessment to make it possible for them to install sewer and water services. Because of the lack of industry most of these small towns have a very low tax base; and again because of the lack of industry most of these towns have a very high percentage of elderly people living on fixed income.

Mr. Stokes: Very well said.

Mr. Martel: Does the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) hear that?

Mr. Lane: There is absolutely no way that these people can pay the high cost of the services that are required in these areas under the present grant structures.

Mr. Martel: Sock it to 'em!

Mr. Lane: Speaking about required services, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are many areas in my riding without fire protection, and recently there have been great losses through fires, and in some cases losses of life. The main reason there is no fire protection in many areas is that many of the townships are not organized, and for this reason there is no municipal council or governing body responsible for the service of these unorganized areas

I must continue to press the government, as did the former member for my riding, Stan Farquhar, for the development of an improvement district to take care of the large section of the riding now known as the North Shore district and which at present has no governing bodies.

I am sure that some of my colleagues in this House are saying by this time that if things are all that bad in the north, why do you stay there? However, if we are asking ourselves this question, I am sure that we already have the answer by merely asking another question, and that is: Why is Ontario one of the richest provinces in Canada? I'm sure we all agree that one of the main reasons is because of our great wealth of mineral and forest products from the north. Obviously people must live in the north, but why should they be penalized, in some cases many times over?

Mr. Martel: I hope the government is listening to that.

Mr. Lane: For an example, fuel oil to heat our homes costs approximately eight cents more per gallon in the north than it does in the Toronto area. Mother Nature has already provided a penalty, because homes in northern Ontario must be heated a couple of months extra each year than do the homes in the southern part of the province.

Mr. Stokes: This fellow is cabinet material, I can tell you!

Mr. Lane: Therefore, why should there be a second penalty of eight cents a gallon on oil that is used? Gasoline for our cars and trucks costs an average of 10 cents more per gallon in the north. In fact, on March 10, one could buy regular gas at a pump in Toronto for 43 cents, while in Sudbury it was 55 cents for the same grade of fuel.

Mr. Martel: They've been hearing that for a long time, over there; haven't they!

Mr. Stokes: They did it with beer; they could do it with gas.

Mr. Lane: Also, we have to drive much farther to get from point A to point B than

does your neighbour in the south. The food we use on our tables to feed our families costs more than it does in the heavily populated areas. As an example, on March 10, one could buy three dozen large Florida oranges in Toronto for $1; in Elliott Lake they cost $2.67. One could purchase three dozen Grade A Large eggs in Toronto for $1; in Elliott Lake they were $1.35. One 5 lb. bag of white sugar was 69 cents in Toronto and in Elliott Lake it was 79 cents. One 7¾ oz. tin of Red Robin sockeye salmon was 49 cents in Toronto, while in Elliott Lake is was 79 cents.

Mr. Martel: I hope they're listening over there.

Mr. Lane: One could buy two 10 oz. cans of Heinz Condensed Tomato Soup for 27 cents in Toronto; however, in Elliott Lake this costs 31 cents. We note that the 25 oz. can of St. Lawrence Corn Oil was 59 cents in Toronto, while in Elliott Lake it was 79 cents. And an 8 oz. jar of Instant Freeze-Dried Maxim Coffee was priced at $1.79 in Toronto against $2.05 in Elliott Lake. We also noted that White Swan paper towels in two-roll packages were 55 cents in Toronto and a comparable product was 71 cents in Elliott Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue along this line of comparison but I do not wish to bore my colleagues; I simply wish to make the point. I would suggest that there be an equalization of prices for the basic commodities across the province. I do not mean that we should take the competition out of trade, but I do feel that if the price of beer, for instance, can be equalized, so can the price of the more needful commodities.

I know that some of you will say that this penalty I talk about is in my imagination and that the north is not being short-changed, but I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that this is the truth. In fact, I would be so bold as to say that the members of this House from the northern part of the province have a great deal more personal expenses and hardships than do the members who live in the general area—and yet on payday our cheques are the same.

There is one industry that is a natural for my riding, and indeed for the entire northern part of the province, and that is the tourist industry. This potential has barely been tapped. Because, as you know, we have hundreds of beautiful lakes, thousands of miles of shoreline and thousands of acres of beautiful, scenic countryside. However, the development of this industry is very slow for many reasons; partly because tourist operators find it difficult to get sufficient financial assistance to enlarge and upgrade their establishments; and partly because tourists are reluctant to drive north because of the poor road conditions that I have described earlier.

In the case of Manitoulin Island one of the very damaging things to the tourist industry is the very outdated ferry service to the island. Many people have driven to the ferry only to find out they're on a waiting list that sometimes takes two to three days to clear up. So you can imagine what pleasure is left for a long weekend family trip. Also, there is no regular air service to my riding. And many people who own property in the area, or would purchase property there, are reluctant to do so because of the transportation problems involved in using it frequently.

Mr. Martel: The minister can't take it any more. He's got to leave.

Mr. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The former Minister of Northern Affairs can't take it.

Mr. Lane: What a great change there would be if we had daily air service to the airports at Gore Bay and Elliott Lake. Businessmen would be able to leave their families in their cottage all summer and commute on weekends by air. Another thing that is very detrimental to the tourist industry is the lack of official planning for the area and the bottleneck that now exists in the subdivision branch of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I would strongly urge the government to give greater assistance in this field so as to assist the north in the development of this great industry. I would also urge the government to acquire blocks of land at various locations throughout the north for future parkland and game preserves, so that future generations may enjoy some of the natural scenic beauty and the wildlife animals which it has been our privilege to enjoy. In many cases it is too late now to purchase some of the land that—

Mr. Stokes: It's not too late on Manitoulin Island.

Mr. Lane: —should have been acquired for park purposes, as it has already been bought by speculators and others. However, there is one large parcel on the western portion of Manitoulin Island, consisting of approximately 80,000 acres, that could and

should be purchased now while it is still available. I know that the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) was very interested in acquiring this property for the province, but there just never seemed to be any funds available.

There are also smaller acreages of good parkland near Whitefish Falls and Elliot Lake.

Mr. Martel: Sock it to 'em!

Mr. Lane: Surely there is a great responsibility on both the provincial and federal governments to ensure the future natural beauty of this province. I would suggest that this property be purchased through the ARDA programme on a cost-sharing basis between the governments of Ontario and Canada.

One of the best things to happen in the north during the past 25 years was the development of the Department of Northern Affairs. The two ministers who have been in charge of this department from the date of its inception have recognized the problems and have been dedicated to the development of the north. It seems a great pity that one of the Northern Affairs officers which has served the district of Manitoulin, which consists of approximately 7,000 white people and 4,000 Indians, has to be closed at the end of this month because of lack of funds.

Mr. Martel: They are closing the one in Nickel Belt, too.

Mr. Lane: It seems to me that this is a very short-sighted decision. The district of Manitoulin does not have Manpower centres, unemployment insurance offices or other central services outlets so this office is the only real medium the people of this district had to provide them with information and assistance regarding their various problems. I realize it is wise to curb spending and instigate control, but surely the approximately $20,000 per year it would take to continue to provide the services of this office for the people of Manitoulin Island would not greatly affect our total expenditures.

I realize this speech will not make me very popular with many members of this House and with many people in southern Ontario. Many people will ask me why I am criticizing a government of which I am a member. I would like to clarify this by saying that I am criticizing past governments of this province—

Mr. Stokes: A very positive approach though!

Mr. Lane: —but I have every confidence that the present government, of which I am very proud to be a member, will recognize the situation and will immediately work toward solving some of the problems that now face the people of northern Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should start by complimenting the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) for drawing more applause from my caucus than from the hon. members opposite.

I would just like to say, as a new boy in the House to begin with, that I believe it is customary to give my compliments to the Speaker. I haven't had the pleasure of working with you before but certainly if you continue to live up to the reputation with which you took the office you now hold in this Legislature—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Well deserved!

Mr. Cassidy: Well deserved. I don't think that I'll be disappointed.

Also, as a new boy, it is very difficult for me to follow on the habit of some of those who have spoken in this debate, and the custom in this Legislature of those who have been in the Legislature for some time; that is, commenting on the strengths and more particularly on the weaknesses of certain members of the ministry. Not having had the pleasure or otherwise of being in contact with them in the Legislature before, I really can't say very much about that.

I do feel, though, Mr. Speaker, that by coincidence I have had the experience of working with one of the new members of the quasi-ministry in this House, in this Legislature—also a new member like myself, the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). He and I have been colleagues together on the Ottawa city council for some time, and I feel it is my duty to bring to the attention of members of the cabinet some of the background of the new member because I think there are a few things that maybe would concern or at least interest them.

Of course, although he is a new boy the member has certain advantages that I lack.

He has been made a parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough). I would, in fact, like to congratulate him on that appointment if I knew what, in fact, it entails. However, accepting the post, I think, has been a bit of a trial for the member because he expected and felt he deserved more.

He is a man of tact and he has never actually said that he had been promised the position by the Premier (Mr. Davis) but, you know how politics are! Certainly with the shrug and every gesture, every flutter of the eyes and so on, the member, while he was a candidate, indicated what he expected. At one time he said: "Bill Davis promised that the Ottawa area should have two cabinet ministers and Bert Lawrence is one"; with an obvious inference of course, of who would be the other one.

The member for Ottawa South in fact, came here wearing a corporal's rucksack but I think members of the government should be aware than inside that rucksack, in fact, was a Premier's baton. He was bold enough to point out in a radio interview shortly before the election that Ontario's Conservative premiers normally occupy their office for about eight to ten years. You can see the pattern with Mr. Drew and Mr. Frost and Mr. Robarts. The member for Ottawa South foresaw that the same thing would happen with the present Premier.

He also foresaw, I think quite rashly, that the Conservative government would still be in office in eight years' time. And he was very sanguine. He expected that he personally would be ready, willing, and in fact, would occupy the second chair from the aisle on that side in about eight years' time when the hon. Premier steps down.

So I think the members should be aware of this ambition and those backbenchers who felt disappointed at the appointments to the cabinet and the parliamentary assistantships should realize the kind of over-vaunting ambition that is facing them.

There are trials in politics and we have had some recounting of the kinds of trials that the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), for example, had during his campaign. In the Ottawa area, in fact, apart from the few that I had myself on election night, the trials of politics really come after the election, rather than before. They seem to have concentrated on the mayor of Ottawa, who happens to be a Liberal, and on the member for Ottawa South, who is senior controller in the city and happens to be a Conservative.

As members may know, the member promised to resign his position on city council, but then he found a number of reasons to hang on. And one of the unspoken reasons was the fact that the mayor, it became apparent, was being promised his political reward for faithful service to the Liberal Party in the form of a provincial court judgeship, or some kind of judgeship within the Ottawa area. I don't quite understand the patronage there but I know it exists. Well, the minuet of controllers and aldermen and so on waiting to see who would get appointed to the board of control and waiting to see whether or not the mayor would take the job was bad enough without seeing the hon. member for Ottawa South hanging on in order to see which way the wind would blow and which way he personally would jump.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Like humpty-dumpty.

Mr. Cassidy: Now, I'm not privy to the discussions between the Premier and the members in his party, however there are reports that the member for Ottawa South sort of put it to the Premier, like this, and suggested that he would take his marbles back to Ottawa unless there was something done about those nods and winks and shrugs that were made before the campaign. Otherwise, he would go back to Ottawa, become mayor, vacate his seat, and let the NDP win a by-election in Ottawa South. And the explanations, I'd suggest, fit rather better than the explanations that there were really serious things that the member wished to do at Ottawa city hall. They said he wanted to tidy up a few things. It's the longest tidying-up job, I think, in the history of Ontario politics.

I think perhaps the taciturnity of the minister, of the parliamentary assistant, can be explained by these temptations that were put in his place while he was waiting to see what would happen in the Ottawa area. In fact I have searched the press clippings file in vain to find him saying anything of substance since the election.

One or two members may recall that in the December session he was on his feet once with a refrain which had grown very familiar in the Ottawa area. In Ottawa, it's the habit of politics, of which the hon. member was not averse to joining in to suggest whenever a problem arises that the answer is to get the federal government to pay for it. And, lo and behold, in December there he was in this House in his maiden—it was the first time he spoke in this Legislature—suggesting it was about time that Ontario discontinued

entirely its payments to judges and that the federal government should pick up the tab.

He did suggest to a meeting on Parliament Hill for Conservative workers looking to the federal election, that they shoudn't overlook pregnant women and that pregnant women were very valuable workers in an election campaign. He also had the tact to suggest in Sudbury, where I believe he was present in his responsibilities with the Treasurer, that the Conservatives should have wooed the ethnic vote in Sudbury. This was to a meeting composed mainly of Anglo-Saxons, according to the Sudbury Star. I am sure the other members for Sudbury could have informed the hon. member for Ottawa South that it wasn't just because the Conservatives didn't woo the ethnic vote in Sudbury that they lost those three seats to the NDP; that there were some much more fundamental problems, not to speak of the tact of telling the party that has lost and is composed of Anglo-Saxons that it really should have gone after the ethnic vote.

That really brings me to one of the promises made in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker. That was the promise of the government to outlaw the holding of more than one elected office. I am afraid that several members on the government side and perhaps, particularly, the member for Otawa South, have been an embarrassment to their party and to the government in this regard.

As one who must be in the same place as the hon. member for Ottawa South, I really found it very hard to see him. He did say that one of his reasons for tidying up at the local level in Ottawa was to look after the budgets. A week and a half ago we had a budget in Ottawa, a capital budget session, and the member for Ottawa South came in, put his papers down on his desk and disappeared. We haven't seen him since. I was glad to see him in this House today, but sorry he is missing the regional executive meeting.

P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It must have been a Tory budget.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, that's right, it was rather. I was sorry to see him at a Tory nomination meeting in Ottawa last Wednesday because I had spent four hours at a regional council meeting—the one regional council meeting held every month in the Ottawa area—and the member for Ottawa South had not been present. He had found time to go to a nomination meeting that began only 10 minutes later

The Premier wants to outlaw the holding of more than two elected jobs and, in fact, you know, it is rather shameful. I am sorry I can't comment on the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle) or on the member for Don Mills area—I guess it is the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell). However, in this particular case there really is a severe question about just how much a man is worth to the Ontario public.

According to this Legislature, the Premier, I believe, is worth $39,000 a year to the Ontario public. While I am sure I will have, and I certainly have had, disagreements with the Premier, I think one can conclude that he is probably worth it. However, the member for Ottawa South happens to have six jobs to which he has been elected by the public—six, if you count them—or to which he has been appointed as a consequence of election.

One of them, of course, is his position in this Legislature. Another one is the recently acquired $5,000-a-year job as a parliamentary assistant to do we know not what. Then, he is a member of the Ottawa board of control and of Ottawa city council, a post to which he was elected by the people of Ottawa. He is a member of Ottawa regional council, to which he was elected by the people of Ottawa; and a member of the Ottawa regional executive—not to count selling a bit of insurance on the side.

Mr. Lawlor: I hope he doesn't make more than the Premier.

Mr. Cassidy: He does! Not only that, he makes about $46,500 a year.

Mr Lawlor: I am sure he can't be worth that much.

Mr. Cassidy: Which almost puts to shame the ranks of the corporate directors who support the Conservative Party, you know. And not only that, but a third of it or a third of most of it is tax free. In other words, it is the equivalent, if taxed, of about $60,000 a year. It really is quite incredible.

Mr. Lawlor: Is he as good to the public as they are to him?

Mr. Cassidy: Well I don't know; time will tell about that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Now Mr. Speaker, I happen to be in the same position, in fact, in the sense—not quite in the same position, no! I slipped on that one!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The similarity, Mr. Speaker—I have talked enough about the differences—the similarity—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: He is not a parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Cassidy: No, I am not a parliamentary assistant. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a full-time job in this House as a parliamentary assistant, but, as a member, which ought to occupy all of my 50 or 60 hours a week, and a full-time job back in Ottawa.

As it happens I had a full-time job in Ottawa prior to being elected to this House and I had a part-time job as a representative in the Ottawa city council, a job which I said during the campaign, where it was an issue, that I would hang onto until I could be assured that my successor would be democratically elected. I continue to have a full-time job—it happens to be here now—and to do the other part-time.

Frankly I don't like it particularly, but I am staying on in these two jobs until we can make it clear to the government that when they bring in legislation to outlaw the holding of two elected offices, they should make the other fundamental reform that is needed, which is to ensure that vacancies on municipal councils are not filled in the autocratic and undemocratic fashion in which they are forced to be filled right now by the Municipal Act—that is, by appointment of people already on the council.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Members are aware of my politics. I think if you want to take a personal example, it is quite clear that not only is the system undemocratic that exists in every part of the province, except the city of Toronto—and I hope the member for Beaches-Woodbine is taking note of this, because by-elections do exist in Toronto—not only is the system undemocratic, but it also ensures that when any member of the municipal council dies or has to resign for one purpose or another, if he does not happen to be part of the club that governs most municipalities in the province, a voice like his is not going to be put in his place by the clubby, close establishment that governs most of our cities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the government ensure that the sense of democracy be maintained when vacancies are filled, including vacancies that are filled by elimination of two separate offices, of two elected offices.

I would like to make another couple of comments, though. One is, I think that the government should not strictly parallel the present legislation that insists that a federal MP who wishes to run for the provincial Legislature must resign his federal seat in order to be actually nominated to the provincial seat.

This applied in the case of the member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens). I am not suggesting that that be changed, because it is obviously a pretty important decision to be taken if one wishes to switch from the federal to the provincial level or vice versa. However, I think the governmnt should bear in mind a couple of things about municipal office.

In the first place, for many people, it is a part-time kind of thing. It is something they do out of love as well as out of wish for remuneration. In the second place, there are many people at the municipal level who, I would suggest, would feel very different about running for provincial office, for the provincial Legislature, if it meant that they had to get off their local council.

In fact, you could see a decimation of local councils in a provincial election if local aldermen and controllers ran. Alternatively, you could see the provincial Legislature denied the talent that it ought to have available if municipal people said: "Look, the stakes are too high. I have been in municipal government for 10 years. I want to keep on, but I would like to have a crack at the provincial House. I am quite willing to quit—and I think I ought to quit once the election is over if I win—but is it really worth my while to take that risk of losing or, in fact, even to take a certain risk of losing?"—as it might happen with certain members of the party to my right, and occasionally of our party and even occasionally the party opposite.

How can one expect a municipal councillor to take a certain risk in a losing a seat where he wished to show the flag for his party, for example, if he knew that his involvement in municipal affairs were to come to an abrupt and certain end? What about the reaction in municipal councils which would then be faced, not with the occasional by-election as I have suggested, but with an

incessant series of by-elections after every provincial election?

I think, too, we should recognize the role of municipal government in terms of forming and training citizens in the practice of politics and the art and practice of legislation. I think we should be aware, too, of its role as a training ground, particularly for people who are not naturally in a position which suits them for politics. I am suggesting that in the past there has been a tradition, for example, that lawyers and certain kinds of businessmen are more easily in a position to get into politics than people who work for a wage and who cannot make their name known as easily over the area of a riding.

Municipal government provides that access into the political stream as well as the training. Should the government follow the example of legislation that forces a federal MP to resign his seat before he presents himself as a candidate provincially, then it would be cutting off a very valuable flow of talent and making this Legislature less accessible to people who don't have the advantages of education or high income—such as a number of people who are already in the House.

I think that the government should be consistent as well. It said in the Throne Speech that it doesn't want people to hold more than one elective office. We have just seen an example, and I give it to you as an example of a member who holds two or three elected offices, plus a number of other appointed offices, or selected offices, that flow out of that initial election—two at this level of government, four or five at that level of government.

Now, here in this House we have a very strange situation, in that people who are elected to represent voters in this Legislature and who sit on the Tory backbenches, in fact, come along and we find that they hold all sorts of other jobs within the hierarchy of provincial commissions, boards and this sort of thing—appointments which the government has at its disposal.

I recalled something that had come up in the Globe a year or so ago, so I did some checking just to find out. The member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans), for example, has succeeded Mr. Boyer as a vice-chairman of Ontario Hydro. I believe the job is worth $10,000 a year. It is certainly important enough that the member now lists his mailing address as the Ontario Hydro office on University Ave.

There is the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) who, despite being a man of the cloth, is a board member of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario, a $7,000-a-year job. At least, that was the pay at last report; it may very well have gone up. I am certain it will not have gone down in the last couple of years.

The member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) receives $5,000 a year and is still chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission. The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) is a member of the Ontario Hospital Services Commission—a nice, cushy sideline that pays $6,000 a year.

Mr. Deans: More than a heck of a lot of people earn!

Mr. Cassidy: That is right, yes. In fact, more than most of the people who are voters and electors in my riding or the member for Wentworth's riding actually earn.

The member for Hastings (Mr. Rollins) has taken over from the present Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) as chairman of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, a job which pays a rather curious salary of $4,960 a year. And the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) is the chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and gets $10,000 a year.

Mr. Deans: That's just expenses.

Mr. Cassidy: Is that expenses? In other words, it is tax-free. It looks like income to the people outside and it looks like an unbearable kind of irresponsibility for a government which is saying that people should not hold more than one elected office and which is giving as its reasons just what it is improper—not that it presents a conflict of interest, but just that it is improper.

There's just one word on my list: The member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil) is a member of the Crop Insurance Commission, a job that pays $60 a day.

Mr. Deans: Tell us about the OWRC.

Mr. Cassidy: The member for Wellington-Dufferin—

Mr. Deans: Tell us the official figure.

Mr. Cassidy: The figure I have is $10,000; maybe that is just expenses and there is a salary on top of it.

Mr. Deans: Ten thousand dollars?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, that's right. I hope the Hansard reporters have got that straight.

I have not been able to check on the member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar)—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That is only the top of the table; let's see what's under the table.

Mr. Deans: I think it is up to $16,000.

Mr. Cassidy: Is it up to $16,000.

Mr. Cassidy: Is it up to $16,000 now?

Well, it doesn't matter whether it is $10,000 or $16,000, it is still—I've got to choose my words carefully here—

Mr. Deans: It is still 10 to 16 times what he is worth.

Mr. Cassidy: I've got to choose my words carefully, because I am tempted to use language which is unparliamentary in this chamber, but it is an awful lot more than most people in this province are earning.

Mr. Deans: What does the member do for that money? Tell us really.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member could find a convenient spot to break his remarks in view of the hour.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, I think that I might adjourn now, Mr. Speaker.

I just really ask, how in the name of God can a government that is seeking to stop people holding more than one elected office defend this practice, this kind of cheap and blatant patronage to its own backbenchers?

I think it's indefensible, Mr. Speaker, and I would strongly urge the government leader opposite and the other members of the government to make sure, when the legislation comes in to stop the holding of more than one elected office, that it also prevent backbenchers on that side from holding various kinds of jobs which could and should and ought to be filled from outside, if they want, by some honest patronage and not the kind—

Mr. Deans: Not by Ward Cornell.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right—not by Ward Cornell.

I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: No motion is necessary when we are recessing over the supper hour.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 13, 1972

Provincial responsibility in payment of family allowances, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 280

Arrest of U of T students by Metro Toronto police, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon 281

Access to Robarts Library, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Lewis 281

Exclusion of Uxbridge Township from pits and quarries regulations, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 282

Report on conduct of election, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 282

Alleged rescinding of compensation board penalties, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis .. 283

Dismissal of doctor from addiction foundation, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Leluk 283

Report on conduct of election, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 283

Land acquisition in the Bruce Peninsula, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Sargent 284

Solitary confinement of Don Jail inmate, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Lawlor 284

Facilities for handicapped in Bronte Creek park, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Good 285

Draegermeter tests at Falconbridge Nickel, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Martel 285

Alleged rescinding of compensation board penalties, statement by Mr. Guindon 285

Alleged rescinding of compensation board penalties, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Martel, Mr. Reid 287

Investigation of strike-breaking firms—licence applications, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bounsall 289

Payment plan for nursing homes, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deacon 289

Meeting on environment with mayor of Hamilton, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 290

Lunch hours at LCOB store, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 290

Guaranteed annual income—pilot programme, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. B. Newman 290

Title to lands in Metro Centre, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Cassidy 291

Loans to unemployed—cracking down on loan sharks, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Drea 291

Conditions at old city hall court, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Sargent, Mr. Singer 291

Wright report on education in northwest, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Foulds 292

Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Leluk, first reading 794

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne: Mr. Shulman, Mr. Edighoffer, Mr. Clement, Mr. Young, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Lane, Mr. Cassidy 295

Recess, 6 o'clock 324



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 10

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 13, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: When we rose at 6 o'clock I believe the hon. member for Ottawa South—that is, Ottawa Centre had the floor. He may continue.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Given the comments I made about the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) I would prefer to be known by my own riding, Mr. Speaker.

I do wish to start out this evening's session with a small apology, if you will, for misleading the House. I assure you it was not deliberate, but members of my own party and the Leader of the Opposition did point out to me that I had made a rather grievous mistake in reference to the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), who unfortunately is not in the House right now. I had the temerity to suggest that he was only earning $10,000 a year in his job as chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and in fact the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) drew my attention to the fact that in 1970-1971 the member for Wellington-Dufferin drew $16,500 as vice-chairman of OWRC.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): I didn't think the Leader of the Opposition would be an informer for the NDP.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Researcher.

Mr. Cassidy: This is simply a friendly gesture between parties. Mr. Nixon is very helpful to me as a new guy around here and I want to give him credit. My own members drew attention to this too.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I can understand that.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): When I redistributed the seats we got rid of his riding this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: May I remind the hon. member that he should refer to the other members as hon. members and not by name.

Mr. Cassidy: I am sorry.

Regarding the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin, not only did I mislead the House about his former salary but even more so I think I misled the House about his present salary which, if he is getting as much as the chairman got in 1970-1971, amounts to $36,442 in addition to his $18,000 stipend as a member of this Legislature.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What does he do for it?

Mr. Cassidy: I don't know.

Mr. Deans: What does he earn?

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I suppose he inspects wells, and maybe he drinks water from various parts of the province and things like that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I bet he agitates that sludge too.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There's enough of it around here to agitate, I might say.

Mr. Deans: Is it true that the member inspects wells for $36,000 a year?

Mr. Cassidy: For $54,000, of which $6,000 or $7,000 is tax-free, and not counting the various perquisites—I'm sure he has a limousine and a few other things like that in order that he can get to those wells in an expeditious and efficient sort of manner. Anyway, I am sorry to have misled the House about the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We know how sorry the member is.

Mr. Deans: This is his maiden speech now; help him out.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin on a point of order.

Mr. Root: Did I hear the member say that I took $36,000 out of OWRC? That is a complete distortion of facts.

Mr. Cassidy: I said the previous chairman was getting $36,442 in 1970-1971, and I assumed the hon. member was at least drawing as much, if not more, for his contribution.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): He is not worth that much.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the member mean to say they cut the salary when they gave him the job?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps I could continue, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member can solve this conflict of time and energy and so on simply by resigning his job on the Ontario Water Resources Commission. Certainly we would be prepared to accept it on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the very least the government should do is to do some honest patronage, and what they should do, and could do in fact, is to find the very best man who is qualified for that very important job rather than give it out on a patronage basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to my riding of Ottawa Centre. I believe it is the tradition in this House and in other chambers of Parliament, particularly in a maiden speech, to talk about the verdant vistas and the marvellous aspects and the marvellous benefits that the government has brought to the riding and this sort of thing.

I would love to follow on with that tradition, but I really find that is very difficult. In fact, it is impossible, given the kinds of problems that exist in my riding. Rather than praise, I really want to weep over it, Mr. Speaker—weep over some of the things that the government has either done or has failed to do in relation to the people of my riding of Ottawa Centre. It is a downtown riding, an inner city riding with a combination of highrise dwellers and mainly working class people. It's certainly obvious to me that the problems that the government has ignored were too great for the people of my riding to succumb to the wiles of the big blue machine and to put in yet another Tory backbencher.

You know that leaflet that went out, the Premier's leaflet, in which "Bill Davis Listens to People", and he stands on the beach like Robert F. Kennedy and that kind of thing? There wasn't a single photograph in that book—

An hon. member: A misquote!

Mr. Cassidy: —with which the people in Ottawa Centre could identify. Maybe that is the problem. I offer it to the government as a suggestion for the next time.

I would like to give one example. About a month and a half ago, a group of 15 tenants living in a row of 10 houses on Laurier Ave. near the heart of my riding were told by their landlord that their rent was increasing and the rent was increased from $150 a month to $225 a month.

An hon. member: And this government has refused rent controls!

Mr. Cassidy: This government has refused rent control, that is right! These were three and five-bedroom houses. The people had been living there in many cases for 10 and 15 years. They were working-class people on moderate incomes; in one or two cases they were people on welfare. They simply couldn't afford the kinds of rents that the landlord, or the new landlords, were asking.

It sort of points up a problem, I guess, about the Conservative government's friends. The people who had owned the property previously were businessmen but they were gentlemen, if you will; the rents had been rising occasionally but they were gentlemen about it. Unfortunately, some speculators took over the property and, imbued by some of the examples they had seen under a Tory government in the province, they decided they would make a great deal of money very quickly. One of the ways they did it was by trying to raise the rent by 50 per cent.

I wrote to the Provincial Secretary for Justice—I sent him a telegram, in fact—urging very seriously that the government consider some kind of programme of rent regulation which would give at least some bargaining power to tenants who were cast in the kind of situation that these tenants were put into. I may as well say that in Ottawa $225 is an outrageous kind of rent for that kind of accommodation.

It was accommodation, incidentally, which when inspected by the minimum standards inspectors for the city of Ottawa was found to have literally hundreds of defects which had to be corrected. The minister replied and I would like the letter to go on the record. He was in Australia when I sent him the telegram, unfortunately. I believe he was

looking into questions of offtrack betting which was not exactly the most central thing to my people. He said:

> As you know the whole question of rent, price and wage control as economic tools has been examined and discussed by both our government and the federal government in Ottawa. The imposition of rent control in isolation would not appear to be a practical economic step. Some form of across-the-board restriction would have to be imposed to require controls to work effectively. In any event—there is quite a damaging admission here as a matter of fact—it is not the philosophy of our government to radically alter the limited private enterprise system existing in Ontario.

Limited private enterprise—it's really quite an admission on the part of the government over there.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Yes, it is really throwing in the sponge!

Mr. Cassidy: To continue:

> We feel, and experience has supported the theory, that it is the most effective method—

Mr. Lawlor: He thinks it is important.

Mr. Cassidy: To continue:

> —of achieving the highest degree of prosperity for Ontario citizens.

That is, to keep the limited free enterprise system we have in the province right now.

Then Mr. Lawrence, weeping crocodile tears, goes on:

> I wholeheartedly sympathize with the unfortunate tenants mentioned in your telegram but I do feel that the efforts of yourself, the local Ottawa press, and the others who have expressed deep concern and interest in the well-being of the tenants would be better employed in a sincere attempt to find alternate accommodation for these people, or to intercede in the negotiations between the landlords and these tenants. I do feel that the remarks made by the press and yourself are inflammatory, and are intended to be so, and really do not serve the ends of the tenants and their predicament.

So what the minister is suggesting and that all he could offer is that I or the press go cap in hand to the landlords, who are bent on their rent increase, and say, "Please, sirs, don't do it. Be nice, won't you?"

I totally reject the suggestion that all that we on this side should try to do is alleviate the tremendous social problems that are created by the government over there. I also reject the idea that rent control is linked to a complete set of controls. That is a false view which is put forward by the government in order to defend its lack of action.

I would point out that the government itself—I think it was the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough)—three years ago, in response to private legislation by the city of Ottawa to bring in a system of rent control in that city, said, "No, boys, not now. Let's wait and see how the Landlord and Tenant Act is working."

Anybody who has any experience in this knows that the Landlord and Tenant Act has only civilized, basically, a jungle-like relationship between landlords and tenants. The only thing it has done for tenants is to ensure that when they're kicked out they're given a full month's notice rather than being pushed on to the street with their furniture behind them. It has certainly not given them any additional bargaining power, or any means of counteracting the tremendous power of landlords.

I'd also point to the fact—and I think the government could take note of this; maybe the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) should take note of this for his colleagues—that a system of rent control or rent regulation has been in force under a government which is equally strong in its adherence to the system of limited free enterprise, that is, under the government of the Province of Quebec. It has been in force since 1953. Moreover, the government of Mr. Bourassa, who is certainly rather less left-leaning and progressive than some of his predecessors in that office, has, in fact, extended the Quebec system of rent control to all dwellings built up until three years ago, whereas previously it only applied to older dwellings more than about 18 or 20 years old.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the system of rent regulations which they have in Quebec works. Anyone who knows the rental situation in Montreal, for example—a city just as large as Toronto and a city which has had just as rapid growth as the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto or as Ottawa—knows that the level of rents in Montreal is 30, 40 or 50 per cent lower than it is in the city of Toronto or in the city of Ottawa. A great deal of that has got to go down to the fact that the Quebec government didn't get hung up over some ideology

about free enterprise and moved in in order to protect the tenants for whom it was responsible.

The minister's reply, I think, is typical of the kind of replies that one gets from this government. The idea that the government should be judged only on some standard of contributing to the prosperity of the majority and ignoring those millions of Ontarians who are, in fact, poor, who are oppressed, as tenants, just is unacceptable, Mr. Speaker

I believe that this society in Ontario will be judged as much on what it does for the disadvantaged in Ontario as for what it does for the prosperous. I hope that the government takes that lesson to heart.

I think that the government ought to take unto itself—and certainly an NDP government would—not just a responsibility for narrow legislation affecting landlords and tenants and not just legislation for public housing in the sense of what it can build under the Ontario Housing Corporation, but, in fact, it should accept the idea and the policy that decent housing is a right for every resident of the province of Ontario. As a government, it should be responsible for taking an overview, for taking a view of all housing problems and not just those in a very limited sector.

Up in Ottawa—I can tell you how bad it is. In Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, we have a list of close to 3,000 families who are looking for family accommodation under the Ontario Housing Corporation. At present there are no new projects in sight, because the appeal to private builders in order to build has not yet been successful. Many of the people are on that list, Mr. Speaker, because of policies affecting housing which have made it impossible for them to afford housing in the private market.

I suppose there's a footnote one might add —that the Ottawa Housing Authority is refusing to recognize any kind of a union among its employees and that they just happen to be paid at $1,000 to $1,500 less than people doing comparable jobs in the Ontario Housing Corp.—and with no pensions and no fringe benefits.

There was a survey done the other day into housing in the Ottawa area, Mr. Speaker. They tried to decide just how many of the 95 houses which were advertised in the two local papers—the three local papers—would, in fact, be accessible to a man, a civil servant say, with his family, earning $6,000 or $7,000 a year.

The sum total was that there were all of two houses in the downtown area renting for less than $200 a month and there were six houses in the suburban areas renting for less than $200 a month. There was nothing at all for large families and the average rent—which doesn't include heat or hydro in the Ottawa area—for the houses that were advertised, was $230 a month.

If you accept the idea—and I am sure the government does in theory—that housing should cost no more than 25 per cent of income, Mr. Speaker, that means in order to afford the average rent for the houses that are offered in Ottawa today, you should have an income of approximately $11,500 a year. And people just don't have that kind of income.

That is one example, Mr. Speaker. The Throne Speech really, as a whole, has very very little to offer. All it promises in housing is a re-evaluation of its role and responsibility with regard to the Ontario housing industry. It will try and encourage housing construction so that more homes are available to more people at the lowest possible cost. Just how vague can a promise get?

The kind of re-evaluation that is promised, it seems to me, is going to take months if not years to complete and in the meantime the housing crisis in urban areas in the province, which I have tried to illustrate from our situation in Ottawa, will simply continue to deepen.

There is no word in the Throne Speech about any change in the legislation affecting tenants. There is no word in the Throne Speech about that $10 million programme that the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) was meant to bring in and that the Premier offered just before the election, which was designed to ensure at least that we would keep some of the older housing we had by rehabilitating it. It was an election promise that got ditched right after the election and you may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we tried and were totally unsuccessful in prying it out of the government during the session of the House in December.

Perhaps I could take another example. No, there is something else here on housing. The average price of houses in Ottawa, $29,640 in 1971, according to a survey by A. E. LePage the realtors; $31,000 in Toronto; $24,000 in Hamilton. And the only place where it is reasonable, curiously enough, is in that heartland of Toryism, really right in the heart of the blue belt, down in London—$19,856 is the average price of a house there.

Maybe it is the fact that the problem isn't

pinching the Tories in their own backyard that is keeping them from acting on the very serious housing problem we have in the province right now.

Perhaps, another example of the pious promises with little action that we have seen in the Throne Speech is in education.

In the Throne Speech we have what I consider to be a very great and challenging opportunity which the government is totally failing to grasp. Right now because of the pill and declines in family size and so on, we happen to be in the curious position for the first time in 25 years of having declining school enrolments at the elementary level.

We also happen to be in the position—thanks to, among other things, some planning, or lack of planning, of the Conservative government—we also happen to be in the position of having a surplus of teachers. We happen to have a surplus of school space at the elementary level as well. In other words, the resources exist to really upgrade the quality of elementary education throughout the province but the government, far from exploiting that opportunity, is turning its back on it.

In Ottawa the per capita grant level of spending per pupil is to rise by 10 next year—in the coming year—and it will decrease by $15 in the subsequent year. In other words, over a period of three years education spending at the primary level is frozen in the Ottawa area.

And this is true in many other parts of the province as well. I picked up some clippings—I don't have them all here. In London it is true though; and London is encountering very much the same situation. I am aware of the fact that the spending per pupil in London and Ottawa happens to be higher than many other parts of the province, but this is not an excuse to cut it back in these particular cities.

What we should be doing, of course, is putting new resources into the cities that have been disadvantaged in terms of education. But, in fact, if you read through and talk to members in this caucus, you'll find that in Sudbury and places like that, the education cuts are hitting just as bad.

What concerns me particularly—I don't want to steal too much thunder from our education critic on this—is the additional fact that the opportunity to level up the quality between elementary and secondary education is being totally lost. Just totally lost.

There have been suggestions to me that the reason for that is that the government doesn't want to encourage the separate schools at grades 9 and 10. I am sure that that is an ungracious suggestion and that it isn't worthy of the government, and I certainly don't hope that's true.

In the Throne Speech the government stated that it wishes to encourage the community use of schools. But the cuts that are going on are being interpreted by the school boards—or rather, school boards are taking the attitude that they should try to cut in non-educational areas wherever possible. And more power to them, I think that is what they should do.

So, right now, what are they cutting? They are cutting some supervisory people; they are cutting supplies, which I deplore; they are cutting into the janitors. Now, it is very simple. If you want the schools open in the evenings so that the community can use the schools, you've got to have a janitor there to keep the place open and to lock up when they go and to clean up.

In the Ottawa area they are cutting down from one janitor per school in the evenings, which encourages community use, to one janitor for every four schools. In other words, the community will only have one-quarter of the access to the schools that it had before.

It is a small thing, but it is certainly an example of the way the government promises much and delivers little—or, in fact may, by what it does, be actively working against its pious intentions.

The Premier said the other day, resources would be found in order to encourage communities to use the schools without it coming out of school budgets. Very nice! Fine! But people are asking for this kind of integration right now.

Local governments are already in a financial bind and it is going to get worse and if the government intends to give local governments more money to help them pay for the schools, it is simply going to be waiting for two or three years to do something they could do perfectly easily right now by ensuring that there were adequate resources for the school boards.

Let me give another example. One might consider it small; I don't think it is. During the election the government came up with a dramatic plan to encourage daycare with $10 million in construction. I have had a look through some of the files because I was aware of the problems that this scheme was producing in the Ottawa area where local government is finding it very difficult, if not impossible to meet the deadlines.

All right, in Sarnia, the earliest start of construction on their daycare centre can only be April 1 in a programme where the full provincial funding runs out at the end of May.

In Oshawa, council has asked the province to change the deadline because they can't hack it by the May 31 deadline.

In Kitchener, they have only just, late in February, approved the site and building plans for their centre.

In Ottawa, I can give a very graphic example of how a local group, which took the government in earnest in its promises, has been sadly disillusioned. This was a project for a daycare centre in the township of Gloucester, which is a suburban area—a rapidly developing suburban area on the outskirts of Ottawa.

The township moved fairly quickly. By Christmas it had moved a resolution to purchase land, and by the end of the year it had sent information about the site to the regional director of the Department of Social and Family Services. In mid January the community people involved in this project had picked one of the three plans that was sent out by the provincial department in order to save local groups time. They picked concept three and they said: "Look, this is the nicest. This one we like the best, so would you please send us the working drawings so we can get the contract out and ready to go ahead." That was on January 12. On January 13 they got a Telex back from the department saying: "We are awfully sorry but the working drawings for concept three never existed, so you'll have to do it on your own."

This was a month of investment in terms of time, because had they known that they had to design their own centre they would have started in December. Then they started to meet with architects and began to run into some problems, particularly when they were told late in January that according to regulations published in the Ontario Gazette late in December their building would have to meet the building code for the handicapped. They found this very curious, in view of the fact that they were planning to put pre-schoolers and infants into their daycare centre and had no intention of using it for the handicapped.

An additional request that they have space for an after-four programme in the centre was rejected by the province. They made another request, which again was a very simple, straightforward and sensible request; they said: "Why build a daycare centre without a basement, when we could build a basement and have certain community centre facilities there as well?" And at the end of January the council, which was very co-operative, agreed. It agreed to put up $20,000 in order to put in a community centre. But the province said: "We're awfully sorry but Gloucester township is going to have to pay pro-rata." In other words, it would have to pay the same amount of dollars per square foot of basement space added to the building—in other words half the cost —as the province was going to pay for the rest of the building. Instead of the province putting in about $120,000, the provincial share would drop to $80,000 and the local people would have to put up about $60,000 or $70,000, which was far beyond their means.

As a consequence, a very sensible idea of putting a community centre facility in the basement of this building had to go by the board. Now I don't know if it is the view of the provincial government that basement floor space is equal in value to floor space at ground level. If it is I would be happy to find them lots of space to rent and I'll rent them at ground floor prices. I'll rent basements in Ottawa for them and we can do a bit of business, unless it's a conflict of interest or something like that.

Mr. Speaker, let me state another problem we've had in Ottawa. It came up in the House the other day in question period, but of course one can't debate in question period, and maybe now is the sensible time. I'm glad that the minister is here, while I put on record, if you will, the reasons for the kind of frustration that I expressed the other day in the House. I can assure you that it was a frustration that was based on two years of experience with the provincial government and not just on the few months that I've had down here.

In March of 1970 a community forum, Action 70 Action, which had arisen out of a forum that was sponsored by the provincial Department of Citizenship, got together and proposed an income supplementation programme. They sent a brief to the minister in July and the minister came back to them in October and said: "Look you had better get some community support on this." So they did. The welfare committee supported the project, the local newspaper supported the project, a whole list of agencies and individuals and so on supported the project. Then the government started to promise action.

In March, 1971, the Premier said: "It's not a question of letting this slide until after the election," but the government did. In June of 1971 the Action 70 Action committee met with Mr. Wells, who was then the minister, and he assured them that the decision would be coming before the end of the summer.

As of September, there had been no action. The regional government entered the picture with a project that was very similar but much smaller. It has had no reply either and it eventually decided to proceed on its own. I hope the minister does listen to this. I trust that the minister will take some action on this. It is an example of the kind of promises that are not followed up by performances.

There is just one other area on the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that I want to talk about before coming into the field of municipal affairs. I am very worried about the government's proposal to review the Ontario Municipal Board, not because the OMB should never be reviewed, but because I fear what this government is going to do to it.

One of the things that I think we should all realize—and citizens outside should realize—is the very valuable role the OMB has assumed as a protector of minority rights. It has to depend an awful lot on the presence of Mr. Kennedy as the chairman. Unfortunately, Mr. Kennedy is about due for retirement. He only has one more year.

I don't think that there is a single member in this House who could name more than one or two members of the Municipal Board or who could give any indication of the kind of protection for minority rights, for citizens' rights, that they would give if they took over the chairmanship from Mr. Kennedy. I think that fact is a very sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker.

Is the government proposing to review—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Who is he protecting?

Mr. Cassidy: —Mr. Kennedy? There is a long tradition in this province that the OMB exists in order to protect the minority rights of the public which are, in fact, often trampled upon by majorities at the city council level. It entitles them to a thorough review, which sometimes local governments don't have the courtesy to give to their citizens and on occasion it reverses a decision that has been made locally. It is also responsible for keeping local councils financially honest and financially secure, and maybe that's a good thing which the hon. member for Grey-Bruce should think of as well.

Mr. Sargent: That's very fine.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the review of the OMB genuinely an attempt to uphold the OMB's power while streamlining its operations—something which I think we, on this side, could support—or is the review going to follow, let's say, the views of the hon. member for Ottawa South, who has been known during his stay in Ottawa city council as a devoted and dedicated opponent of the powers that the OMB enjoys in relation to local governments? Is it simply an attempt to emasculate the Ontario Municipal Board and to leave citizen groups doomed to total frustration and alienation, all in the name of decentralization of responsibility?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on. As you may know, I am responsible, or meant to be responsible, as my party's critic for municipal affairs. There is a certain learning process on this. What I would like to do this evening is really to talk at a philosophical level, on a philosophical basis, about some of the problems that are afflicting local government in the province and, then, go on at a subsequent time as legislation comes forward, possibly during the budget debate, on some of the more direct and practical implications of it.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, local government is sick in Ontario and it is sick for a couple of reasons. It is sick because it is politically inadequate, and it is sick because it is fiscally inadequate and because, I think, in most parts of the province the people in local government don't even understand what's going on, with the headlong urban growth to which they are now being subjected.

According to the Throne Speech, the government recognizes the need for stronger and more independent local governments. The speech talks of a closer partnership with municipal representatives. If they really want a closer partnership with the Treasurer, there is going to be an awful crowd around there with him trying to hold hands, because that minister has an awful lot of responsibilities. I think that's the first place where the actions of the government go against its avowed intent in the Throne Speech.

Let's face it the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is now head of the new ministry, I am quoting the Throne Speech again

—of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs with special responsibility for urban and regional planning, provincial-municipal relations and finance, and federal-provincial relations.

After that mouthful I had better return to what I was saying: the Treasurer has an awful lot on his plate as the superminister par excellence, the superminister of everything.

I find it very difficult to see how the minister can, in fact, give local government the time and attention that it deserves. He has to sandwich in the time and local government is too important to be given attention while sandwiched in with everything else.

It strikes me as very odd, Mr. Speaker, that the government which sets up policy areas for public protection, and policy areas for human resources and financial resources should then inconsistently come along with a policy area for intergovernmental relations, planning, regional planning, economics, federal contacts and municipal affairs and boil it all down into one minister plus a couple of flunkies who, in fact, have no authority to do anything except keep some people off the minister's back.

In many cases, I fear, municipalities won't, in other words, even be able to get in to talk to the minister, let alone get his attention on the problems that they have.

Perhaps I can sketch in the background of the way in which our cities are going right now.

This is a very concrete kind of thing, I suppose, but I last lived in the city of Toronto 12 years ago. I grew up in this city and I used to ride my bicycle on the highways and byways of this city, and those byways are now turned into superhighways. What has happened is that cities like Toronto and Hamilton and Ottawa have developed a self-generating growth at a precipitate rate which is going to be extraordinarily difficult to turn off. The stability and gradual rate of change to which people could adapt and to which they were used is a thing of the past.

This development is going on so fast right now that there is a ferocious competition particularly for space, for land. The city is constrained by its physical shape. Its functions can't go out indefinitely—the government has ensured that, in Toronto, for example, by the Toronto-centred region plan. Business and residents compete with each other in a free enterprise system for space close to the centre.

The public authorities have to compete as well. They have to pay the inflated land costs that result when they are asked to provide the services to accommodate this growth, to accommodate the sewers and the water and transportation and that kind of thing.

In the speculative market people who can afford automobiles—the middle and upper classes—can get away from it. They can go out to the suburbs and they are not caught up in it so much. For a few more years they can somehow pretend that the problems, particularly of the core areas, don't exist. The city may even help by giving them GO trains or subway trains or special facilities that ease their journeys to and from work.

In the meantime, there is an ever-growing number of people who are getting impoverished by this system and who cannot afford to compete, and are being forced to compete nevertheless, within the centre of the city. The people who are disadvantaged, the people who are on welfare, on marginal incomes are subjected to an intense squeeze in which they are the losers. If I can return to my riding, that includes an awful lot of people who have the fortune or misfortune to live in my riding.

These are poor people struggling for scarce space and at the mercy of slum speculators and developers who are driving up slum rents in competition with other people who want to come into the centre of the city, including middle class professionals, who renovate older property, or students, or people who are single and voluntarily poor.

Moreover, the people in the centre of the city are drained of leadership because any time anybody in the centre of the city gets a decent job or gets an inheritance or something like that, they are very tempted to move away from where the problems are and to go to the suburbs themselves. So the people who could be the natural leaders disappear.

I can give you a simple example of this. In Ottawa, the board of education elections are held on a city-wide basis. There is not a single representative for about 100,000 people in Ottawa who live within the central area of the city. Every representative on the Ottawa Board of Education comes from the more affluent middle-class suburbs.

What I think the government should realize, Mr. Speaker, is that the problems which are now being faced by the poor and

disadvantaged will continue to spread to people who now consider themselves in the middle class. They'll find they can't buy houses—they're finding that right now. They'll find that the competition for space, which only affects the poor, will affect them as well, because when you double your population in 30 years—which is what is suggested for a city like Toronto—you simply won't believe the kind of competition for space that will continue with the free enterprise system which this government upholds—limited free enterprise, I forgot the phrase.

Where there is a permanent scarcity of housing, the relative and the absolute cost of housing will tend to skyrocket and do it so much faster than the growth of incomes. In a period of growth as rapid as is projected for the city of Toronto and other cities within this province, it will not be possible to create urbane and civilized large cities. That has been done in London, England. It has been done in other places, although they have some problems. But those cities have had centuries, even millenniums, in which to grow, not just a period of 30 years.

Moreover, the political consequences of what's happening in the cities really appal me. The cities have been governed traditionally by a sort of constellation of elites. The people who get elected to city councils—I have been on a city council and I have seen them, and I suppose a number of members on that side have as well—you are probably aware the constellation of interests there includes developers, and contractors and people who dabble in real estate or speculate, it includes lawyers who have an interest in land as well. It is a whole constellation around the fact that the land and the development is in private hands.

Not only that, but as we are seeing right now in Toronto, this constellation of interest is powerful enough that it can afford not just massive campaign contributions, but it can also afford even to have its own newspaper, as the property interests have here.

As you know, from the experience in Toronto, citizens with an alternative set of values have not yet found an effective means of combating this constellation of interests at city hall. Municipal councils and civil servants have grown to believe—and they have grown to believe, thanks to the policies of this government over the last 27 years—that they must grow to survive, they must grow to have assessment and therefore they have not simply accepted, they have courted rapid development and that, in turn, has brought them more problems than it really creates.

Unfortunately, I fear the reforms now being undertaken in a rather mishy-mashy kind of way by the provincial government may make the problem even worse, because not only will they make local government unrepresentative but they will also make them also more and more remote from their people. In the past, you might not have liked the interest that your aldermen represented, but at least you could get hold of them to clear up the snow. Now even that small consolation is ending

You can see the phenomenon here in Toronto, where you have a confrontation—a real debate about issues—in the Toronto city council; but Metro council—where the big decisions, the real decisions are made—is a very unpolitical place and there is very little discussion of issues there, compared with the Toronto city council, as a result of an indirect electoral system created by the government over there.

Metro Toronto is 20 years old; it should have grown up by now. Yet the politics and the drama are at city hall in Toronto. We're seeing it in Ottawa as well. I'll give you another graphic example. Our regional government has profound powers over the development of the Ottawa-Carleton region, yet it meets for two or three hours a month. It's a pity the member for Ottawa South doesn't come more often. Whereas the Ottawa city council, which in fact has much more limited powers in relation to the overall development of the region, meets for about 15 hours a month. The real political debate about the future of the city, whatever there is, takes place in the city council and not in the regional council.

I suppose I should say to the government that their contempt for democracy was demonstrated by the appointment of a former warden of Rockcliffe and former president or chairman of the British American Banknote Co. Ltd. as the chairman of the regional council. They helped a great deal in creating this chairman-of-the-board style of government at the regional government level in Ottawa, where issues are fuzzed over or never debated on a matter of principle and in fact where things simply slide through because nobody considers that it's his government. Nobody cares enough about it. That, I fear, is inherent in the kind of regional system we have right now.

Mr. Speaker, I've covered some ground; I'll be developing this in later months, because I want to learn more about it myself. I will try to communicate with the government but they do have some high-priced help

working for them. What I fear is that if my perception is not complete on this particular question of urban development—its effect on the politics and the political responsiveneess of local councils, and so on—if my perception is not complete, theirs is totally non-existent.

We do agree, Mr. Speaker, with the commitment of the government to extend regional government through the territory of the Province of Ontario. We can see a lot of merit in that. But to return to the things I was talking about before—responsiveness and responsibility—I would say there's very little concept in what the government is proposing that would meet the criteria of having responsible local governments. And the fiscal actions of the government—the squeezes and freezes and other things that it imposes—have the effect of taking away this decision-making power from the local or regional governments, rather than genuinely giving them the fiscal tools they need in order to be genuinely responsible at the local level.

I suppose I should say a word about the tax credit plan which the Treasurer proposes to bring in, because of the nature of reform that this was intended to be. As you know, if you now live in Etobicoke you get a $75 rebate, and if you live in the borough of York you get a rebate of about $45.

Well, the government, bless their hearts, looked at that and said, "This is ridiculous; this is really wrong. The people out there in York need it more than the people in Etobicoke." So they're turning it around, and now the people in York in fact will get $80 or $90 and the people in Etobicoke will get $10 or $15.

It's still a pretty insignificant and paltry step toward a genuinely equitable tax system within the province, because the people in Etobicoke now will be paying, let's say, $800 in taxes, after their rebate on their income tax form, out of an income of $25,000; that's about three per cent of their income. But the people in the borough of York may well be paying five, six or seven per cent—$250 or $350 a year out of a $5,000 income. If that isn't regressive taxation at the property tax level, I don't know what is, and the Treasurer's reforms certainly won't cure that.

There is a need, Mr. Speaker, for decent and adequate tax resources for the local level if the government means what it says about assuring responsible local government. We suggested, and the hon. member on my right (Mr. MacDonald) very ably put forward in this House a couple of years ago, a municipal foundation plan which would have the effect of assuring that every resident, tenant or ratepayer in the province would get equal services from his municipality in return for an equal burden of taxation. That's very simple, and I'm really surprised that the government haven't taken him up upon that, because it was a very simple and sensible plan. Alas, they haven't.

I think that over the months ahead we should probably do some work on behalf of the government in order to show them just what disparities there are in tax burdens at the municipal level around various parts of the province. Certainly there hasn't been a breath of a whiff of a whisper by this government of taking the next step, which would be to give the new regional governments, as they come into being, access to a progressive and rapidly growing tax field—that is, giving them a share of income tax.

Mr. Speaker, I really am an optimist, although I have a tendency, a sort of predilection, to fear the worst out of the government, and that really is a wrong kind of view. I have suggested a number of things to the government in this speech today. I will remain optimistic that it acts on them. On that note of hope and trust I should like to sit down. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that your boss isn't here tonight. I have a few shots to take at him, but I know that you will convey to him that I have a high regard for his background in municipal life as mayor of Preston, serving his people there. His record in the House I know will hopefully give us a sense of balance here, in view of the arrogance of the group over there.

I think that you can say, in view of the learned readings we have had from the Speaker to date, he is about to set a new record, as it were. He is the first Speaker to operate in the dark on purpose but, as time will go on, we will find that we will have our times, I feel that he will have instructions from the government now that it is so cocky; that he will try to keep us in line; that probably, as time goes on, the Sergeant-at-Arms will have a chance to use his sword.

I want to give you notice now that we are not going to take any nonsense from the government insofar as falling in line with interpretations from the chair as to our rights are concerned because, more and more, sir, the rights of the opposition are very much more important than they ever were

before. The people of Ontario are aware of this overload.

I might say to the members of the government and to the new members of the opposition that we have been impressed with the calibre of the new members here. I think that the cheesecake in the back row over there adds a lot to that party. They could stand some sharpening up, because it is a pretty sick looking bunch we have to look at for four years here. I am not looking at the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer). I am just looking at the glad group, but I hope the new members will not become, as we have become, very disenchanted with the rights of democracy and the rights of the private member. It is a very discouraging and frustrating fact—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Depressing.

Mr Sargent: —and depressing that we in the opposition cannot, in essence, do a meaningful job for our people because of the machine we are faced with. It is well known —the House leader knows what I am talking about—that it is a joke in my area that we can't get our road surfaces fixed; that we have the worst roads in the Province of Ontario, because the member for Grey-Bruce is a Liberal. It is a known fact that they spent money for about five miles of road there just to elect the member for Grey South (Mr. Winkler) this time. That is the only time that we will ever get any more money until the next election.

On the projection of the road factors in our area we have—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Sargent: The minister would know more than the Minister of Highways (Mr. Carton) because the projection shows 1990 for our roads up there.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I simply said, "Don't hold your breath."

Mr. Sargent: That is great. We will see how big the minister is at that. But I am glad he is here today

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am here every day. That is more than the member can say.

Mr. Sargent: He sure gets paid for it; he should be.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Don't crowd your luck on that one.

Mr. Sargent: You have got me afraid already here.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I know how afraid you are.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the other day we had some very good—excellent—speeches in the Throne Speech debate, but the member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) was talking about the difficulties he had in being elected and the anti-semitic campaign the Tories carried on against him. That is deplorable.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, those were not my words at all. I did not suggest an anti-semitic campaign was carried on.

Mr. Sargent: Well, how do you say it then—Communist?

Mr. Reid: The only thing he missed.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He said he thought the Liberal was okay.

Mr. Sargent: I don't think he was too happy, was he?

Mr. Shulman: I had my complaints, but that was not one of them.

Mr. Sargent: But it was during the election, though, what happened to him. Now when one has characters like MacNaughton and McKeough and Lawrence in the act, these things happen after the election. It is amazing what happens. The House must hear this; it is funny.

When the news reports came out on election night, the first guy to go down in defeat was Sargent in Grey-Bruce. After the first two polls, they reported I had lost the election. So it came on CBC that, although I won the election by about 3,000 votes, I lost in the first two polls. So a commentator was asking Mr. Lawrence on the CBC hookup: "Wasn't it strange that Eddie Sargent in Grey-Bruce went down to defeat so early?" And good old Al said: "Well that is the greatest thing that ever happened, because he is the most disgraceful member ever in the House."

An hon. member: Shame, shame!

Mr. Sargent: And he went on to say that everyone would be happy about this thing happening. Now what I am concerned about is the fact that he can't even be a good winner. And here is a man who is in charge of fair play and justice in our province.

An hon. member: Can't be a good winner? He can't even demonstrate fair play.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know. That night we had about 20 lines into our committee rooms and they were all blocked with long-distance calls. People were angry about this thing. They had voted Tory but they couldn't believe that there could be so much hatred and viciousness in a cabinet minister, the Attorney General.

What I am getting on to say is that we have a man like MacNaughton, who pulled the dirtiest boomerang on me in history. I am not going to go into it now, but we have guys like McKeough and MacNaughton and Al Lawrence—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, order please.

Mr. Sargent: Okay. I can give you their titles, but it is easier this way, Russ. There is no need for nose-punching at this point, but physically I could take these fellows outside and I could clean their clocks anytime.

Now, getting back to what is important—

Mr. Reid: And he is not kidding either.

Mr. Sargent: Glad to have you back, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): How is your clock?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Tell us what Charlie did.

Mr. Lawlor: Tell us about that boomerang business.

An hon. member: You are under surveillance now; watch yourself.

Mr. Sargent: We have the debt picture here in this province. It is a pretty serious situation; the worst financial nightmare in the history of the province. About half a million dollars in loss this year, plus about a $5 billion debenture debt. And now we have an increased budget in the Prime Minister's office, in the area of about three quarters of a million dollars, which would provide manned offices for 117 members across Ontario.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Hear, hear.

Mr. Sargent: Think of it. Here's a man running a political machine, spending close to $1 million, with all the channels of public funds to keep the machine well oiled. In other words he is skinning the people with their own money.

Now if he wanted to be square with the people, as the nice guy they projected on TV, why doesn't he tell the people of Ontario what he is doing with this close to $1 million. Because this is the man who cares for people. He does things for people.

Mr. Reid: As long as they are Tories.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. I read the book, "The Making of the President" by Theodore White. On page 482 the theme of this book is "doing things for people." And so the image makers from the States come into the picture. They have not only taken over our economy, gentlemen, but they have taken over the making of the Premier of Ontario. They take their theme—"doing things for people"—out of page 482 of Theodore White's book, and they set the guidelines for the making of the Premier of Ontario.

They put a man in the driver's seat who has ruined our educational system. He does things for people all right. We have a new breed of millionaire in this province, and they are all on Bill Davis' coat-tails. And he girds himself with all these henchmen at public expense. Even the man, I forget his name—his name is Latimer—he is the man who doles out the patronage for the Tories—

Mr. Shulman: He is the man who appointed me Chief Coroner!

Mr. Sargent: Robarts had the intelligence to hide this man but now smiling Bill puts him right in the Premier's office and he has the taxpayers pay his salary to deal out the patronage.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Nobody's denying it!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's only Latimer who knows their names, that's all!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We are just kids compared to Trudeau.

Mr. Sargent: We have, in northern Ontario—

Mr. Reid: Now that is a good excuse!

Mr. Sargent: I want to say to the members that never has this House seen a man who should have been Prime Minister more than Bob Nixon, and—

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Good fellow.

Mr. Sargent: You all know that too. I can tell you by looking at the numbers here. There's a book called "The Boss," a story about Mayor Daley of Chicago. Mayor Daley has a machine there and he even has to pass on the hiring of a street sweeper; the machine is that tight. He will never, never be defeated as mayor of the city of Chicago as long as he lives.

Now, numerically, the deal here in Ontario is that of all the civil servants they control, each civil servant controls 11 votes. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I tell you this sadly—it will be happy for you—but numerically, we can never defeat this government in this province.

An hon. member: Wait until next time.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Some of them voted for me!

Mr. Shulman: How come we got here?

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): No wonder his leader didn't win!

Mr. Sargent: It is a mathematical certainty

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Most profound statement the member for Grey-Bruce ever made!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: You know it's right and that's why you're smiling!

Mr. Leluk: Remember that four years from now.

An hon. member: They'll defeat themselves.

Mr. Sargent: They say that people don't vote for something; they vote against something.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That is the key.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I would hope to God that is true. But you have the weapons! We have one man who had 75 jobs open. They had 300 applicants and he had 75 names from the Conservative association and not one other member, unless he was recommended by the Tory association, could get one of those jobs.

Now this is a fact. It happens in Ontario and we could go on and tell you the control of patronage the government has. I know most of the fellows over there and I consider them my friends. It isn't their fault; it is part of the machine, the way they run things.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Don't let them off too easily!

Mr. Sargent: I want to say this; we have had in recent months a lot of ink used on conflict of interest and in it lies the key for the Tories' defeat. People are having a progressive concern about the increasing areas of profit by politicians and rightfully so.

Many feel as I do—that all we hear about is the one who gets nailed. These are the tip of the iceberg, but the main concern and public focus has been on the conflict of interest of the individual, and how those people with power of decision-making use their office for their direct gain.

I go along with the judge in Port Arthur, that it is a pretty grey area and there is a lot of ruling that is completely unreasonable in this area. What is of much greater concern to me, Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of Ontario, as a member of this Legislature and as a citizen of Canada, is the colossal conflict of interest now being perpetrated by those in power in this Queen's Park, by the boss of "the big blue machine."

At every opening of the House, the opening of the Legislature, we have the Lieutenant Governor giving his speech. Like a puppet he reads off the ghost-written speech by the government. He retires to his diggings.

Mr. Deans: He reads it well

Mr. Sargent: He did a good job. I like the old gentleman. He retires to his office and the official party goes down there with him to welcome the guests. I put the word "guests" in quotes. Now, it is hard to believe—if we hadn't seen this, we wouldn't believe it—but this lineup is about two blocks long. It is four-deep of the party faithful. All these big business tycoons of Ontario, all the big concerns handling multi-million-dollar contracts for the government, standing patiently in line for two hours to pay tribute, to shake hands with the Premier and say: "Hi, Mr. Premier! We are here. We will be seeing you."

Mr. R. F. Nixon: "You will be hearing from us!"

Mr. Sargent: "You will be hearing from us!" That is right. Thank you, Bob.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): "Be sure and sign the contracts."

Mr. Sargent: As one watches this parade of the bluebloods who go through this ritual every opening of the Legislature, one could say knowingly that—knowing what we know goes in this government—there goes a billion dollars worth of businessmen protecting their billion-dollars-worth of contracts.

Now this is the main cog of "the big blue machine." And boy, how it works.

This is the almost insurmountable task that we have to do as the opposition, to try to protect the people. During the election we saw, Mr. Speaker, the smiling Bill Davis appear on millions of idiot boxes, spending about $8 million. The figure that has been given is $5 million—but the figure is $8 million.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Get it up a little higher, Eddie. You have been bringing it up a little higher every day.

Mr. Sargent: Well, don't you kid yourself. It is in that area, Bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You didn't get your share, eh, Bill?

Mr. Sargent: All to say that Bill Davis is a nice guy. They bought the election by brainwashing the people.

Now you may wonder, Mr. Speaker, what this has to do with the conflicts of interest. I charge, Mr. Speaker, that this Premier and the government owe it to the public of Ontario, if they are sincere, to make a complete disclosure of the companies and the individuals donating to the Tory election campaign machine, to furnish a list of all companies who donated to the party in amounts in excess of $5,000 for election funds.

And further, what is most important is that if any one of these companies, or individuals —and you hear this good, Mr. House leader and convey it back to your leader—if any one of these companies or individuals is doing business with the government now, or in the next four years, that they be charged with gross conflict of interest. It is a simple, clear-cut charge.

I know what is going on and so do all of you. You must surely know what is going on when you get excited about an alderman and conflict of interest because he votes on a piece of property. It is incredible that we condone such goings-on at this top level of government in Ontario, representing eight million people. We know what's going on. It surely is as corrupt as any criminal offence I know—that I can think of—to use a cheque book for party funds or as a bribe for a contract for now or for future business.

Where did Bill Davis get $5 million or $8 million, and how is he going to pay it back? Well, I guess the answer is pretty simple. The government will not allow an outside audit of its books and now we have the Committee on Government Productivity to strengthen the House in capability, to further centralize control, an action of the in-House group. I have another name for them—the not-in-House group.

Mr. Speaker, if you would like to have the truth happen in the Province of Ontario, to take the lid off and to see exactly what goes on in Queen's Park, I suggest to you the people of Ontario will know what has been going on for the past 28 years. In the United States, Congress by a vote of 334 to 19 passed legislation dated Jan. 20, 1972, requiring more disclosure of campaign contributions and stating how much money can be spent on an election campaign—six cents per voter.

This is the story we must unveil for the people of Ontario. It's a shocking situation that we can talk about public disclosure and we have the government up to their necks with their henchmen.

We have the arrogance of the government in land acquisition in Grey and Bruce counties. Today I got a phone call from the chairman of the planning board in Grey county; they have spent $50,000, I say to the House leader, on a plan for the Beaver Valley area. They are all going to disband and resign tomorrow, because the $50,000 they have spent in the past year will all be thrown out the window by the Municipal Board.

They come into our area and, through the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Bernier), they want to acquire 90,000 acres of land and don't have the courtesy to tell the reeve, the warden or anyone what is going on. I have scores of letters from people who own property and have their lifetime savings there; they can't believe a government would do these things to them.

Mr. W. Newman: Try the airport.

Mr. Sargent: The member knows what I am talking about, then.

Mr. D. A. Evans (Simcoe Centre): At least he'll sympathize with the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. God bless him for having the guts to say what he did. The member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) had the guts to say what he did, and the whole House respected him. He won his point and won millions of dollars for his people because he had the guts to stand up. But somewhere along the line the truth will out.

Now we have a report here by Don O'Hearn or Bill Prager I don't know which—about the arrogance of this government. It says Deputy Treasurer Ian MacDonald in 1969 was getting $28,800. As of last March, this had been increased to $38,000—a boost of about 35 per cent. It was MacDonald's boss, Treasurer Darcy McKeough, who in the budget last year announced a ceiling of five per cent, but he increases his associate's salary by 35 per cent.

An hon. member: The rich get richer, the poor get poorer.

An hon. member: How about the increase of $100?

Mr. Sargent: There's the case of Dr. Reynolds, who was secretary of the cabinet last year. He was receiving $25,000 in 1969; in 1971 this was increased to $38,500—an increase of 50 per cent.

Mr. Shulman: Almost as much as the MPPs.

Mr. Sargent: The highest-paid civil servant in 1971 was Mr. McNab in Highways at $39,000.

Mr. J. F Foulds (Port Arthur): He's worth as much as the Premier.

Mr. Sargent: Now here we have a good one here: In 1969 Donald Collins was deputy minister of the Department of Civil Service and received $28,000. Last year he was chairman of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and was paid $36,400—up about 30 per cent. Along with this, his wife is an officer in the Prime Minister's department and she gets $18,000. Well, that's pretty healthy —$54,000 going into one household.

An hon. member: It's obscene.

Mr. Sargent: That's almost as good as a licence to steal.

We have the sacred cow, Ontario Hydro—no one knows what is going on there.

An hon. member: That's the fault of the federal government.

Mr. Evans: The federal government participates in nuclear power—

Mr. Sargent: They are launched on a $1 billion programme for nuclear power.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I know you're in—

Mr. Evans: —and the federal government calls the shots.

Mr. Sargent: They don't know where they are going either. And I'll tell you quite frankly—

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The blind leading the blind.

An hon. member: Give them some direction!

Mr. Sargent: Well, I can tell you. I have a book called "Poison Power." It's the experience of nuclear development in the United States and it is the most shocking document. I think it should be required reading for all members if they want to know what they are talking about insofar as nuclear power is concerned. We have spent a potful of money in Glace Bay using a system down there that—

Mr. Evans: It was the federal government's system.

Mr. Sargent: Just a moment. That was Stanfield who put that in effect down there. Yes!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was your federal leader.

Mr. Sargent: And it's now cost us about $100 million. They are going to toss another $50 million in the pot. It will never work. It never worked in 10 countries in Europe but they are going to try and make it work there and they are going to try and make it work at Douglas Point. Now this is my riding. It cost me thousands of votes there this time but I believe what I am saying.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): It got you thousands of votes. Tell the truth.

Mr. Sargent: I must have lost quite a chunk there.

Mr. Evans: All of 200.

Mr. Sargent: But the thing that we have in this is the fantastic margin for error. If any one of these power plants were to be

struck by an aeroplane or blown up it would be worse than a Hiroshima. In England, a few years ago, there was a leak in one of the nuclear power plants in the midlands and 30 miles downwind hundreds of dead cattle were found in the fields the next day.

And I happen to believe that if the winds are westerly, if anything happened to Douglas Point, all of Ontario is going to go down the drain with it—and I know what I am talking about. We've had a number of errors there. The last boo-boo cost us $1 million because it was located in the wrong place. But Mr. Robarts knew nothing about it and no one knew what was going on—and I had to have a CKNX reporter tell me the story.

Mr. Evans: Trudeau doesn't tell us anything.

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the whole nuclear programme is an unnecessary frill we can't afford—and I made quite a study of this. Along the west coast in the United States they are pumping the ocean water inland to big reservoirs, they are damming it up and they are creating their own power through ocean water, and it is costing them a decimal point of what it's costing us now; and there is the safety factor.

We have in the north country millions of lakes – really millions of lakes. There is enough water power up there to be harnessed to serve this whole area forever. But we don't need a guy like Bob Macaulay to go down to Ottawa to get in bed with the AECL and make a deal to cost Ontario taxpayers $1 billion. I asked Mr. Gathercole at the last meeting with the Hydro commission: "What if it doesn't work, because your own paper said it is doubtful whether it will work or not?" And he had the audacity to say to me: "If it does not work we have wasted $1 billion."

So, here we have a situation where—we have clippings now – the government has closed down Douglas Point now for God knows how long because it can't get heavy water.

Mr. Evans: You know why. Because the federal government has been unable to meet demands. That is why.

Mr. Sargent: Because they can't buy it in Russia and they can't buy it in the States. In business they have the vision to foresee these things but because the government has a blank cheque it goes out and wastes billions of dollars. I can read this thing, Mr. Speaker, but there is no point. I am not getting through.

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): In what country was livestock killed? Not Canada!

Mr. Sargent: I've got it in my file. If the hon. member wants it, I'll give him the whole file.

Mr. Kennedy: Give it now, then!

Mr. Sargent: I don't have it with me now.

Mr. Kennedy: The member said millions of cattle were killed.

Mr. Sargent: No, I said in England—in the midlands of England. If you study this nuclear –

An hon. member: The member can't read yet.

Mr. Evans: They haven't the same system that we have. Ours is a better control system—best of the nuclear powered stations.

An hon. member: It doesn't work.

Mr. Sargent: It doesn't work? It doesn't hurt anybody. Mr. Speaker, my concern mainly is this: One time when I was mayor of Owen Sound I heard a clamouring outside the office at city hall and someone was saying: "I want to see the mayor and nothing lower." Well, I got up and I told this man there was nothing lower than the mayor. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I feel that from where I stand and I look at government today, there's nothing lower than a backbencher in the Opposition.

Mr. C. Bennett (Ottawa South): Mayors.

Mr. Yakabuski: Wrong!

Mr. Sargent: Because of the fact that they —This man walking out there! He lords it over his people at election time that Sargent can do nothing for them. I know it's a fact and I feel badly about it but that's the way the ball bounces. Somewhere along the line someone has said you can't hope to change the whole world but you can change the corner in which you live. By God, we're going to try. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I too am a newcomer, like others who have spoken here already today, and I would

like to say that there seems to be some sort of a conspiracy afoot for those of us who are sitting on this side of the House but whose hearts are on the other side. That is, we seem to be following the most eloquent speakers the other parties have and it is a great disadvantage to us. The uncomfortable position that I have is to follow the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent).

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Glad the member recognizes it.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): In the member's heart he knows he is wrong.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would like, as others have, to congratulate you on the office you hold and, from my own brief experience and as well from the comments that I have heard from all sides of this House, on the confidence members have in you.

I rise on this occasion to address this assembly for the first time with a considerable mixture of pride and humility. I'm proud that I have been selected by the electorate in my constituency to serve in this august body and I am humble in that I know that I have joined a distinguished group of ladies and gentlemen, all of whom are dedicated to serving the people of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity and occasion to pay tribute to my predecessor in this Legislature, Arthur Wishart. This gentleman served his fellow citizens for a period of eight years and he won the respect of members from all sides of this House for the efficient and effective way in which he carried out his duties and responsibilities as Minister of Justice and Attorney General, and later as Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I shall not attempt to relate to you, Mr. Speaker, his many achievements. Others more capable than I have already done so. His accomplishments are a matter of public record.

Now Mr. Speaker, I represent a riding made up predominantly of steelworkers, lumbering people, people who work in the pulp and paper industry and in the tourist business. Our city is well served by two railroads. We're located on the waterway system on the St. Mary's River. We've excellent transportation by the waterways and we're served to the east and north by Highway 17 and the Trans-Canada Highway. I'll have more to say about that later.

The city of Sault Ste. Marie is a community of 78,000 persons consisting of a mixture of ethnic groups, each contributing its culture to the enrichment of all the citizens of its own community as well as the rest of the province. My riding, located as it is on the Canadian-United States border, is the gateway to the finest recreation area in North America—thousands upon thousands of acres of beautiful forest land dotted most generously with lakes and streams that are a joy to hunters, fishermen and campers. We're blessed with many miles of sparkling sand beaches along the shore of Lake Superior, a short drive from our city.

Sault Ste. Marie is the only port of entry, Mr. Speaker, between Canada and the United States from Fort Frances on the west to Sarnia on the east. Thousands of Canadian and American tourists visit our area each year and return year after year. I'll have more to say concerning the border crossing point later in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) for his congratulations, bestowed upon me in his remarks earlier in this debate. He congratulated me on my recent appointment as a parliamentary assistant to the designate Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier). He was also kind enough to refer to me in his remarks as a good candidate. He suggested that some inducement was offered to me prior to the event of Oct. 21 in order that I might become that candidate.

Let me assure the hon. gentleman that no inducement was offered and none was sought. The hon. Leader of the Opposition would, of course, be in a better position than I to discuss inducements, when one considers the public commitments made prior to the election that the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) would become a cabinet minister, known as the Minister of Urban Affairs, had the Liberal Party formed a government. This inducement, obviously, had the desired effect in York-Forest Hill, but it certainly didn't have much effect in the rest of the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I couldn't ask him to change his political principles.

Mr. Rhodes: I was very much impressed by the speech given by the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis). His eloquence is exceptional and his delivery commands everyone's attention, but I feel a certain closeness to the hon. member in that he, along with others close to him, spent a considerable part of October last in the city

of Sault Ste. Marie. There were persons from such places as New York, Ottawa, Peterborough, Skeena, British Columbia, and various other centres of Ontario. I may say, Mr. Speaker, as the then mayor of that community I was most pleased that these distinguished persons saw fit to spend so much time in my community, but it came as a bit of a surprise when they all left on October 22. I do hope that they did not leave with a poor impression of my city.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some comments here and on other days about campaigning in the last election. I have listened with interest to some of the criticism that has been levelled at the type of campaigns that were conducted in the various ridings. I suppose that I was very fortunate in that the riding that I live in was not subjected to this type of campaigning, not to the degree that has been expressed here by others. But I think it is only fair, Mr. Speaker, and I think most will admit this, that any type of campaigning that is less than what we would suggest would be acceptable was not confined to any one specific riding nor was it limited to any one particular party. I think all of us were subjected to a certain amount of what might be said to be less than desirable type of campaigning.

So it is rather difficult for me to become too upset by some of the criticisms I have heard, and certainly very difficult for me to become very upset when I understand that one of the main problems someone has is to bring two cases of imported brandy into the province. I really can't get too shook up about it if he is having difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, in the area that I represent, one of our major problems is increased job opportunities, the need for more work. In northern Ontario communities where we depend upon one industry we are having difficulty keeping people in our communities, because we can't offer them job opportunities. Our young people are leaving us, not because they want to leave the northern communities but because they are required to leave us. They can't find the work they want to do.

As a result, two problems have been created: One, the young people are leaving the north; and two, more and more people are being concentrated into this Golden Horseshoe area, which really needs to have more control on it.

It should be, I think, our job to see that people can find work in the communities they have been born and raised in, the communities in which they want to stay. The one thing I am urging is that the government see fit to attempt to entice industries to develop in the northern community, to bring jobs so that people can stay where they want to stay; in particular in my part of this province jobs that will be related to the use of steel products and lumbering, jobs related to the tourist industry.

These types of things we are going to have to have if we are going to keep young people in that part of the world which, Mr. Speaker, I would compare with any other part of this province as being a most desirable place to be.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We need secondary industry.

Mr. Rhodes: We need secondary industry, yes. There is no question about that. But there are a number of problems that are going to have to be looked at very closely.

The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) touched upon one subject that is of most interest to me, and that is the type of transportation systems that we have in and out of our part of the province.

There is no question, I think, in anyone's mind, that we need improved highway conditions. The highway from Sault Ste. Marie to Sudbury is in desperate need of upgrading. Now I am not going to stand before you and suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, or to the government—

Mr. Stokes: A turkey trail!

Mr. Rhodes: —that it should be a four-lane highway. I think that is impractical. But I do say that we do need passing lanes in the hills and on the curves in order to facilitate the movement of the very heavy traffic, that is being increased continually in this area; increased by more and more tourist activity, increased by the number of vehicles that are pulling trailers in the summertime and the number of vehicles that are towing snowmobiles in the wintertime. It is impractical for us to stand back and allow the congestion to develop, because it is hampering the economy of the north, this effort necessary to move goods to and from these cities, be it from this part of the province or from other centres in the north.

The government has to be commended—there is no question about it—when it started NorOntair that was a real step forward. I am hoping to see that become even more so,

to serve other communities. But the service from Sault St. Marie to Sudbury and to Timmins is a good service and it is doing its job. Hopefully it will do more in the near future.

The tourist trade is one of the largest industries we have in our part of the country. More and more people are finding that the open space of the north country is drawing them from the asphalt jungles in the midwest of the United States—Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, all of these major cities. Each year you will see licence plates from practically every state in the union in our part of the province.

They are there, Mr. Speaker, because they want to get away from this blocked-in area they are living in. When they get to Sault Ste. Marie, Mr. Speaker, they run into an international bridge. As I mentioned before, that is the only bridge crossing for the whole area from Fort Frances to Sarnia.

They run into an international bridge that now has a fee on it that makes it almost impossible—well that is probably the wrong word – makes it impractical for people to cross over because of the cost. It is $3.50 to get across the bridge when you can enter Ontario at Sarnia for 50 cents or a quarter. The same price is being charged at the international bridge to get into Ontario from Michigan, or vice versa, as is being charged to cross the mighty Mackinac Bridge across the Straits of Mackinac. That fee was reduced in order to facilitate traffic into the upper peninsula of Michigan.

I know that a study has been made. I am looking forward to the results of that study and hopefully it will be to the advantage of all of us to have the tolls brought back to a level at which we can induce the millions of people who are coming up to the border and not crossing to do so. We are getting a lot of them, but there are more to be had. They spend a considerable amount of money; millions and millions of dollars.

I have heard quoted that anywhere from $40 million to $55 million American is spent in the district of Algoma; and that filters its way throughout the total province. It is good for the total economy. It could be assisted by consideration of those bridge tolls.

Mr. Speaker, the government has taken a stand to prevent foreign ownership of vacation lands. I support that stand completely; that it shall be Canadians who are given first choice to lease property and not to buy it. I would like to suggest that the government policy go perhaps even further.

I would like to see priorities set up so that local residents in specific areas be given first priority on the leasing of land in recreational areas around our lakes. In a certain radius outside any particular community they be given first priority; with second priority to Ontario residents; third priority to other Canadians; and a fourth priority then, perhaps to Americans or other foreign persons. Primarily, give the first three chances to Canadians, local, provincial, and national. In that way I think we can make sure that our vacation sites remain in the hands of people who live in this country.

One of the big sports in my part of the country, Mr. Speaker, is hunting. The hunting season right now is such that to go out into the woods when the hunting season first opens is not exactly the safest spot in the world because of the great numbers of people who go into the woods at this time of the year. I would like to suggest that it be very seriously considered that people who live in the Province of Ontario be given a portion of that hunting season before non-residents are permitted to go into the woods. Give them some time so that they could enjoy their own backyard, if you will, to go out and hunt in their own province before the season is thrown open to the non-residents.

I know there will be some criticism of this. Tourist operators will feel it will affect their business, but I suggest to you that persons who live outside of what is known as the general hunting area, namely northern Ontario, who live in other parts of Ontario, would travel up to hunt in that specific time, so it would be really a balance-off. But it would be Ontario people.

Northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, needs more facilities for the treatment of retarded and disturbed children.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Hear, hear!

Mr. Rhodes: There is a report that suggests this should become the policy of the government, and I am satisfied, from the Throne Speech, that it will be.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It was promised in1959.

Mr. Rhodes: I am anxious, Mr. Speaker, to make it clear that one of the things that bothers the people in the riding that I represent is that if a youngster is unfortunately afflicted and is retarded and requires hospi-

talization and cannot stay in the home, he is sent many miles away from his family and his home. It is very difficult for the parents to visit him.

This would bring families back together again. People would be able to have a closeness with these children, and at the same time it would provide work for people in these hospitals; nurses, nursing assistants, technical people.

I'm looking for the expansion of community college facilities in northern Ontario. We are fortunate in my riding that we do have the Cambrian College of Applied Arts and Technology, which has had very substantial expansion—the government is to be commended for the foresight on this—and it's producing some excellent graduates. And Algoma college has just been permitted to add a third year.

But it's important that they become degree-granting colleges. This would provide jobs for people, better educational opportunities; and perhaps just as important, Mr. Speaker, it would keep young people in the home environment in getting their postsecondary school education. It's much more reasonable for a person to have his family go on to postsecondary school education if they can afford it, and it would be much more reasonable for them to have them at home in their own home environment.

I'm pleased to support the position in the Throne Speech on election procedures. I really and firmly believe in one office and one office only. I know there are others in this House who did hold and do hold more than one office—I am one of them—but I believe they should resign from one of the offices and assume one office and one office only. I support that position.

I think it is absolutely necessary that there be a clarification of the conflict-of-interest problem. As long as we permit this to exist we are scaring away good, competent people from seeking office at the municipal level, because no one wants to be subjected to a conflict-of-interest charge similar to the gentlemen at Thunder Bay. I'm sure it will be a long time before these good men seek office again under similar circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said, and pointed out in the Throne Speech, that there will be a review of the Ontario Municipal Board functions. I'm not going into any great detail about the Ontario Municipal Board; most of us are very familiar with it—those of us who have been involved in municipal life. It's interesting to note that there's a possibility of an appeal board or some sort of appeal facility being set up for decisions that will be made by the board.

One of the major problems that I found, Mr. Speaker, is the work load that is imposed on the Ontario Municipal Board—the volumes of work that they are required to do.

One of the areas in which I think they could be helped in this is the simple neighbourhood type of rezoning. These are the simple things about which there are no objections, where perhaps an individual living in a single family home wants to have it rezoned so it can become a duplex: There are no objections from anyone either at the planning board level or at the council level, no one files any objections, and yet you still have to wait a minimum of six to eight weeks to get Ontario Municipal Board approval.

I think there should be a change in the legislation and a change in the requirement so that if a simple zoning request goes through the regular channels of the planning board and the municipal council and receives no objection, it should not require Ontario Municipal Board hearing and they could go on to other more important work.

The proposed legislation to enable school boards or municipal councils to share in developing facilities is an excellent suggestion and it should certainly be carried out. In my community, more and more use is being made of the school facilities.

It has had a double-barrelled effect: It has made the community conscious of the school facilities, made the people a lot more aware of what is in the school and given them a greater respect for the school. And it has cut down on vandalism, because young people realize now that this isn't just a school, a place to go during the day, but it's a place that can become a community centre and be used by them for their enjoyment in the evenings.

It is proposed to acquire land for recreational areas and to expand the public use of lands. I completely agree, but I must hasten to say not only in the southern part of this province but in the northern part of the province where we have many miles of beaches that are going to be quickly gobbled up—along the shore of Lake Superior, for example. Unless these lands are acquired now. And I know the story, Mr. Speaker, that says well why in the world should the government buy private land when we have thousands of acres of Crown land already. But you don't have thousands of acres of Crown land along the Lake Superior shore,

and I am concerned that it could become gobbled up and purchased by American interests. We should be buying that land along with certain inland lake areas as well.

The Throne Speech says support the cultural organizations. Again I say amen, because when you live in the northern part of the province you find that you are far removed from the seat of government, and far removed not only from the seat of government but from the cultural areas of this province. We don't have O'Keefe Centres and St. Lawrence Centres. We don't have museums. We don't have any of these things in our part of the province and I suppose we can't expect them, but the groups that work so hard to promote the cultural activities for the betterment of life of all of the people in these communities should have the unqualified support of the province.

Mr. Martel: Does the Premier get the message?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, some of the things that have been said here a little earlier by my colleague from Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) about the cost of fuel oil and the cost of gasoline in northern Ontario, these are things we have looked at very seriously. And I have said: How can you arrive at a solution? You can't say to the people of southern Ontario that they should pay X number of cents per gallon and then the people in the north should pay less than that. I am not going to suggest that. But I am going to suggest that perhaps a look could be taken at the taxes on gasoline and that perhaps we could say that the taxes on gasoline per gallon in northern Ontario could be reduced in order to bring the price to the same level that is enjoyed in southern Ontario. I think that's worth considering in the future.

I think the government has taken a very positive position in the protection of the environment. We are very concerned in my part of the province with environmental protection, because we see evidence of what has happened in other parts of the world and we are in a position now where we can do something about protecting the environment in northern Ontario—the air, the soil, the water. But now is the time that protection must be taken. I am gratified to say without any hesitation that the large industrial complexes in my area are making a sincere and honest effort to meet the requirements of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and of the Department of the Environment. No one wants to put these people out of business, no one wants to force plants to close down and put people out of work; but I think we have the right to ask that continual progress be expected, and I suggest that it is happening in my part of the province now.

Well Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps gone longer than I had intended, but there are many things that are of concern to myself and that I know are the concern of the people who elected me to come here.

It is not now, nor was it, my intention to be hypercritical of anyone, to be hypercritical of the government, past or present. I simply make my remarks to let it be known that these are the attitudes that some of the people that I represent have reflected to me. I think it is imperative that all of us, in all parts of this province, feel that we are sharing in the prosperity that is ours; and I am satisfied that the government that is in power is aware. I have noted more of an awareness of northern Ontario, more and more in the last couple of years.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps one of the reasons why I heard a remark a few moments ago, a little earlier in my comments, about party affiliations and what have you. You run into it back and forth across the floor and all over this country, and I think for good reason.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to express my appreciation to all of the members of this House who have been kind enough to give me the benefit of their knowledge and to assist me as a new member. I look forward to the next years of working with them for the betterment of the entire province.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Sock it to 'em.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Lots of backing there.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, let me first, like so many others, congratulate you on your appointment. In my first four years I have found that you do carry about you a sense of fairness, a knowledge of the rules of the House and a sense of humour; albeit occasionally, of course, you get rather crabby—but I guess everyone has a few shortcomings. But I know those of us in this party, when we learned of your elevation to this post, were certainly gratified and

delighted for you. I want to take this opportunity to express my congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, on October 21 "the big blue machine" didn't run into too much trouble, but there was one area of the province where it did encounter some difficulty. As the Sudbury Star, that rather noted Tory newspaper indicated, "the blue machine" ran aground on the rocks in the city of Sudbury. Instead of having one Liberal, one New Democrat and one Tory, we now have three New Democrats to the credit of the people of the Sudbury area. There was some real horse trading went on in the last election –

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They have been laying off ever since.

Mr. Martel: I am not sure who horse-traded for the Liberals. It must have been Al Eagleson for the Tories, because the Tories ended up with Jack Raftis in Sudbury, who was formerly a card-carrying Liberal member. They ended up with my good friend from the Soo, who is a sometime known Liberal. In that trade the Tories got a bye, of course, in Cochrane South. There was a bye for the Tories, where the Liberals ran a dog in the manger.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They didn't even know the difference either.

Mr. Martel: Then in Cochrane North, of course, they ran the rather infamous Mr. Kelly. Now that is some horse trading. I don't know who was working for the Liberals, but boy the Leader of the Opposition wants to fire him, because his party came out on the short end of the stick.

Despite all of the pancakes that the Premier (Mr. Davis) gave away in Sudbury, the crowds weren't there. I can recall him coming right next to my headquarters to turn the sod for a community clinic. If it hadn't been for the school children there would have been more people that came in on the bus than residents of that community of 16,000. It was most gratifying to us in our headquarters.

We invited the Premier in for coffee and doughnuts, but he wouldn't come. In fact we could have invited the whole party and all of the Tories who were around and there wouldn't have been enough to fill the headquarters.

But that is the way the vote went in Sudbury East, and that is rather gratifying after four years. They had real troubles, though. They gave free booze away at the university and it didn't work, because I won that as well. Then the white knight came in. They were in trouble. My colleague from Sudbury was running against the candidate, Jack Raftis. He had a slogan, "Housing, Hospitals, Highways and Happiness," and he was really rapping the government on the hospital crisis. Three days before the election they brought in the "White Knight," Lawrence of Ontario, and he signed an agreement. Well it was the wrong Lawrence!

Mr. Lawlor: He brought in happiness itself.

Mr. Martel: That was the then Attorney General (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) coming in to sign an agreement with the hospital people. But it didn't work and Jack Raftis isn't here. Some other interesting things happened. For example the Liberal candidate for Sudbury phoned me. He was really upset. The automobile insurance industry gave $20,000 in the Sudbury area. They gave $10,000 to the Liberal who was running against me. They gave $5,000 to Gaston Demers–the guy who used to sit over there –

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What a waste of money!

Mr. Martel: – and they gave $5,000 to Jack Raftis–$20,000 from the insurance industry in Sudbury alone. I guess Michael Meehan was a little upset, because he didn't get his share of the largess that went around.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): No wonder the premiums are going up.

Mr. Martel: They are getting it back. Everything has gone up. My premiums this year is $50 more. The insurance companies are making back what they spent on behalf of the Tories. They are making back in one year what they spent–the $13,000 a day, I am told–to assist the Tory party.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): They lost money in Saskatchewan last year too.

Mr. Martel. That is right. There was a Liberal government in Saskatchewan last year until the people had the foresight to kick that bunch of hooligans out and return 46 NDP members, I believe; 46 out of 60, which wasn't bad in an election. And we didn't spend $8 million or $10 million to do it.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The Ontario insurance companies have not kept their premiums steady for four years.

Mr. Martel: The interesting thing is, as I told Ross DeGeer—I think he is an organizer for the Tories—I recently suggested to him that as long as his party kept the Tories it has in the Sudbury area we won't even have to run a campaign any more. The Ross Shouldices and the Wicketts and the Moreaus and the Fieldings—with those people supporting the minister we don't even have to run a campaign. They're the biggest shysters in the area. And I'm going to document it, item by item—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The member had better withdraw that.

Mr. Deans: He is going to prove it.

Mr. Martel: I am going to document it, item by item.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Does the member consider that parliamentary?

Mr. Martel: When I deal with those people —the way they have fleeced the people in my area—I could use a lot tougher term.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): They are terrible.

Mr. Martel: And I'm going to document it all this evening, Mr. Speaker—and tomorrow, because I'll never finish tonight.

An hon. member: That's good news.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Does he mean I can leave comfortably?

Mr. Martel: The minister can what?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Does the member mean I can leave comfortably?

Mr. Martel: He can leave any time he wants. I watched with interest last spring when the budget debate wound up. The leader of the New Democratic Party happened to be at a conference in Ottawa and I can well recall the first citizen of the province belittling the leader of the New Democratic Party because he was off electing a federal leader. Well, I haven't seen that man and outside of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs the cabinet has virtually not been here—

Mr. Lawlor: Perfectly right.

Mr. Cassidy: Perfectly right.

Mr. Martel: —for the entire debate. But the Prime Minister—

Mr. Lawlor: Scandalous!

Mr. Martel: —the first citizen; he hasn't been around, yet he could chastise other people for not being here.

Mr. Lawlor: All sitting in little holes in the corner thinking, with no results whatsoever.

Mr. Martel: I want to turn to the budget. There's a document that excited every Ontarian, particularly those from northern Ontario. It really held out the promises for northern Ontario.

Let's see what it said for northern Ontario. "Regional government in 1972." Now that regional government has seen the Sudbury area virtually stand still since 1969. To every local government to which this government has written in the past three years, the answer has been, "No, we can't do anything because regional government is coming." That's a promise for northern Ontario this year. It's been in the budget every year—or the Throne Speech—since 1969.

What else have we got? Oh, yes, essential services. The only way I can see that working is if the government is contemplating building a faculty of medicine at one of the universities in northern Ontario. If that's what the government is about to do I commend them for it.

However, I would suggest rather strongly that that is not going to happen. Statistics, documentation, all indicate that the only way you get people from a particular area to settle in that area is if they are educated there. It's been proven in documentation done in England and in a variety of other countries that the people tend to stay in the area from which they graduate.

I strongly suspect that the next faculty of medicine will go to Waterloo. There's a lot of insurance companies there and that's where it will go. It won't go to northern Ontario. So what the services are that they're going to —that's another thing they've been doing, lo, all these years. I noted with interest the three Conservative people to my left, of all places—the member for Muskoka (Mr. Miller), the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) and the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes). They all chastise the government on one of these things, faculties, or services for people.

I can well recall the former Prime Minister—not the one that just left, John Parmenter, but Les Frost—in 1959, saying, on the eve of an election, "We've decided that the 'nickel basin' is the place and I'm so

happy and proud to announce tonight that that is where the next school hospital for retarded children is going to be." That was 1959. This is 1972. It's not there yet; I guess it's still in the planning stage.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): That was before an election though.

Mr. Martel: Oh, on the eve of the election in June of 1959.

I listen to these people to my left complain about roads. We've been making that point over and over again. The point about price of gasoline has been made over, ad nauseam, in the last four years. It was as though no one could hear over there.

And the tourists. This is the most interesting one of them all, the tourist outfitters. I can well recall the former minister responsible for tourism (Mr. Auld), as he stood in his place and he said, "Oh ho, we are going to help you—$1 million of loans, maximum $50,000," which comes to 20 loans if you give the maximum. Now that was an asset. I can well recall my friend from Fort William (Mr. Jessiman), I believe it is, as we sat through all of those rather nauseating meetings during three days in March. And all of the people, the tourist outfitters, came in and they continually got taken in. You know, the government was going to act on this and the government was going to act on that. And we were going to meet of course, we were going to meet—and there was the chairman over there at one time—we were going to meet to discuss the recommendations. That was in 1969, that was in 1970, that was in—no it wasn't in 1971, we didn't have those meetings; the House was reconvened too late. We never met to discuss any of them.

But you have got the representatives from the tourist outfitters here. They have been taken in, lo, all these years, and they all bemoan the fact that as tourist outfitters they don't get any financial assistance from the government. And yet, you know, interestingly enough, they are all Tories. They are all Tories and they deserve what you are giving them. I hope you continue to give them more of the same, because they will never change. You know, there is one thing about them, they are reliable; you don't have to do anything and they keep giving the vote to you. Well, what else did the government promise us in northern Ontario? It says on page 14, a lignite deposit. Now that has been in the process of being developed—what is it now, 40 years? Forty-odd years? I ask the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), or some place; 40 years it has been discussed and we have now got that. Now that boggles the mind too. So we are going to give it to a company from Alberta for it to reap the largess.

And then we are going to expand the board of directors of the Northern Ontario Development Corp. I looked at the statistics the other day on the loans for northern Ontario and they are virtually non-existent. You have been promising jobs since 1967.

Interestingly enough, tonight you have heard two northerners, and what have they both said? You know, you have given us short change; you haven't created any work for northern Ontario. The way they spoke you wouldn't think they were Tories. In fact, I watched the new minister responsible for justice, that rather large portfolio, this afternoon and he continued to shrink and at last I thought he was going to be right under the desk he was so embarrassed, as the member for Algoma spoke about roads and so on and the things that were missing from northern Ontario.

That really boggled the mind. That is what we have got for northern Ontario, plus the lignite deposit. So that is a great deal. Now that is going to create jobs for northern Ontario.

What is in that Throne Speech? Well I don't know, but that is going to be the solution for the problems confronting northern Ontario. There isn't a thing about job opportunities. There isn't a thing about processing natural resources at the source. There isn't a thing about location of secondary industry related to the natural resources. There is just nothing there.

As I say, it really excited most people who read it carefully, except the Tories; they liked it. They are used to bland stuff and I guess it excited them. It doesn't take much to excite them though. But the part that excited me, was that part on page 11.

> As part of a general review of overall economic policy, my government considers it urgent that there be a re-evaluation of its role and responsibility with regard to the Ontario housing industry, and will seek further means by which housing construction can be encouraged so that more homes are available to more people at the lowest possible cost.

That excites the mind too. It is not as flamboyant as last year's statement, you will recall, which was a lot of platitudes with no substance. But that excites me, because I have recently been involved with some of your friends, Mr. Minister, that we are going

to speak about now. On the problem of housing—and particularly that last point where you say, "so that more homes are available to more people at the lowest possible cost"—this government struck out.

It struck out rather miserably too. I might say, in respect to what has been happening to a good number of residents in my riding and in the riding of my colleague from Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) and, I might add, in the riding of the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) because of some very, very scrupulous businessmen. I won't put the "un" yet—that will come later.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that some of the ways in which we are, of course, going to reduce costs are ways in which the Tory government will never move. There is simply no way that this Tory government is going to put an end to land speculators—just no way, because that infringes on free enterprise.

They don't really care how much the people are fleeced because the government can't infringe on the free enterprise system. Nor will they take a look at the mortgage companies that operate in Ontario and the 15 per cent they are charging the residents in my riding—Traders Finance, Traders Home Plan. At 15 per cent for 15 years on a $15,000 loan the people pay back $37,964 for a $15,000 home. The government won't interfere there because that is free enterprise, you see!

What tools have they got that they are going to use to reduce the cost of a home if they don't get rid of the two main obstacles, the first mortgage, the only mortgage, unless they get rid of the land speculators and unless they reduce the interest rates?

There are other things they could do which would further reduce it For example, they could allow municipalities to assemble and develop land and sell it at cost. I make that point because I recently bought a piece of land in a municipality that does just that. It cost me all of $3,300 for a fully serviced lot—13,000 square feet, underground cable, streets that are paved—the whole bit, sewer and water, $3,300. I wonder about the member from Mississauga (Mr. Kennedy) and his friend who he brought before the select committee, whose free enterprise idea was it doesn't matter if it costs $15,000, that is free enterprise.

Again, the government won't move in these areas where they could naturally reduce the costs because they are going to hurt the free enterprise system which works from one premise, the maximized profit. They feel no moral responsibility to the community. It is maximized profit. I want to talk and bring all of these items out in respect to a housing development in my area—and related to at least another six developments in my area, I might add, just to indicate who is at the head of each of these companies. I might also add that before this came to light I allowed the election to go by so I wouldn't get accused of what I was ultimately accused of – attacking Tories.

The president of the company, one Mr. Ross Shouldice, is the bagman for the Tories. It is a fact of life. They would be better off without him. The president of the Tory riding association in my municipality is the manager for Cambrian Real Estate. The first vice-president of the Tory organization in Sudbury is an assistant manager, one Mr. Wickett. He was elected last Thursday. I make these points.

You know with friends like that up there you don't need an enemy, Mr. Speaker! You don't need an enemy at all. They are built into the organization; it is unfortunate.

What did Cambrian do in Rock View Estates? I want to start with a couple of letters I wrote to the minister—not the minister with us, but the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales)—on June 21, 1971. Three months before this development started I wrote the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and in a reference in my letter I said,

> Despite the fact that Valley East has an official plan, and is obtaining sewers and water, it is difficult to get an amendment which will allow badly needed houses to be built. Yet as Mr. Lyndenback indicates in Dryden, an unorganized township, there is a development of 43 homes under way by a contractor. It is most frustrating to a council which has planned carefully for the future to wait months and months to have an approval which is still forthcoming, while a contractor in an unorganized township can get the approval to move ahead creating yet more problems. I understand that Mr. Chris Sola has been trying for several years to stop development in unorganized townships—including Dryden—to no avail. Possibly the department should act on Mr. Sola's recommendations.

Mr. Sola happens to work for the Department of Municipal Affairs—and he has been trying.

Also the department might expedite ap-

provals such as in Valley East. I got a letter from the Minister—I had just hinted at this subdivision that I didn't want and didn't feel should go ahead—but I got a small letter that said:

> With reference to Mr. Martel's letter and yours regarding development of 43 homes in the unorganized township of Dryden, I wish to inform you that this development is taking place on lots that were approved before subdivision control came into effect.

I subsequently wrote the minister another letter on July 12, and I said:

> With reference to the development of 43 homes on a second subdivision, I haven't been able to –

Pardon me, that's to Mr. Don Taylor. I didn't figure the minister would act, so I wrote Don Taylor as well as the Minister of Municipal Affairs. And I had spoken to him on the telephone,

> With reference to the development of 43 homes on a second subdivision, I haven't been able to obtain the plan number. However, when investigation of the first problem gets under way I would hope that the second subdivision could be examined. I understand, as I indicated to you, that the houses are to be built on swampy ground. If this is the case, hopefully action can be undertaken.

Well, I'm still waiting for a reply. I also wrote the minister on July 20, and I said:

> With respect to the Dryden development of 43 homes. I have written to Mr. Taylor of your staff to have the matter at least investigated. I am informed that the development will be on very swampy ground and that construction of the houses will create an instant slum because of the poor quality of material and workmanship which is going into this subdivision. The shortage of houses in the Sudbury area necessitates that people buy these and, like subdivisions in other communities, the houses fall apart within months of purchase.

I waited vainly, of course, for a reply from the minister; he didn't acknowledge this letter. This was before the actual construction of more than two units had started—but to no avail.

I subsequently followed that up with yet another letter to the same minister, the hon. Dalton Bales. This one's dated Aug. 31. You know, he slipped in one day, then he slipped out and then he went down and he visited but he didn't bother to call me or to indicate through his staff that he would be there. But he went down to look at it, and it progressed smoothly.

But I wrote him again, and I said:

> I might suggest, also, that the subdivision, which I presume you saw when you were here in Dryden township, has been given approval by the health unit for the installation of septic tanks. The 43 houses are being built on what is basically a swampy area, and in spring they will be in mud right to their knees.

Well, it continued, Mr. Speaker. Subsequently, because I couldn't get the Minister of Municipal Affairs, who's responsible for subdivision control and municipal development, to act, I wrote the then Minister of Health (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) and suggested to him that he might intervene because this land just didn't suit a housing development.

I got a reply from his executive assistant. It was dated Nov. 2; I had written on Oct. 12. Those were the hectic days when most people weren't answering their mail. I got a letter from Mr. Mealing, who I believe is an executive assistant to Mr. Lawrence. It says:

> In your letter you were particularly concerned with the housing development in the township of Dryden. In the attached letter and report from the Sudbury and District Health Unit it will be noted that each lot application has been carefully considered and many of them have not been approved.

But if you go there today, they're all built on. Never been approved! That's just an interesting little sidelight.

Well, what did it say in this memo that they sent? Well, Mr. Moreau phoned the health unit to try to get approval for his subdivision, and in a memo dated Feb. 8, 1971, he requested lot approvals for this subdivision and stated that this subdivision was registered. Well, that's nonsense. It's never been a planned subdivision. Never. One would suspect that if the Department of Municipal Affairs provided the health unit with the fact that this had never been an approved plan of subdivision someone would try to put the squelch on the development of this property in this unorganized township. No one did but there it was.

I ask the question, how can someone say it is a planned subdivision? That would be a kind of fraudulent statement to make to the department, I would rather suspect, or to the health unit in the Sudbury area. Nothing

happened. The builder continued his merry way.

As I say, this was in February, 1971, and members will notice that the Department of Municipal Affairs said they knew nothing about this plan of subdivision. It had never been approved. The health unit knew and yet, here we are in August, building houses without approval. It is interesting.

I want to tell the House how they got approval for some of the lots. They eventually got some approval. In an unorganized township without a septic system or without a proper sewage system, you have to install septic tanks. What you do is you have an accredited firm come in and take a percolation test of the soil. My understanding is that it is a very simple procedure. You simply drill a hole four feet into the ground. You put the water in and fill it up to the top and you wait to see how long it takes to run off or to filter into the soil so that you determine whether or not it is satisfactory to install a septic system.

Well, it didn't go down! It didn't go down at all, so what my friends did was they went out and they brought in two feet of gravel. They put the gravel on the lot and they drilled a four foot hole and they filled it up. Within eight seconds it went down two feet, but it just stayed there at two feet.

So you can see what is going to happen this spring with the septic systems there. The chairman of OWRC would appreciate that. It goes down two feet and then it goes along the surface. Can members imagine what is going to happen with these septic systems come next spring? I have great visions of what is going to happen. It is not going to be a particularly delightful place to be.

But that's how the percolation tests were given. This information was provided to the health unit but still no action. Things continued. Houses were built on lots that were never approved.

On November 25, I wrote the Minister of Health another letter and beseeched him to intervene on behalf of the people. I questioned the following things. I said:

> With respect to the problem involving Dryden township, I note with interest on page 4 of the summary of information provided by the health unit, an indication on Oct. 26 that lots 11, 12, 17, 28, 29, 32, 33, 44 and 45 have been approved and that there had been apparently deliberate violations by the contractor. I would not be surprised if one went out there now and found the houses were built.

I subsequently went out to check and, lo and behold, there were the houses. They were all there but the health unit missed some of this. In fact, they missed a lot of things. The people were living in the houses.

It was interesting how I came actually to see the houses. A businessman in the city of Sudbury, who was requested to service the furnaces in those homes, refused to because the furnaces were installed backwards! He refused to accept responsibility so he contacted me to see if I would come down to see them. I went down to see them and it just boggled the mind.

On Nov. 30, I went to the houses. I am just going to read what's wrong with some of these houses; just a few items, 16 or 20 of them! From Mr. Daniel Wood.

> The rear basement wall was hit with a machine. It is severely cracked and has moved in from the frame of the house, leaving a gap of approximately six inches.

Can you imagine how much that six inches keeps out the cold in winter? Great stuff.

> We were told that the backyard would be at least level and a ditch would be dug across all three lots at the base of the mountain to divert run-off in that ditch along the railroad tracks.

This has not been done so they are going to swim this summer or this spring.

> The siding has not been installed. The brick has not been filled around the windows. There is no mortar in them. There are no air vents to the attic—which I understand must be installed to comply with the building code, if we had one in the province. We need a lid for the well.

In fact these people needed a well because, interestingly enough, in every house there was no septic system, there was no drinking water, there was no plumbing. Yet they were being sold and lived in with the health unit knowing of these facts, and I might say –

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Four rooms and a path.

Mr. Martel: What's that?

Mr. Martel: Four rooms and a path.

Mr. Martel: Well they didn't even have that, because it was too late to dig it! Well, what else in this same house?

> The basement windows were installed improperly, leaving gaps. In fact, there were no basement windows in some of them. There were no pipes for the oil

tank; you had to bring a pipe in through a window or through the kitchen down into the basement. There were no pipes. The holes were in the walls, but no pipes. The sump pump burned out and it has never been replaced.

This was the end of November, and in northern Ontario it is fairly cold by November and things are freezing – except in this subdivision which I had complained about. I stated that it was on a swamp, because even in January the water is running into the houses.

You wonder where government has been all the time. Not that they weren't advised; I took a number of inspectors from the various departments round. The sump pump burned out and had never been replaced, so you got two to four inches of water. The hydro is installed improperly. One wonders where Ontario Hydro was when they were inspecting. There is no pump-out for the sump pump. We were promised steps to the front, and interestingly enough most of them didn't even have steps at front or back. There is no trim on the gable ends–this is all one house I am talking about. That was a Christmas present they got. I might say that the fuel bill for one month, November, was $98 – rather expensive. You see they had to stuff the windows with Kleenex. They didn't even have the buttons that filled in the holes on the sashless windows.

And the one house, it was interesting, part of the agreement was that they would have these windows that have a vacuum between the panes. They had one installed and they said they would put the rest in. When the woman came back, she came back too quickly–they were taking that one out and they were replacing them with just ordinary panes. But she had signed the agreement, you see, and interestingly enough they didn't get copies of the agreement. There are going to be some rather interesting developments in this.

Mr. Cassidy: Why would anybody live in these houses?

Mr. Martel: I'll tell you why they were living in these houses. I went to see a family which was living in a lean-to made of cedar boughs. And do you want to know why there were no houses?

Mr. Cassidy: Shameful.

Mr. Martel: Because the government, through its Ontario Housing, admits today that they built less than half the houses they were responsible for over the last four years–they admitted it in correspondence. In fact, Inco and Falconbridge–and I don't give them credit for very much, but to their credit on this occasion, they advised the supersalesman and his staff in 1967 of their expansion programme over five years, and the supersalesman did nothing and neither did Ontario Housing. I'll tell you when Falconbridge started to move. You know, they don't send you any Christmas cards. Neither does Inco. They don't do like the former Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Yaremko) and send Valentine cards to everyone; but they got tired of me taking them on over the housing. I used to blame them and they gave me a call and they said: "We advised the government in 1967." So I wrote the supersalesman. I had been writing him for about 12 months but I couldn't even get a response apart from the usual letter, the run around.

I wrote the supersalesman and I said: "Isn't it interesting that Inco and Falconbridge advised you of their expansion programme?" Within two weeks–after 12 months of trying–a representative of Ontario Housing was in Sudbury to see me.

That is why there is no housing and that is why people were forced into buying cruddy shacks, paying $15,000. And by the time they are finished paying back the 15 per cent mortgage for 15 years, they have paid back $37,964 on a $15,000 shack that is falling apart, that when they moved into didn't have any drinking water. In fact, there weren't even wells, they didn't have septic systems; the plumbing wasn't inspected and the basements were full of water.

Mr. Cassidy: Shameful!

Mr. Martel: In fact, one very interesting thing happened. They got the roof on–they put it up in sections–and then they put the shingles on and, with the weight of them, the roof fell off. That is a sturdy house.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Who built it?

Mr. Martel: That is Cambrian Real Estate.

Mr. Cassidy: The Tories built it.

Mr. Martel: That is Moreau and Wickett. By the way, the minister can see why I say with friends like that he doesn't need an enemy.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That must be a house built on sand. Was it?

Mr. Martel: It wasn't just one house. In fact, there are now six subdivisions, which

I will name, plus the fact the member for Sault Ste. Marie now tells me that Cambrian has moved up there. I hope—and he indicates that he will—he will join with me to stop this band of hooligans.

That is one house; I haven't read all the complaints. I can read them all. As a result of all of these complaints, Mr. Speaker, we called a meeting to try to help the people. We formed a homeowners' group and we had a Mrs. Woods as the president—just a small tiny thing. Her gift for taking on that rather difficult role was one series of phone calls after another with harassments, threats, the whole gamut.

Then, of course, as the heat became a little hotter, the cook couldn't stay in the kitchen. They then started to phone me. One Ross Shouldice phoned to indicate that, if I even so much as said a word, I would be faced with the prospect of a law suit, which ultimately came in the neighbourhood of $100,000, compliments of one Mr. Reg. Moreau. But we got the people formed into a homeowners' group.

Then I met with the health unit, Municipal Affairs, Financial and Commercial Affairs. They were very good. I must say that they were most helpful.

The Department of Labour sent Mr. Adams in, who is going to be responsible, I understand, for developing the uniform building code. He was floored by what he saw. The one department that wouldn't send anyone in was—can you guess who?—that great supporter of justice in this province, none other than Lawrence of Ontario, the "White Knight". The "White Knight" wouldn't send anyone in, even though there were threats. He said, "No, no, our department can't send anyone in."

The legal people tell me that anonymous phone calls, threatening people, constitute a criminal action. I would suspect that the man who was responsible for justice at that time, before reorganization, should have been only too anxious to send someone in—but not the "White Knight".

No, no. He talks. In fact, he is the greatest reformer when it comes to talk but when the nuts and bolts come down, he is the most archconservative of them all. That guy isn't even in the ball league, he is such an archconservative. But he gives that flair, that appearance of someone who is concerned about people.

I can well recall standing in my place two years ago advising the House and advising the members that Lawrence of Ontario was trying to capture northern Ontario as his power base for the leadership of that august party over there, and I was right. Great reformer! You heard him today when my colleague from Lakeshore questioned him. He sounded like a reformer, too.

We had the meeting and, out of the meeting, do you know what happened? Every house was condemned. Every house in the subdivision was condemned. There wasn't one left. Here it is: Condemned Wanapitei Subdivision Units."

It is interesting. I had arranged the meeting. I had never given it to the press in four months of trying to press for this and, out of it, after all the houses were condemned, I was the one accused of being political and it was "political harassment" of those Tories. It is in an article which I will read a little later on. I was harassing the Tories. I was doing it because they were all Conservative members and for four and a half months at least, it didn't even get to the press as I tried to get various government agencies to move on it. But, Mr. Moreau very generously after it was exposed and all the houses were condemned, was going to fix it, but not morally—pardon me, he was doing it morally. It had nothing to do with legal responsibility. He was doing it out of the goodness of his heart. Now that really captured the imagination of everyone in the Sudbury area. He was doing this out of the goodness of his heart.

Well, he was doing it because every house was condemned and, despite the fact that some of them were sold, people hadn't moved into them yet and it would have meant that if people hadn't taken possession of the house, he would have to repay the money. But, he was very generous—he was going to do it.

As I say, we got the people organized into a group—but it is interesting. An article in the Toronto Star of Friday, Dec. 31, "New Homes Condemned; Owners Don't Know Whom to Blame." Well, that is not the story we got, as our friends, Wickett, Moreau and company. And Boivin – I forgot Stanley. He is only the president of Sudbury East riding PCs. I forgot him.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): He is the clean-cut one.

Mr. Martel. He is the clean-cut one, that's right. He cuts well.

An hon. member: He has a white hat.

Mr. Martel: Yes. Well, you want to see them. Well, anyway, the –

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Stan who?

Mr. Martel: Stan Boivin, president, PC association, Sudbury East. I only make the point with friends like that the people opposite haven't got the ghost of a chance in the Sudbury area. Keep them around, it helps.

Well, the houses were condemned, and it was political harassment on my part. You know, the poor beggars.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Don't give any secrets away, Elie. You want to win again too.

Mr. Martel: Well, I will tell you what, to my friend the member for–what is your riding, Bill?

Mr. Hodgson: Just call me Bill.

Mr. Martel: That 8,500 majority, Bill, is going to serve me quite well come the next time around.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Don't give away all your secrets.

Mr. Martel: That is something like 55 per cent of the vote and I don't quake as much as some other people over there might. I don't have sleepless nights over it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is not much quaking going on.

Mr. Martel: What was that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is not much quaking going on.

Mr. Martel: There isn't? They tell me the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. Apps), quaked–what was it, 167?

Mr. W. Hodgson: What about the member's leader? What was his majority?

Mr. Martel: It was 190. He did well.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A landslide in comparison.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, might I stop here, before I launch into another section of this rather wonderful story about some rather unscrupulous gentlemen in the Sudbury area?

Mr. Speaker: A motion to adjourn the debate would be in order.

Mr. Martel moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the House leader whether it is the intention of the government to proceed with any of the bills on the order paper before the Easter recess?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): In our desire to allow all members to participate in the current debate we will sit through tomorrow in the same debate.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Is there a night session tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 13, 1972

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Martel 329

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Martel, agreed to 358

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 358



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 11

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 14, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have many visitors with us today.

In both galleries we have students from Central Park Senior Public School of Oshawa. At 3 o'clock this afternoon in the west gallery we have students from Churchill Heights Public School of Scarborough and in the east gallery students from the same school. Also in the east gallery at 3 o'clock will be students from George Brown College of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in September, 1971, a special task force and an advisory committee were appointed to examine and recommend changes in the organization of the Department of Education.

The task force was headed by Mr. Sandy Aird, a senior partner of P. S. Ross & Partners, management consultants, and included persons from the Department of Education, other government departments and outside management consultants.

The advisory committee to this task force was headed by Mr. Michael Koerner, a businessman, and included persons representing various levels of education throughout the province.

The study was conducted in close co-operation with the educational community of the province. The views of hundreds of people involved in education were solicited and considered by the task force.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to tell the House that following receipt of the task force report—and in a few minutes copies of the task force report will be put on the members' desks—we are announcing a significant reorganization of the Department of Education.

We are following closely the recommendations of the task force, although there are matters of detail which we will handle somewhat differently from what has been recommended. There is no doubt that the report and its recommendations have given us a sound basis from which we can build an effective and responsive department for the years ahead.

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, we find that in the past 10 years the department has made significant strides in reordering the process of education delivery in Ontario, primarily through the establishment of large units of education administration and the delegation of increased responsibility to the school boards of these larger units. This movement brings with it the need for the school boards in these larger units to assume a growing degree of self-determination in the operation of their affairs.

Such decentralization necessitates a new description of the relationship which must exist in the 1970s between the department and the local authorities. What must be accepted not just in words but in organizational terms and in action is that the responsibility for the delivery of programmes of education has been decentralized and delegated to these larger units of educational administration—that is the school boards, school trustees, officials, school principals and teachers. However, such decentralization does not imply abdication by the minister or the department of their responsibilities, but merely that responsibility is shared in an essential unity of purpose.

Authority and responsibility in education in Ontario have always been divided between local communities and the broader provincial community. The balance between the two has continually changed and the present trend toward greater autonomy for local authorities will likely continue, although provincial authority will not be abandoned. For instance, the Department of Education must retain its authority over the redistribution of money to local authorities as a prime means of insuring equalization of educational opportunity. However, maximum scope in establishing priorities is vital at the local level.

I therefore feel, as this task force has stated, that the department must take into account the changing nature of the delivery system and the trends which will take place in the years ahead as school boards develop

greater effectiveness and maturity. I see the responsibilities of the Department of Education in carrying out this role—which is indeed its role, Mr. Speaker—as:

The conducting and sponsoring of research and planning relating to the short and long range needs of education in Ontario.

The formulation of government policies consistent with these plans.

The development of educational programmes and activities appropriate to these policies, and where practicable delegation of their implementation outside the department.

The establishment of measurable programme delivery guidelines.

The evaluation of programme delivery effectiveness against these guidelines.

The provision of assistance necessary to improve the capacity of school boards to carry out effectively their responsibilities for educational administration.

In discharging these responsibilities the department will ensure the provision of strong leadership and guidance, and equally important the principle of responsible local autonomy.

The new organizational structure of the department envisages that, in the long term, a major part of the delivery of education programmes will be delegated and decentralized. Consistent with this principle, and with the responsibilities of the Department of Education which I have just outlined, the new structure places the responsibilities of the department within three major functional areas:

1. The educational development function.
2. The educational administration function.
3. The support services.

It also recognizes the continuing need for a regional organization, acting between the department and the local educational authorities.

Mr. Speaker, each of these three major functional areas will operate directly under the deputy minister and will be headed by an assistant deputy minister. The educational development division will have Mr. Frank Kinlin as assistant deputy minister. The department services division will have Mr. Stuart Stephen as assistant deputy minister, and the educational administration division will have Mr. George Waldrum as assistant deputy minister. Both Mr. Kinlin and Mr. Stephen have been assistant deputy ministers under the existing organization. Mr. Waldrum is currently director of the supervision branch.

At the moment, decisions about further personnel assignments have been made only in terms of the directors of the various branches within each of the three divisions. And the hon. members will find, on the last two pages of the statement, the new staff and directors of each of these divisions.

Assignment of other personnel within the branches will become part of the whole implementation process as the reorganization plan comes into effect, starting immediately.

Within the educational administration division will fall five major areas of responsibility, including the 10 regional offices of the department throughout the province. The other four branches in this division are curriculum services, supervisory services, school grants and finance, and educational exchange.

Within the educational development division will be the following branches: Planning and development, curriculum development, teacher education and provincial schools, including schools for the deaf and the blind, correspondence schools and the hospital schools.

Within the departmental services division will be the following areas of responsibility: Financial management, management services, legislation and regulations, personnel, educational data processing, educational records, library and information services, and the budget office.

It has already been indicated in the Speech from the Throne that a senior French-language official will be appointed in the department, and an announcement will be made regarding this appointment in the next few days. At the present time, no action has been taken on the recommended position—that is recommended by the task force—of director of public information services, pending the receipt of the report of the Committee on Government Productivity on this particular matter.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that all this structural realignment will provide a firm foundation from which we can move toward improving services on all fronts. It is only a starting point because organizational charts can themselves achieve little. This foundation, however, will permit everyone involved in education in Ontario to develop more effective working relationships—professional educators and people of other backgrounds working in common cause for the betterment of education of our children.

Mr. Speaker, we are proceeding with the implementation of the new organization immediately. Very shortly I expect, the three

assistant deputy ministers, and their directors under each of their divisions, will have worked out detailed terms of reference for each branch. Personnel will then he assigned to the branches. Finally, determinations regarding the organization and development of each of the—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): One would think it was a battlefield rather than an educational field. The minister has divisions, a front, and troops.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He is terribly disorganized.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) said it sounds like the command system of the United States Army.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting! My hon. friends know nothing about the involvement of people in the development of their own system.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is typical—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is typical that the minister would call it a delivery system.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They will find in this a process that develops, that involves the people in the development of their own system.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Where do the members think it came from? There hasn't been an original thought in the educational system for years.

Mr. Lewis: Sounds like an inter-continental ballistic missile.

An hon. member: He is talking about the army.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm pleased to say, Mr.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the second phase of our reorganization plan is now under way. The task force is continuing its activities by closely examining the 10 regional offices throughout the province and the relationship of these offices—

An hon. member: What is the minister doing; searching or destroying?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I think he should abort the whole mission.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —both to the central administration and to the local school systems they are intended to serve.

Mr. Renwick: Why doesn't he?

Mr. Lewis: How many sorties did they fly before arriving at that conclusion?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am pleased to say that Mr. Aird will continue to head the task force—

Mr. Renwick: There is not a word about bussing in here.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —for this important review. Also, in addition to the several members—

Mr. Renwick: It is perfectly obvious the minister should withdraw.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course it's again very obvious, as it's always obvious, that the hon. member for Scarborough West isn't interested in the education of the children of this province.

Mr. Renwick: It is a ridiculous statement!

Hon. Mr. Wells: The hon. members of the NDP are—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —never interested in anything. I think the people know exactly where the NDP stands on these things.

Mr. Lewis: That is true!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that Mr. Aird will continue to head the task force in this important review of our regional offices. Also, in addition to this, several members will be added to the task force from outside the department to give the review a very comprehensive form. As I indicated to the members of the educational community who were present this morning, he will be holding public hearings as part of his review of the regional office setup.

Another part of the second phase will be a study by Mr. Keith Clarke, the new director of the provincial schools branch. He will review the various operational units under his responsibility, including schools for the deaf and blind, hospital schools and correspondence schools. His objective will be to ensure

that we have the most effective type of organizational relationship in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the major outcome of the organization we are introducing today will be a new spirit of co-operation and enthusiasm, which will pervade not only the Department of Education but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, local school authorities and ultimately the young people in the schools of this province.

Mr. Renwick: That is the first cabinet minister who bit the dust.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

REORGANIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Education if he is not concerned that the humanity in the school system will have been drained out by following so precisely the recommendations of the efficiency experts that have been employed? If, in fact, he has committed himself to efficiency and the improvement of what he chooses to call the delivery system, will we, in fact, be saving money at the same time as we are attempting to improve the education system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course I realize—and I guess he can be excused for this—the Leader of the Opposition has not had a chance to read the task force report. He will find that for the first time probably in the reorganization of any government department—and in this government particularly—the suggestions and comments of people outside have been asked for. Teachers and principals were written and asked what they thought about the department and what they would suggest. This all went into the mix, out of which came this task force report, and it does in fact take into account—

Mr. Lewis: I guess you call that the input.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It does in fact take into account the humanity of the whole situation and it will in fact over the years, I think, save money.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister promise me that he will stop calling it the delivery system?

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't he just call it scorched-earth policy?

EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT'S ACTIONS QUESTIONED

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour—in the absence of the Premier (Mr. Davis)—and obviously he has got a lot of explaining to do in here:

First, will he explain why the statements that emanate from his department seem to come in the name of his executive assistant instead of himself; and in that connection, will he explain why his executive assistant is purveying press releases from General Motors?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I should first like to assure him as well as every member of this House that I had no knowledge of any news release brought here by my executive assistant. I had never seen a copy of it and I didn't even know that he had distributed some of these press releases around the Legislature—not in the Legislature but outside.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The minister is still calling him executive assistant?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): What position does he hold today?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have the same close rapport with the Workmen's Compensation Board as he has with his assistant?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, I can explain.

The statement that I made yesterday was prepared in my office I spent a great deal of time on it—probably a couple of hours; a draft copy was made and then sent to the Workmen's Compensation Board for final typing and also to obtain some statistics which I needed. That goes for my statement.

As for the news release, I didn't know one thing about it until the reports or people in the news media asked me the question. I called my executive assistant to my office, reprimanded him in no uncertain terms and I have in front of me his tendered resignation, which I am considering.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is it not true that both the minister's statement and the press release from General Motors were delivered to the press gallery at the same time and by the same individual?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am told that the statement which I made yesterday was given to the press gallery here not at the

same time as my executive assistant had the news releases in his files outside of the House. He went and got some of these copies and gave them to the press gallery and also the members' lounge; not in the House.

PAYMENTS TO FORMER WCB VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, once again in the absence of the Premier, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has begun some kind of an inquiry at the ministerial level into the decision taken by his predecessor to continue the pay, if not the employment, of the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will realize I wasn't the Minister of Labour at that time. I would think that if the question was directed to the former Minister of Labour he would be glad to answer it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, now that the former Minister of Labour is in his place, I would like to ask the Attorney General (Mr. Bales)—let us say the former former minister under whose direction this arrangement was entered into—what sort of an explanation he can give the House; and if in fact he, like some other employees of the government, is not considering putting his resignation before the Premier because of his activities in this connection?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Go back to the McGillivray report and find the answer.

Mr. Lewis: I think they should call an election.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am not putting any resignation before the Premier on this business.

If the hon. member wishes the background on this matter, in reference to the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, I will be pleased to give it from my recollection of the situation.

Mr. Cauley was appointed to the Workmen's Compensation Board as a board member in, I believe, 1944. About 1951, by order in council, he was made a vice-chairman of that board and remained so until his resignation. In 1965 or thereabouts Mr. Cauley had a very serious heart attack and he was away from the office for some protracted period of time. That is before I became the minister. After I became the minister, he had returned to his office and continued the work of vice-chairman of the board, along with two other members, Mr. Bruce Legge and Dr. Steele.

Dr. Steele's health was not too good and he retired from that board and Mr. Sid R. Johnston took his place as an acting commissioner. Mr. Johnston was a former solicitor of the board and had served in that capacity for some time.

In the spring of 1969, Mr. Cauley was away from his duties on the board—periodically. I don't know during what period of time, except I know he was away. He came to see me at my request because he had been away for a period of time and I wanted to ask and see how he was and how his health was.

When he saw me in my office we discussed his health and his ability to carry out his work. It was at that point that he offered his resignation because he said he could not carry on with his duties as required so that board hearings could be held in their normal course.

The resignation, I see in reading the newspaper this morning, has been printed there and that is, as far as I can check, a copy of the original resignation which was submitted to me, and is in the files of the Minister of Labour.

At that time he expressed concern to me as to his own financial situation. He expressed the hope that we would recognize his long years of service and the fact that he had accumulated very substantial sick credits and holiday credits over a period of—at that point it was 25 years' service to the board.

At the same time, since he was a member of the board—he was in full knowledge of this—he knew that there was a management study proceeding in reference to the salaries of senior staff of the Workmen's Compensation Board, as well as members of the board itself. The report from the management consultants was just about finished, but it had not been finalized nor acted upon by the board or the government.

He expressed the hope to me that since it would become effective normally while he was a member of the board he should receive any retroactive provisions that were made in reference to those salary adjustments.

I felt that both of those matters were reasonable; that they were in accordance with the board's general policy. He did not have the figures with him, but I said in principle I thought that those two arrangements were satisfactory and he would then go on normal pension at the end of the period of time.

That is what has actually taken place, except I find today in checking this matter that he was short some 20 days—about a month's time—to achieve retirement and the board allowed him that space of time. And then he went on retirement on a normal retirement basis.

There are several statements that he made, that have been made in the Globe and Mail story this morning, to which I take exception. Exception because they are not the facts. He said in one place that the only time he met me was the day I was sworn into office.

We met the day I was sworn into office, that's quite true. We met a number of times subsequently, as board members together but also individually. I frequently met with the chairman of the board following the board meetings wherein the matters of policy were conveyed to me for transmission to the government and for decision. Let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, I met Mr. Cauley a substantial number of times during my tenure as Minister of Labour until his retirement. I have only seen him, I think, once since that time.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): How many times?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I said a number of times. I would have to go back to my diary to find the exact number of times.

Mr. Sargent: That is the important part of this. How many times?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Quite a substantial number of times.

In reference to the next matter, he refers to certain amendments of 1968; that is in reference to the McGillivray report.

The McGillivray report recommendations became the basis of government legislation and the members of the Workmen's Compensation Board prepared reports on the implications or the effects of the recommendations, and those were submitted to me as the basis of consideration for legislation by the government.

Mr. Cauley, I presume, participated in that as a member of the board. Those various submissions were given to me, I'm sure by all members of the board, but also by staff from time to time on behalf of the board.

He also went on to one other point. He said—or at least it is indicated here—that I asked a member of the staff, or a senior member of the staff of the Workmen's Compensation Board, to go and see him for his resignation. That is not the fact. I have never asked anyone to do those things on my behalf and in this instance I did not need to ask Mr. Cauley for his resignation; he offered it.

Next, he said that he would continue on normal salary, or at least that I asked him to get a medical certificate that would not permit him to work. Those are not the facts.

It is also indicated that I had promised he would continue on full salary until age 65 and that he would be paid accumulated benefits. I take that to mean that he would continue on normal salary until 65 and then, in addition, he would receive accumulated benefits. That is not the case in any way. He had a substantial number of benefits accumulated to him according to his records and those were honoured in the normal policy of the board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With a cheque for $28,000?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I beg pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: With a cheque for $28,000? After a lengthy illness?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Let me deal with one other matter. At the time—and I check the notes on this one—as of 1966 when I went to the department, and it was prior to that, a year prior, Mr. Cauley was receiving the sum of $20,500 as vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

On the recommendation of the management consultants—they were doing work throughout the government so as to bring salaries in the various agencies in line—it was their recommendation that the salaries of the members of the board including the vice-chairman—or, at least the vice-chairman's salary should be increased to $27,000 as of October 1, 1967. That was done. I referred to this earlier, that since he was a member of the board at the time this matter was under consideration that he should receive the benefit of that, and he received it.

There was a further adjustment as of October 1, 1969 and this was part of the management consultant's recommendations. He did not receive that benefit. He was entitled to a retroactive cheque and that was sent to him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the minister deny the allegation that, in fact, Mr. Cauley had irreconcilable differences with the new chairman of the board and that the minister accepted his responsibility in this matter by simply handing over what amounted to $100,000 to get an embarrassment off the

scene at the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No. I deny that. I acknowledge that there were differences of opinion.

Mr. Lewis: Differences of opinion! The minister knows Jack Cauley and he knows they were more than differences of opinion.

Mr. Singer: They couldn't stand each other.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well there were differences of opinion in view and in policy between members of the board, and I had one particular meeting with all members of that board and told them that they were to reconcile their differences if they could. If not they were to come back to me and we would explore the problem, and they did.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And somebody would be fired, eh?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I never said that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why not? Why not?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I never said that. I told them they had to reconcile those differences. I also told Mr. Cauley that we could not have board meetings postponed at the last minute because there were not sufficient members of the board there to conduct the business.

These matters have been dealt with and, I think, in a straightforward way. I referred earlier to Mr. Sid Johnston, who was an acting member of the board. He had retired in May, 1969. On his retirement we appointed Mr. David Decker of Ottawa as the vice-chairman of the board. Following Mr. Cauley's resignation, we appointed Mr. Douglas Hamilton, the secretary of the Ontario Federation of Labour, as the third member of the board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary question on this matter directed to the Premier: Has he instituted an inquiry into the action of his present Attorney General, former Minister of Labour, which resulted in the loss of $100,000 of money in the Workmen's Compensation Board's funds for services that were never rendered?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): I think the answer to that question is really self-evident.

I have discussed this with the now Attorney General who in his responsibilities as the former Minister of Labour undertook a very difficult task to reconcile certain problems within the jurisdiction of the Workmen's Compensation Board. He did it in a very creditable way—I think a very humane way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: An expensive way!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition may say it was expensive. This government is also interested in the welfare of people who have served the people of this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Welfare!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: What about the workman and his pension?

Hon. Mr. Davis: In a way that was equitable to the individual—

Mr. Lewis: It certainly wasn't equitable.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly it was.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, can the Premier—it is very awkward, Mr Speaker, because many of us know what Jack Cauley suffered at the hands of the board for so many years when the ministers would not intervene.

Does the Premier know of any other circumstance in his memory where, in order to resolve a difference of opinion within a government agency, $27,000 a year for two years and four months has been paid, plus $28,000 of fringe benefits, as a way of resolving an internal conflict?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know of any personally. There may have been other situations over the past number of years. I do not know of any personally.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Do the government ever think to fire Legge?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, may I correct one statement made by the leader of the NDP? He was paid salary on the basis of his sick credits. He was not paid $27,000 for two years, plus sick credits. He was paid sick credits which were the equivalent of salary for that period of time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—I want to get this clear, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister saying that his sick credits equalled $62,000 between May, 1969, and August, 1971?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't know where that figure comes from. I haven't calculated it nor have I received it from the board, but I would say this to the member. He received effective salary on the basis of $27,000 a year.

Mr. Lewis: Based on sick leave the minister says?

Hon. Mr. Bales: On the basis of sick leave for days that he had accumulated for sick leave and holidays.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is it not coincidental that the accumulated sick leave should equal exactly the salary as recommended by the management consultant firm?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No it's—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, it's not!

Hon. Mr. Bales: Sick leave is paid on the basis of salary.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but for the period from May, 1969, to August, 1971? Is the minister saying then that the further $28,580 will not be issued?

Hon. Mr. Bales: For the moneys afterwards? No! I said that in my statement.

Mr. Lewis: To cover the 29 weeks in holidays and six months accumulated sick leave benefits?

Hon. Mr. Bales: What I said to the member was that Mr. Cauley has been paid salary on the basis of sick leave credit and holiday credit that fell short of his actual retirement by about a month's time.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't know the exact amount. And that is the money he receives as salary. He does not receive, in addition to that, sick credits. That is what it says in the paper that he is asking, but it is not what he is receiving.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, would the minister be kind enough to table in the House tomorrow the actual amount of money which has been paid in order to differentiate it from what has been written?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I do not have those figures. They come through the Minister of Labour, but I am sure he will obtain them.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a further question? Well, it is on the same—a supplementary in fact.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member may have one more supplementary. There are others who await supplementaries.

Mr. Lewis: Well, then I have an opportunity to ask questions. I can wait.

Mr. Speaker: Right! The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be interesting to know from the minister—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question? Please, no statements.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this very important arm of government handles many hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and the minister says that he had a substantial number of meetings on its operations, I wish he would qualify how many—what does he call substantial? What is substantial? How many meetings did he have a year—by number?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that, to say how many I had. I had numerous meetings, and I would say to the member usually with the chairman—

Mr. Sargent: The minister said yesterday—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bales: —if the hon. member would like an answer please—with the chairman of the board following the board meetings. He always reported to me in reference to any matters of policy that they were concerned with.

I had a standing arrangement with the members of the board that I could see them or that they could see me on request. I saw the members of the board from time to time all together. Sometimes I saw them individually. I do not have a record with me as to the exact occasions on which I saw them. My diary would show some of them, but not all of them.

Mr. Sargent: The minister called once a month or 12 times a year? How many meetings would he have?

Hon. Mr. Bales: No, I didn't meet on a regular basis with the full board. I met at least three times—on an average about three times a month—with the chairman of the board—

Mr. Lewis: That is the mistake all of them make—

Hon. Mr. Bales: —and also from time to time with the other members of the board.

Mr. Lewis: —in dealing with Mr. Legge exclusively.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for technical knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia may have a supplementary and then the hon. member for Wentworth, and I believe that completes the supplementaries. The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Since Mr. Cauley was appointed by order in council, and I take it that his indemnity was included in such order, the arrangements were eventually arrived at; did this result from order in council, or does the minister have sufficient ministerial discretion to effectuate this type of involvement?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Cauley's salary was changed, had to be changed—and must be—by order in council. He was paid his sick credits and holiday credits on the basis of board policy, and on that basis that was quite in order. But the change in salary is by order in council.

Mr. Bullbrook: One further supplementary, if I might be permitted. As I understood the minister's original statement, it said that his position was taken by another gentleman from Ottawa. That would have necessitated another order in council creating that position. Did the minister unilaterally, without any involvement in the new order in council, arrive at this decision? Or is the minister saying it was in accordance with the board's overall policy?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The new appointments to the board are by order in council. Their salaries are shown in that order in council, I believe, at that point in time. The arrangements in reference to individuals of the board are that they receive sick credits on the basis of board policy and they receive holiday credits on the basis of board policy. Those are not set out in the order in council.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the minister have the power to do what he did? I don't think he did.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us what the policy is in regard to sick leave with the board? How does one accumulate and on what basis is the accumulation calculated?

Mr. Lewis: You see, the minister is in an impossible bind. He can't explain.

Hon. Mr. Bales. I believe—I'm going by memory on this instance—but I believe the basis of sick credits is 18 days a year which would be 1½ days per month. Mr. Cauley advised me that he had a large amount of extra time for which he claimed and received extra sick credits. He had built up, over his period of some 25 years on the board, substantial credits notwithstanding the fact that he was absent due to his heart attack in 1965.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The minister is stick-handling now.

Mr. Speaker: That is a sufficient number of supplementaries now. The standing orders provide for a reasonable number of questions. Surely there has been a reasonable number of questions at this point.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that in fact Mr. Cauley had accumulated over—

Mr. Speaker: I heard exactly what the minister said.

Mr. Deans: The maximum he could have accumulated was 450 days in 25 years. Is he telling me that the illness that he had in 1965 did not eat into that period?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. member knows quite well that I had indicated there were a sufficient number of supplementaries—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: —and there must be some end to supplementaries. I indicated that was the last one. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

The hon. member for Scarborough West.

ALLEGED RESCINDING OF COMPENSATION BOARD PENALTIES

Mr. Lewis: I would like to re-open this in a slightly different way, coming back first to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker.

What kind of atmosphere prevails in his department that General Motors Corp. feels that it can have direct access to have a

press release delivered, typed, photostated and circulated within the minister's department? As a matter of fact using the same typewriter and the same paper and the same equipment from which the minister's statements issue. How does he think that is going to affect collective bargaining in Ontario? Does he grant the same right to injured workmen? Does he grant the same right to the United Autoworker? And how is he going to handle it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad the hon. member brought up that question. In the first place the news release didn't come out of my office. The news release came from the Workmen's Compensation Board. As I said earlier—

Mr. Deans: The one the minister read?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister mean the statement he read in the House was prepared by the board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No. I am talking about the news release, not the statement. The statement I made in the House, a draft copy was made in my office—

Mr. Lewis: The same as GM?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —in co-operation with some of my officials. The final typed copy came from the Workmen's Compensation Board.

As for the news release, as I have said I have never seen it. I had no knowledge of any kind that it had been issued, as a matter of fact; and even today I haven't read it. The news release as well came from the Workmen's Compensation Board which apparently got in touch with General Motors after the story broke in the Globe and Mail.

Mr. Lewis: Just by way of—

Hon. Mr. Guindon: They questioned and they heard that General Motors had issued a news release.

Mr. Martel: I can see why the Premier didn't want a meeting tomorrow!

Mr. Deans: It is getting worse.

Hon. Guindon: That is where it comes from. It doesn't come from my office.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister saying the Workmen's Compensation Board got in touch with General Motors to have the release issued?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, sir.

Mr. Speaker that is not what I am saying. I am saying that in the usual course of business the Workmen's Compensation Board were getting in touch with General Motors. They happened to hear about the news release which had been sent to the news media. The release was given to them on the phone and a copy was made and 50 more copies were reprinted by my executive assistant without my knowing it—

Mr. Deans: Has he been fired yet?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —and that is the reason I have reprimanded the executive assistant.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister going to make an apology to the working men and women of Ontario about the favoured position which his department grants to Ontario's largest corporation?

What does the minister mean they phoned the department—

An hon. member: The department didn't do that.

Mr. Lewis: —and had it taken down and issued? It is on the same paper, the same typewriter, the same photostat that the minister's statement was issued on. What does that do in terms of the integrity of the minister's department in collective bargaining relationships?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker my reply is that it doesn't come from my department!

Mr. Deans: It did!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Municipal Affairs): It is the board—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members of the board—

Mr. Lewis: I don't know what you call those people who analyze these things, it's the minister's statement I'm talking about. The statement by the hon. Minister of Labour to the Legislature is, as far as the eye can tell, identically copied; from the same machine, the same paper, the same source. His statement came from the board?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is what he said.

Mr. Lewis: No, he didn't say that!

Mr. Martel: They help him too much.

Mr. Deans: No, he didn't say that. He said it was typed in his office.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Order!

Mr. Lewis: I want to extricate the minister from the damaging attack by his colleague. Let me understand this.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister said it came from the board.

Mr. Lewis: The provincial Treasurer dropped in and dropped out simultaneously. Can I ask the minister: The statement that he read to the House was typed and prepared in his office?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the statement I made in the House yesterday was prepared in my office and the final copy typed at the board.

Mr. Deans: The minister sat in the House and reported it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Exactly, this is what I said earlier. The final copy came from there because we need statistics but the statement was prepared in my office.

Mr. Deans: Corrected by Bruce Legge and sent up.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, it is a pretty obvious one. Does that not cast a real question about the content of the minister's statement? I mean what feeling can the members of the House have about a relationship between the minister and the board which requires final—

Hon. Mr. MacKeough: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I am asking a question of—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member is not asking a question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: It is admittedly a long question, but it is a question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly is!

Mr. Lewis: Right! Now what faith can the members of the House have in the minister's relationship with the board, that the board gets final vetting power and preparation power over the statements? Then from his office there issue General Motors' press releases.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It wasn't from his office.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It wasn't from his office.

Mr. Lewis: The minister will never be able to explain it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

The hon. member has directed a question. It was a lengthy question, but it was quite in order.

Mr. Lewis: I agree, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary just before we change to another question. Can the minister explain to the House why it was necessary that the final typing be done by the Workmen's Compensation Board? Surely he has lots of facilities?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the reason is simply that I had most of the statement ready, all the material except some statistics. Because time was of the essence my executive assistant got all the figures at the board and—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is that man again.

Mr. Singer: Not in his office!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well we need them, and the members have some yourselves. I can assure the members I told him that as far as I am concerned, I am like Caesar's wife, and that is the way I am going to be.

Mr. Lewis: That is fine, but what is good for General Motors is good for the minister, isn't it?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier what he meant when he said the General Motors' statement issued from the board, when he interjected that from across the way?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I understood from the Minister of Labour that both these statements technically, and the press release that related to the feelings of General Motors, were done in the offices or typed mechanically within the offices of the board. That was my understanding of what he said.

Mr. Martel: Time was of the essence!

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is it a function of the Workmen's Compensation Board to type press releases for General Motors Corp., against whom it levies and remits fines? Is that part of the board's function?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really give the leader of the New Democratic Party credit for more intelligence than (a) to have asked the question, and (b) not to have anticipated the answer. The answer to that is quite categorically, No; it is not the policy of the board.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): How did it happen then?

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary: Then when is the board going to be hauled on the carpet, Bruce Legge and company, to be faced down by this government for their behaviour as an autonomous, arbitrary and irresponsible outfit in this province as they so obviously are? When is the government going to bring them before a committee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the New Democratic Party is addressing that in the form of a question, then with great respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't really regard it in the form of a question, but in that this is the question and answer period I shall answer it as it was intended. I would say, Mr. Speaker, I made it abundantly clear, in spite of the desire yesterday afternoon on the part of the leader of the New Democratic Party to circumvent what I think are the traditional responsibilities of the House. I indicated, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Bullbrook: Now the Premier should not say that!

Mr. Renwick: Oh come, come!

Mr. Lewis: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the standing committee on natural resources would be dealing with this on the first Wednesday after the House returned after the mid-term break. I made this abundantly clear.

Mr. Speaker, this government is as anxious as the members opposite to have this matter discussed before the standing committee, and I made that abundantly clear yesterday as well.

Mr. Reid: Not quite.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I did.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the Prime Minister explain how, if time was of the essence, it can be quicker to prepare down on Harbour Street a press release that is to be released here, and then bring it all the way up, rather than preparing it here directly?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is also self-evident, which may escape the member for High Park on occasion —and I say this in a very kindly sense. This government tries to go to the source of information to see that the information is accurate. The information related to this matter happened to be on Harbour Street, or down on Fleet Street, and not within the offices of this department. So I think it is very logical that they would go to the source to get the specific information that was relevant.

Mr. Shulman: As a final supplementary, if I may Mr. Speaker: Is the Prime Minister saying that when a minister of his department is releasing a statement about someone else he has that statement prepared by the person who is being commented on? Is that what the minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No Mr. Speaker, that is not what the Premier is saying, nor is it what the minister said. The minister, as I understand him, said very specifically that the basic preparation of the statement that he made in this Legislature yesterday afternoon was by himself—members of his staff—Sunday evening and yesterday morning.

It was also important that there be certain statistical information included in the statement. That statistical information came from the Workmen's Compensation Board. As I understand the Minister of Labour's explanation it made sense, in order to inform the members of the House as he was anxious to do yesterday afternoon, to have the mechanical work done at the board so that it would be available to the members. To me it is very simple, relatively logical, and I would hope understandable by the members opposite.

Mr. Renwick: Why didn't he summon the chairman of the board to his office?

Mr. Lewis: Why didn't he summon Bruce Legge to his office?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Weak explanation!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of a point of order—

Mr. Bullbrook: Why didn't they pick up the phone and get the statistics from the board?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a point of order: Perhaps then, now that we have got this carefully sorted out, the Premier can explain the quotation in today's Toronto Daily Star from the executive assistant to the minister, which reads as follows:

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! The hon. member should indicate his point of order and let the Chair decide whether in fact it is a point of order. What was the point of order?

Mr. Lewis: My point of order is that inadvertently the Premier misled the House, because there appears today in the press the following:

> The executive assistant said the GM statement was taken by phone in the Labour Minister's office and was then typed out and copied. "It had obviously been prepared by a lawyer," he added.

—for whatever relevance that may be. Now what? How is all that reconciled?

Mr Speaker: The hon. member has stated his point of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question surely, not a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: You would concur that it is a valid point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I accept it as a point of order at this moment.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as it relates to a point of order, I won't debate it. I will without any question debate the fact of whether or not I inadvertently misled the House. I restated what I understood. I think it is very clear and will be very clear in Hansard what the Minister of Labour had said. If it comes to a question of determining whose recollection is more accurate, I am quite prepared to accept the recollection and the statements made in this House by the Minister of Labour over, with great respect, that of his executive assistant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why should the Premier have respect for him?

Mr. Singer: The minister said he didn't—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, it is the General Motors relationship which is paramount rather than who made the statement. Could I ask the Attorney General, the former Minister of Labour, did he ever personally suggest a major inquiry into the practices and procedures of the Workmen's Compensation Board and the behaviour of the senior executive officers, based on the numerous complaints which Mr. Cauley filed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, when I went to the Department of Labour in November, 1966, Mr. Justice McGillivray was completing or carrying on a royal commission into the functioning of the Workmen's Compensation Board. He was looking into all of these matters, not only as to legislation but he also interviewed all of the senior officers of that board. The report of the board came to me some months later, and that was the basis of a number of changes in administrative practices of the board; and also the basis of legislation in 1968.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

ACCESS TO ROBARTS LIBRARY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: In view of the statements apparently made last evening by acting president Sword of the university; and in view of the minister's statement yesterday as reported in Hansard—which reads this way: "I have read, as the hon. member has read, the statement of the acting president, and unless I hear something to the contrary, I think the president acted in a responsible way"—does the minister believe yesterday's statement or would he like to review it in light of Mr. Sword's second statement?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sword's statement, which he made yesterday, deals with the use of the library. The statement made on Sunday dealt really with the sit-in at Simcoe Hall, the activities surrounding that and the calling in of municipal police. So there is really no contradiction or confliction in the two statements.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't the minister agree that the thrusts of Mr. Sword's first statements were: first, that there would be no access to the stacks by undergraduates or by members of the public; and second, that the use of the police was justified; and that his second set of statements was that there would be complete access and that the use of police, the calling in of police in this fashion, was unjustified?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes. There is no question that the second statement indicates a different attitude regarding the use of the library—

Mr. Singer: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —but there is no confliction. There still is not any confliction. As a result of a meeting that lasted for some time between officials of the university and students there was an agreement reached yesterday and this morning, which has been—

Mr. Lewis: There is no confliction; there is a little dissemblance.

Mr. Singer: Capitulation!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —indicated in a statement. I believe as far as the police are concerned the president did indicate on Sunday or Monday morning that he hoped there would be no prosecutions for trespass against the students, and he reiterated that same feeling again today.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, could the minister advise us which set of Mr. Sword's statements he agrees with, either the Sunday statements or the Monday statements?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I really have no disagreement with either statement. The statement made—

Mr. Singer: Oh, I see. That is good.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The statement made yesterday, the latest statement, would appear to be very reasonable. It would appear to have been made after quite lengthy discussions between students and the officials of the university, and it would appear, subject of course to the senate approval, that this statement may very well solve the whole problem of student sit-ins and the use of the library.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister agrees with the confliction?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am hoping, of course, that if this is the agreement that has been reached by the two parties, it will be accepted by the senate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of—

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

The hon. member for Waterloo North.

UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

Mr. Good moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the University of Waterloo.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I should like to inform the House that yesterday the member for Scarborough West introduced a motion under the routine proceedings to refer a matter to a standing committee. At the time and without an opportunity of referring to precedents, and as the standing orders gave me no guidance whatever as to whether this motion should be considered routine or substantive, I felt that I should allow the motion to be put to a vote of the House.

It is true that the Leader of the Opposition made some reference to the fact that previous Speakers had ruled that such motions required notice and could only be considered in the private members' hour, but I'm afraid I did not catch the full significance of this observation.

I now find that precisely the same procedure was attempted on Tuesday, May 18, 1971, by the same member, and was disallowed by the then Speaker; who proceeded on Thursday, May, 20, to deliver a very comprehensive ruling on this point, based in part on a ruling of the Speaker of the House of Commons of Canada on Tuesday, May 2, 1961.

In that ruling the Speaker of the House of Commons made two quotations from Beauchesne which I consider very important: Firstly:

> It is a very fundamental rule that with the exception of certain matters dealt with under routine proceedings, no question can be considered by the House unless it has been previously appointed, either by a notice or a regular order of the House.

Secondly:

> All motions referring to the business of the House should be introduced by the leader of the House.

The ruling of Mr. Speaker Cass is very complete and precise, and I refer the members to it at page 74 of the journals of 1971. The importance of that ruling at the present time is that the routine procedure "motions" is not open to private members. I would like to say that in my opinion this is a very important point and should be included in the standing orders for clarification—perhaps along with some other obscure intentions.

Mr. Renwick: Or discarded!

Mr. Speaker: But it is intended only for the routine motions respecting the business of the House and must be moved by the minister leading the House at the time. I consider that ruling, well-based as it is on sound authority, to be binding, and I express my apology to the House that I did in fact accept the motion, which appears quite properly now to be out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order—

Mr. Speaker: I have delivered a ruling on an order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wouldn't for a moment debate it, sir, but on a point of order I would draw to your attention that we now appear to have two precedents pertaining to this matter, and I personally regret that you have bowed to the former.

Obviously when the leader of the government makes a motion it will carry, but I don't think this should prohibit any other member from making a procedural motion. The custom, of course, is that the majority supporting the leader of the government or the leader of the House will sustain the one and turn back the other. But surely this should not be entrenched in the orders and rules of this House that such a motion be out of order.

I appreciate, sir, what you have said to the House; I just wish that we had been able to change the standing orders so that the procedural order of motions would have been available to any member of the House.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, on this particular point of order, I would like to draw to your attention that the second last time we met, I moved the adjournment of the debate, which was accepted by you. This is a very common procedure. This applies to the order of business in the House, and I would suggest this also should be considered as a precedent.

Mr. Speaker: I would say to the hon. member, of course, that it is in order for any hon. member to move adjournment of a debate. That is not considered as part of the routine proceedings of the House when we have entered upon the orders of the day; that is after routine proceedings.

I would just like to add to the comments by the hon. Leader of the Opposition; I must say that I too did feel that the motion was in order in the absence of any prohibition in the standing orders. However, I am sure the hon. members will agree that I am and must be guided by the standing orders and traditions of this House; until they are changed—and I must again confess that I was erroneous in accepting the motion at that time—the standing orders of this House must prevail.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what concerns me is that on two occasions now when questions have arisen with respect to procedural matters in this House, we have had references to the procedure in the House of Commons at Ottawa.

I am not an expert in parliamentary tradition, but prior to the amendment of our own rules the reference was to the procedures of the House of Commons at Westminster. When the rules were changed the reference was directly then made only to the usages and precedents of this Legislature and parliamentary tradition.

My point of order is that I am concerned that both in the ruling yesterday, and in the ruling again today, references have been made to the rules of procedure of the House of Commons at Ottawa, which is separate and distinct from the phrases that may be included within and the meaning that may be given to parliamentary tradition.

If I may just very briefly state my point, Mr. Speaker, we overturned a proposition yesterday with respect to the right of persons in a parliamentary tradition to speak in the Throne Speech debate and gave the government the right to pre-empt the time of the House at the expense of those who would participate in the Throne Speech debate.

I would suggest that in that instance and again today, Mr. Mr. Speaker, research into parliamentary tradition should govern the decisions to be made by this Speaker of this parliament and not by way of reference to the more restrictive procedures which have prevailed in the House of Commons in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: Well I will take the comments of the hon. member under consideration. It is my understanding, of course, that we are guided first of all by the standing orders adopted by this House, which standing orders were adopted as a result of a report of a select committee that had been constituted to study all of the proceedings that had existed at that point in time and to come up with recommendations.

I believe too, if my memory serves me well in reviewing the report of the select committee and also the Lewis book on rules

that we had been guided by hitherto, that not only would we be guided by the rules of procedure in this House but by the precedents and traditions and customs and usages in this House. Then we had the right to refer to the House of Commons, then to Westminster, and as a last resort we would refer to May on parliamentary procedure. This is my recollection of what had been done.

In any event, if the House of Commons at Ottawa was not included in the original instructions or usages, then it crept in some place along the line, and actually the rulings in the House of Commons in Ottawa are based on parliamentary experts such as Beanschene, who was quoted in connection with this particular House of Commons ruling. However I will be glad to consider what the hon. member for Riverdale has suggested to me. As the matter stands at the moment, however, my ruling must stand.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Mr. Speaker, last evening before we adjourned I was in the process of outlining the conduct of Cambrian Real Estate and how they had manipulated the constituents whom I represent in a community called Wahnapitae.

I make reference to an article which appeared in the Sudbury Star which stated—and I am quoting: "That order for condemnation of its 20 constructed homes as unfit for human habitation will be signed by Dr. J. B. Cooke, medical officer of health for the Sudbury district."

I might state that this came from the medical officer of health. It didn't come from me. And the material which I will bring up now indicates this—contrary to what the real estate firm attempted. They tried to create the impression that this was political harassment.

I don't know how the medical officer of health can be accused of harassing. He was simply doing his job, and that was condemning houses not fit for people to dwell in.

However, the president of Cambrian Real Estate became very benevolent at this time and indicated that they were going to assist the homeowners without any additional cost. But you will note that this was at the end of December and for some number of months we have been trying to get some assistance for them.

I mentioned last night an article which appeared in the Toronto Star on December 31, 1971, which was headlined: "New Homes Condemned—Owners Don't Know whom to Blame." And this was the name of the game with respect to Cambrian Real Estate. If you can confuse the people long enough and often enough they will just give up and go away. And I want to show some of the reasons for confusion.

The lawyer who handled the dealings for most of the people, one Mr. Fouriezos—well known in the Sudbury area. He used to be a judge—Judge Charles Fouriezos—appointed by this government. He handled a number of areas in this development. For example, he was working for the vendor and, interestingly enough, he also acted for the purchasers. And what even makes it more intriguing, he also did the work between the vendors and the builders.

Now, one would suspect that there might be a conflict of interest there. You know, if you run into the snag that these people ran into, and you went to your lawyer and you said, "Now who is responsible?" who does he protect? Does he protect Cambrian Real Estate? Does he protect the homeowner? Or does he protect the construction firm, Cross Canada?

Well, you can understand the confusion which reigned and why the people, when they spoke to the press, indicated they in fact didn't know to whom they should turn with their grievances.

And of course, Mr. Moreau became very benevolent. He said: "We are going to do it." But this was two months later after it broke in the press. He also indicated—and this was the first indication that someone was after him because he was a Tory—in the following statement: "He and his associates have been strongly tempted to pull out because of political harassment from Martel and other NDP politicians. We are all solid Conservatives; vice-president David Wickett, and manager of sales Stan Warback and myself."

Well, he was really running for cover because Mr. Moreau has never been a Con-

servative according to the Conservative people. But I think he was seeking sanctity under the Conservative arm. He comes from the Liberal Party, but he became a Tory overnight. I think he was looking for a little shelter.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Some can see the light very quickly.

Mr. Martel: Surprisingly, to the member for Algoma, the light was to try to get protection. They tell me that Mr. Shouldice has a pipeline into Queen's Park.

In fact, I am told by the head of the Tory organization in Sudbury that he has a pipeline into Queen's Park and this is why it is so difficult to get any redress for the people in the Sudbury area. Hopefully, now that the Conservative member for Sault Ste. Marie has joined with me in this—because he is having the same problem in his area with Cambrian Real Estate—we'll have something done.

Things started to warm up. I called a second meeting for January 10, and in the interim things warmed up. Mr. Shouldice, who is really the brains behind about six or seven developments—he keeps only one share now, in Cambrian Real Estate—has opened up another company, Mr. Speaker. It's called Trasco which we will come to in a few moments.

Mr. Shouldice, who is really the brains behind it—he used to own Cambrian; he sold out—phoned me at my home on Mar. 5 and he indicated to me that if I should say anything I could anticipate many problems such as a lawsuit. I guess this was a fear tactic. He was going to throw a little scare into me. It didn't work. That didn't work with him and I told him it wouldn't.

He then suggested that we get not the builder—this is the type of gentleman we're dealing with—that we get Traders. He said, "We can raise Cain. We can get Traders to pay the shot and we'll be clear. You'll be out of the picture and you won't be sued." Isn't that a wonderful arrangement? You can see the type of man we are dealing with. A very conscientious businessman. "We'll get Traders, the people who were backing the development."

Moreau was blaming the builder. Shouldice, whose name the road is in—and that's the only place his name appears—wanted to get Traders. Between the two of them they were going to get the builders and Traders and Cambrian Real Estate would come out in the clear.

What Cambrian have tried not to have their name linked to was the fact that as a real estate company they were the developers. But they are. They are the developers and they are also the real estate agents. This jeopardizes their licence, I am told and, you know, they try desperately to protect that licence.

As a result, I wrote Mr. Crone who is the chief inspector of the real estate branch of the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs and he was most helpful. He has ordered an investigation into the dealings of Cambrian Real Estate. However, I am not satisfied to this date that investigating Cambrian Real Estate alone goes sufficiently far.

I suggest that the investigation should include Cambrian Real Estate, Trasco, Silouette, Futuristic, a whole series of companies. Surprisingly enough when you look at them, the majority of the principals are all the same and they operate in the greater part of northern Ontario. Moreau says, in fact, he is the biggest real estate agent in northern Ontario. He is more than a real estate agent. He is actually the developer and I wrote Mr. Crone to ask in fact if he would conduct a full investigation. I am not sure yet that that is going on. I know that Cambrian's actions in Rock View estates have been under review and in fact I suspect the report is now being written.

The threat didn't work. Two days later, which was two days before a second meeting with a number of departments, I got tipped off that in fact my friends had made their threat good and on Jan. 8 I was served with this writ in the amount of $100,000. Yes.

> The plaintiff claims for damages in the sum of $100,000 for slander. The slander complained of was spoken by the defendant over television station CKSO-TV in the city of Sudbury in the district of Sudbury on or about Dec. 24.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): It wasn't the money that bothered them.

Mr. Martel: The date is Jan. 8. The complaint was Dec. 24. Interestingly enough, they never did go to the television station to see the tape. One can only assume that this was still a part of the threat, so that no one would say anything about these wonderful dwellings, because neither Cambrian Real Estate nor their solicitors went to CKSO to view the television tape. They heard it on television, or someone heard it and told them, and so they filed a $100,000 suit. That goes to show you how concerned they are that

their little exploits are, hopefully, going to be exposed at last.

We had the meeting on Jan. 10, Mr. Speaker, and we had representation from the Department of Labour, Mr. Graham Adams—who as I indicated last night at a previous meeting—who's going to be responsible for the uniform building code for Ontario. We had representation from the Ontario Water Resources Commission, who expressed grave concern that come spring each and every house is going to be flooded out. This was expressed by Mr. Bracken, who's the consultant, I believe, for OWRC in North Bay, and representatives from the OWRC themselves.

You recall last evening that I had indicated, however, in June, July and August, 1971, and in four letters implored the then Minister of Municipal Affairs, not to allow this subdivision to be developed. And here we have, in January, 1972, representation—I have the minutes of this meeting which I'll quote from in a few minutes—stating that there's grave danger that each and every house will be flooded and that the septic systems will not work.

Well, where was "Dauntless Dalton" last June, July and August? You know "Dauntless Dalton." He was there, but as usual, you know, he doesn't move. The health unit people were involved, Municipal Affairs, Financial and Commercial Affairs and the reeve of Valley East township—and some people question why I had him there. Well, the reason is he has a couple of hundred units of these self-help homes developed in his community by Trasco Real Estate.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Trasco?

Mr. Martel: Trasco is also Mr. Shouldice. These self-help homes are going up—I'm going to illustrate, just very briefly in a few moments, some of the problems that are going on with a couple of subdivisions.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: The only person who was missing, once again, was the "white knight." I asked the "white knight, Lawrence of Ontario," if he would send someone in, because not only had I been threatened but Mrs. Woods had also received a good number of anonymous calls in the interim, as I indicated last night, and this I understand is a criminal offence. But the "white knight, Lawrence of Ontario," wouldn't send anyone as per usual and as had been anticipated. Well, the fear game didn't work; the lawsuit was there. And some interesting things came out just previous to this meeting. The Sudbury Star—you know the well-known newspaper—

Mr. L. Maeck (Parry Sound): A good Conservative newspaper.

Mr. Martel: Yes, a good Conservative newspaper. It's a Thomson newspaper.

Mr. Maeck: Yes.

Mr. Martel: I don't know why, but they did a story on two pages—two full pages, Mr. Speaker, two full pages—and if you notice the headlines they had to work overtime to make Cambrian look good and they did; because Cambrian came out being persecuted and the devil's advocate in the whole affair was the member for Sudbury East and his New Democratic colleague, the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren), who has so ably replaced the silent member for Nickel Belt in the past House.

Here were some of the headlines: "Subdivision Condemned," "Politicians' Bunk Scalds my Backside."

Mr. Patterson: Is the member's picture in?

Mr. Martel: Yes, it is in. One of the few times. That is a statement by Mr. Wickett, and you know they became very benevolent. Let's see: "Realty agent takes on job of repairing." But the interesting thing is the headline: "Subdivision condemned." If the subdivision is condemned by the health unit it really boggles the mind to understand how Cambrian Real Estate can come out the hero, but the Sudbury Star managed it. Interestingly enough, when I was going over this paper the other day, maybe this gives the reason why.

Do you notice that newspaper? This whole section is advertising by—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Is that recycled paper?

Mr. Martel: I would hope it was. I am not sure, with what is written on it, that it would go through the recycling machine; that is how revolting it is. But that section has Cambrian Real Estate—it is understandable. Then over here you have got Whitson Gardens, and over here you have got Trasco. It is pretty understandable, Mr. Speaker, why you then get headlines; it becomes quite obvious. Not only are they Tories—forget that—but it is quite obvious why they come out the hero. "Realty agent takes on the job of repair."

Mr. Paterson: Is that $300 worth?

Mr. Martel: It must be at least. Here is what the people pay. They have got a self-help home. To understand the self-help home, Mr. Speaker, it goes this way. You sign an agreement with Cambrian Real Estate. They show you a model house, and that is what you will get. But you have to finish it. You have to pour the cement for the floor. You have to put in the insulation. You have to do all the woodwork. You do all the painting and a whole variety of jobs.

You sign a contract telling what the agreement is all about; only you don't get a copy of it. Charlie Fouriezos keeps all those. That is the lawyer fellow I was telling you about who handled all three sides. He keeps that. You don't get your mortgage money, by the way, until you have completed what your responsibility is with respect to upholding your end of the agreement. But you don't have a copy of the agreement and you can't get the rest of your mortgage money until you have finished your work. What do they pay? They pay $15,000 for the house—one mortgage, $1,000 down, $15,000 with our friends Traders, and over 15 years. You pay $37,964 back on a $15,000 mortgage, on a $15,000 loan.

I suggest this cries for government intervention. It won't come, as I said last night, because that is part of the free enterprise system. You just wouldn't interfere with companies lending mortgage money at 15 per cent. Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty sad state of affairs when people can be bilked.

I go back now to the original point that Cambrian was the developer. There are no two ways about it. They assembled the land and, interestingly enough, here is what happened. The solicitor who worked for the homeowners' group makes the following point:

> Mr. Pharand stated it would appear from looking at the titles that the developers were Moreau, Wickett, Morwick and Cambrian Realty. There was never a registered owner of these lots, although Mr. Pharand stated he did see offers of purchase which were signed by the present homeowners and Cross Canada Builders to purchase the land, and the offers were accepted by Cross Canada Builders, and the transfers were from Moreau, Wickett, and in one case, Mr. Boivin. There was a written agreement to purchasing sale upon Cross Canada Construction Ltd. It was explained when Cross Canada sells houses to individuals, the transfer will go directly from the registered owner to the purchaser.

This suggests to me that somewhere the land registry office in Sudbury pulled a faux pas, because there was only one principal involved all along, and everyone was negotiating with him. I suggest that our friends in the land registry office, knowing whom they were dealing with, should also answer as to why this would occur. So you will notice, we have got the health unit allowing people to move into houses which didn't have sewers, water; where the plumbing was installed, never inspected; where the furnaces were installed improperly; where the basements are full of water. One wonders what went on and where the government people were when this little fiasco was being enacted. This further proves the point that they were the developer. It was pointed out that the homeowners never received copies of the agreement between Moreau, Cambrian, Morwick or Wickett and Cross Canada. Cambrian Real Estate stated the homeowners did but, in fact, this is not the case.

Mr. Fouriezos stated some of the homeowners said that once they had signed the offer they did not see the agreement. It was stated that the people were not given copies of their agreements until such time that the mortgage company was satisfied the work was completed. Isn't that a dandy situation? You can't get a copy of the agreement so you don't know what you are supposed to complete on these houses. You can't get your money from the mortgage company until you complete the work as outlined in the agreement.

How in the world were these people supposed to find out who is responsible for making repairs, what their obligations were in this agreement and what the obligations of Cambrian Real Estate were? One wonders when you check with the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs here in Toronto why there is no protection for people in such a dilemma. There is nothing. You can check with any government agency and there is not a law to protect the people in Ontario from such dealings.

Mr. Speaker, you can see this is a very difficult situation. The people didn't know where to go. I started out originally just wanting the houses repaired, not only in this subdivision but more closely related to my own home, in Valley East township where there are a number of subdivisions. I was willing to remain in the background and see the repairs made in these subdivisions.

The more one digs into it the more one is convinced it was deliberately connived so that the people didn't know where to go; so

the people wouldn't take any action; so they would ultimately give up and just accept the houses as they are. I am no longer satisfied in just seeing that the houses are repaired. I'm asking that this government revoke the licence of not only Cambrian but any other company under the guise of this group of people in the Sudbury district. That's foremost.

I'm further suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that beside Cambrian, Whitson Gardens—in the riding of my colleague, the member for Nickel Belt—Whitson Gardens, which smells to high heaven, be investigated.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is this literally or figuratively?

Mr. Martel: Both! The septic system doesn't work. There is one big one and it just doesn't work. They've got a sweetheart arrangement in there. You can't buy oil from the company you want; they put one tank in so you have to deal with one of their friends. He supplies all the fuel. Another sweetheart arrangement there is that if you go to sell again, the transaction has to go back through the original real estate firm; you can't sell on your own. He has got to get his slice of the pie twice. He is not satisfied with one. They have to be investigated.

Another outfit, Silouette, is also part of the same bag.

I think you'll find out that the same principals who own Cambrian, or Trasco are also those who own Silouette. Interestingly enough, when this started to really break open in January Silouette contacted all of their homeowners and said to them, "Look, if there is anything wrong with your house, contact us and we will come and fix it right away." Homeowners had been complaining six or eight months previous to this but they couldn't get to first base.

Futuristic, another company—they have some of the nicest names—is also part of the same bag. I don't know how many other companies because as I said the whole name of the game is to deliberately confuse the people. Beyond wanting the houses repaired, I am asking now that the government conduct a major investigation into all of these companies and revoke their licences.

I want to draw attention for a moment, if I may, to what's going on. By the way, Mr. Speaker, you'll notice this pile about four inches thick; these are the complaints—I must say some of the letters are in triplicate—of all the various homeowners in 1 Proulx Court. There are 20 or 25 complaints. For instance, one man's basement collapsed totally and the sump pump burned out in the middle of December; he had to move his family back to Quebec because he had no place to keep them.

I can go through them all: There's no caulking in any of the windows, so the north wind just blows right through; there's not enough insulation. All small points, I'm told, yet the people who are there are all in the same boat.

By the way, get the name of this company: Conservative Construction. This isn't—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: CCC.

Mr. Martel: You can see it? Conservative Construction isn't Ross Shouldice; this is his brother Bev. He builds conservative homes.

Mr. W. Ferrier: (Cochrane South): Do they fall down?

Mr. Martel: Sure.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Is this a sweetheart too?

Mr. Martel: The same sweetheart arrangements prevail. They build a house; you repair it. You don't get a copy of the agreement when you purchase the house until after you've made the completion or you've finished your part of the agreement. But you don't know what your part of the agreement is because they won't give you a copy. And Traders Home Plan won't give you the money until you've completed your part of the bargain. But you don't know what your part of the bargain is because the lawyer has that in his grimy little paw and he won't give it to you. So how do you complete the home?

Well, I'll just read a couple of these letters very briefly, Mr. Speaker; any one at random really does. But for those of you who might not believe me, I've taken pictures of just one house where there's a pile of muck and water in the basement; one whole wall had a two-inch crack from one end to the other; and the bricks were falling off the front. It was all of six months old at the time these pictures were taken.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): What did the consumer protection division have to say?

Mr. Martel: The consumer protection division has nothing to do with it, has no legislation to protect these people and can't interfere. It's like a jungle out there; you're on

your own. Here are the complaints about just one house by a Mr. Larochelle, the gentleman whose basement collapsed:

> Foundation cracked in three places; one corner of the house is slowly caving in; the bricks on the front of the house are cracked; impossible to open front door—jammed tight; walls cracked in every room of the house; water seeping through the living room windows.
>
> For a period of 2½ months the water flooded my basement to a point where I had to repair eight sump pumps and water would come so high that it would stop the furnace motor from functioning; therefore there was no heat in the house for hours at a time each day. The basement floor is 1½ feet below the water level. [Now that would be great.] Articles damaged were as follows: dryer, washing machine, clothing in two rooms, trunks, camping tent, sleeping bag, outboard motor, box of clothes and boots.

That's just one at random; there are about 45 houses.

You know, somehow I couldn't get my friend Ross Shouldice really involved. He's the brains behind it all but he's a clever cookie. And you'll notice the names they give to their developments: Whitson Gardens, Rock View Estates; now it's Elmview Estates. People in Elmview Estates phoned me last weekend—

Mr. Bullbrook: That Rock View Estates is somewhat appropriate; I imagine they have a heck of a lot of rocks up there.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Mr. Paterson: They are going to name the next one Martel Manor.

Mr. Martel: That would be a slur on my good name.

I had two families in Elmview Estates contact me this weekend; this involves Trasco and Roscoe Shouldice—I suggest most Conservatives know him rather well. The complaints by this woman, a Mrs. John MacDonald, were that, first, the water is filling the light fixture in the kitchen. She phoned to complain about it and they said, "Well, just take the globe off and let the water drain out." That's a real solution to the problem. Water drips out of one wall socket in the kitchen all the time. Not much of a menace you know, but all the joints in one bedroom where the gyprock comes together are cracking. There is a two-by-four coming through the wall. So they suggested to her husband that he go out and straighten out the chimney and he would get around this: "You see, you straighten the chimney out and the wall won't crack." Last week Mrs. MacDonald went to vacuum the baby's bedroom and she went to lift the rug. Unfortunately, it was frozen to the floor. One would suspect that there is no insulation.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A little condensation.

Mr. Martel: Yes. So she had been trying for three months, Mr. Speaker, to get these little problems fixed up, and our friend, Shouldice, just keeps avoiding it. That one really boggles the mind doesn't it—"empty out the light container, it doesn't present a hazard." We finally found out that—

Mr. Deans: Is that what they mean by cold running water?

Mr. Martel: That is cold running water via the light bulb.

Mr. Deans: That's hydro power.

Mr. Martel: This was originally owned by Cambrian, but after the people signed to have the house built, the house somehow—and I can't explain it because even my lawyer friends in Sudbury just can't sort out this whole mess—but somehow or other it ended up in Trasco's hands.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Oh, yes. I won't say why, but somehow after they signed the agreement with Cambrian the house ended up in Trasco's name. Well, that is Mrs. MacDonald.

We also have Mrs. Patry. Maybe somebody who knows something about building could explain this to me; I haven't been able to get the explanation: They put all different-coloured brick on her house, and they told her: "Just don't worry about it. It is supposed to be all one colour and come spring it will all turn the same colour." Now, I don't know how that works.

Mr. Deans: They figure she is going to paint it.

Mr. Martel: I don't know how this comes about, Mr. Speaker, but this was what this woman was told.

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): It is a blend.

Mr. Martel: There is not one window in the basement that has a lock on it. It is great for security purposes. Part of the self-help agreement, of course, is that you lay your own tile. We must remember that Elmview Estates, I guess that's it, is four months old. So they laid the tile and all the tiles are lifting now. When they contacted Trasco, Trasco said to them: "Yes, but you should have put more nails in the floor, in the wood." But that's Trasco's responsibility, so she said: "Yes, but some of the boards were rotten." "Oh, but you should have changed the boards." Well, this is a three-month-old house and the tiles are all lifting and of course the responsibility falls on the home-owner.

Well, you see what has happened, Mr. Speaker. Really, it is not really funny. What has happened is that the people are into a bind. Traders are into them for $15,000 over a 15-year period, which means they pay $205 a month, or $37,000 back. These are working people. Now after $205, how do you make a pile of money to start to make the repairs which are necessary to make those houses livable?

That is why this government has got to get off its backside and do something in that area. It has got to move in, as I said, and conduct a full investigation into Cambrian, Trasco, Silouette, Futuristic, all over. They have got to strip this outfit, or all of them, of their licence to practise any type of business in this province. They have got to get the uniform building code established —and the sooner the better—and make it applicable right across Ontario, not only in the organized communities but in the unorganized communities, so that these birds who can now circumvent the law by going to an unorganized township can no longer do it.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Kick them out of the Tory party.

Mr. Martel: The interest rates must be reduced by this government. Land assembly must be allowed by municipalities so it can be developed at cost and sold to the people at prices they can well afford to pay. Legislation must be introduced to protect people from these parasites—and I call them parasites because that's literally what they are. Finally, I think that the Department of Municipal Affairs or someone must establish a course of some form wherein building inspectors, or people who are going to be building inspectors, must get certified. We've got more people running around this country, posing as building inspectors, who don't know one end of the hammer from the other, let alone know anything about housing.

If we are ever going to have any type of uniformity in house inspection it has got to be through some type of course where people must qualify for that type of work. We have got a building inspector in Valley East township. He should have headed this off but the man knows nothing. It is unfortunate. He knows nothing about buildings because he allowed all this to go on.

I suggest that these are the areas where this government must move with respect to housing; lower interest rates; land assembly; uniform building codes; establishment of courses for building inspectors; consumer affairs legislation to protect the people from parasites such as I have just illustrated. Finally, in respect to Cambrian, Trasco and those companies, that they be deprived of their licences. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, thank you.

I would like to take a moment first to congratulate the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter), my neighbour from Waterloo county, on his election as Speaker of this House. His performance up to now of course has been of a most satisfactory nature, and we know that it will be.

I think I can't pass up the opportunity at this time to make a few brief comments on one aspect of the election campaign. I am tempted to do this because of the presence in the House of two of the ministers who were involved in this aspect. This was the practice of the Conservative candidate who ran against me to make it appear in his advertising that he and he alone was responsible for every good action of the government.

It is rather amusing that the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps) is here. Both he and I have made speeches in this House for the last number of years—he longer than I, having been here longer than I—to emphasize the need that some revenue was required in municipalities where there are large universities. This legislation did come two years ago, and last year it was increased so that municipalities can receive $35 for each student at the university.

I tried to tell my opponent that the Minister of Correctionel Services (Mr. Apps) wasn't going to like it when he, in his advertising, took the credit. He urged the provincial gov-

ernment to make sure that universities pay their fair share of municipal taxes, and he took credit for this great step forward of the government.

This is the sort of thing that kind of bugs you during the election campaign from someone who has never been a member.

Another thing he took credit for was that he helped New Hamburg solve its water problems. He rounded up the NDP Mayor of New Hamburg, trotted him down to see the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr)—and really, I hope the minister was not a party to these ads! They were put together to let the poor people out in these areas think that the candidate for the Conservative Party had already solved their water problems because their water problems have been with them and they are now with them, and they will be with them for some time in the future.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Careful, careful.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): No, no I am serious.

Mr. Good: This problem of water within the New Hamburg and Wilmot township area is one that is not resolved at the present time.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): If the members had seen the minister in Sudbury with the people of St. Charles!

Mr. Good: He also was taking responsibility for the pressures being put on government to equalize the assessment in the rural areas so that the rural tax burden for education would not be so great. Nothing has changed, even though he made it appear in all of his advertisements that he was the one who was doing all these great things for the people of the area. I just had to mention this in passing, seeing that some of the ministers involved were here.

There were two things in the Throne Speech about which I would like to speak briefly. They are direct references that were made by His Honour in the Speech from the Throne. One is the fact that Ontario will host a tri-level conference this year aimed at furthering federal-provincial consultation on national policies which will affect the provinces; and which would be, of course, in the relationship of the municipalities to the province and to the federal government. And the other will be in the announcement that legislation is proposed for a regional government in Waterloo county.

In the first matter, regarding Ontario hosting a tri-level conference, it would appear to me that this announcement is designed to bring, I suppose, accolades to the Province of Ontario, and especially to the Premier (Mr. Davis), in the same manner as his predecessor Mr. Robarts received them when he first instituted and hosted the federal-provincial conference.

Well I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not necessary, and could in fact be damaging when we look at it in the light of what has gone on up to now.

A resume of the first minister's conference in Victoria last November regarding tri-level conferences indicates the impact of federal policies and programmes on individual cities and on general urban patterns. The co-ordinating role of the Minister of State for Urban Affairs was discussed and it was agreed that there must be a close co-ordination between the federal and provincial governments for the effective co-ordination of the relevant municipal policies and programmes. Now the involvement of municipal governments in the co-ordinating mechanism was discussed and it was agreed that the determination of such involvement must rest with each provincial government.

It was thus concluded that on-going discussions to finalize the exact elements of the consultation mechanism should go forward and be expedited.

So as a result of this, Mr. Speaker, a committee was set up, and this committee was composed of the Hon. Robert Andrass, the then Minister of Urban Affairs for the federal government, the Ontario Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) at the time and the president of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, Mayor Marcel D'Amour, of Quebec. These men were appointed to work out an agenda and representation details for the first meeting of a proposed urban tri-level council to be held early in the spring of 1972.

Now I hesitate to mention it, but I must say that it appears to me that the government of Ontario is calling its own tri-level conference to undermine, or perhaps, even scuttle the work which had been started at the tri-level conference in Victoria.

It would be interesting at this time to ask the former Minister of Municipal Affairs what progress, if any, has been made in the setting up of an agenda for further tri-level meetings; as had been indicated at the Victoria conference and at the meeting of the provincial first ministers the preceding April.

We know that the provinces jealously guard their constitutional rights regarding the municipalities, but the time has come when dialogue at the tri-level must take place. To re-initiate the committee as set up for the Victoria conference would be much more desirable, in my view, than Ontario trying to steal the limelight. The fact of the matter is, like it or not the federal government is involved in urban affairs in one way or another.

Up until now this has been primarily direct. Currently there are 27 federal departments with 113 programmes which have some urban impact. Included in this are housing programmes. Constitutionally it is quite appropriate for the federal government to deal directly with individuals. As a result, most federal housing projects, that's mortgages, insurance loans, and so forth, deal directly with individuals.

To deal with municipalities it is necessary for the federal government to go through the provincial government, and this process is an important one.

Consider the following assumptions, and then we realize the importance and the need for high-level, tri-level consultations.

Urban problems, and programmes needed for the problems, are highly inter-related. That is one thing I want to consider.

And all levels of government, regardless of the constitution, are involved in programmes which have considerable urban impact.

And third, no one level of government by itself can deal adequately with the present pressing urban problems. For example we all know there are forces with impact upon the cities that are beyond their own control.

In this light, the need for tri-level consultation is extremely important. To argue that the federal government should not approach the provinces and their creatures, the municipalities, before they put their own shop in order, I think is not a valid argument. The creation, as it was, of a federal Ministry of Urban Affairs last year, is to some degree a manifestation of the federal desire to improve its own ship in terms of co-ordination in the field of policy.

If we are to develop a national urban policy—and this is what everyone has been talking about; that is a set of broad, generally agreed upon principles to guide the growth of our cities in Canada over the next quarter of a century—then it is essential that all tri-level talks end up with a national policy. Not a federal policy, a national policy.

The tri-level consultation should be a formal mechanism, with municipal, provincial and federal representatives—that is, elected officials, ministers of municipal affairs, city managers, mayors and so on—and in this sense it must be a policy formulating body.

The point is that the inherent nature of urban affairs and interrelated urban problems means they must depend to a great extent on the action of all three levels of government for their solutions. A tri-level mechanism will not replace our existing means of intergovernmental relations, but rather it will make the process easier.

To argue, as the Premier does—and this was recorded in the Globe and Mail last Nov. 18—that until there is a fundamental constitutional revision and reform all arrangements to deal with urban problems by means of tri-level consultation will be short, stop-gap measures, I feel is to paint the picture much too bleakly. The point is that the Premier is concerned about direct intervention on the part of the federal government in the affairs of the municipalities. And perhaps his Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is even more deeply concerned and more vocal than he is.

It's interesting to note here that at the tri-level conference at Victoria, it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs for British Columbia, Mr. Campbell, who said: "We have had pages and pages of mush from the federal people but no cash." Everybody seems to look to the federal-provincial relationship as nothing more than a cash handout affair. Well until we're ready to recognize the fact that policies must be developed at these tri-level conferences, we will never get anywhere in the solution of our problems. The point is we are talking about policy not programmes. Programmes are commitments of action where policy only sets the direction.

Most specifically, the tri-level consultation must not be a mechanism to discuss programmes and all the allocation of resources problems which that creates. It must be to discuss policy; that is, what direction does the nation in Canada want to take in terms of its urban growth?

Suppose, for example, that we could get general agreement at all three levels of government regarding the tri-level mechanism as to the type of urban Canada that we would like to see by the year 2000—that is a basic direction specified in broad terms, such as population distribution, economic development, transportation and so on. We would then provide an agreed-upon framework within which all programmes—federal,

provincial and municipal programmes—could be examined.

Surely in this policy approach there is an urgent role for tri-level consultation. And this consultation doesn't need to involve itself with how much money this province is going to get or how much money that province is going to get, because this is what has broken down more federal-provincial consultations than anything else. If we are going to get any consultation working on a three level base we have got to stop thinking in terms of programmes and talk policy.

This is going to be the one thing which I think is going to lead to the breakdown of our present government reorganization; that is the fact that we are so oriented toward programmes that the three policy ministers over there find themselves not only appearing useless, but perhaps even feeling useless.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The useless three!

Mr. Good: We have been accustomed to consider the importance of the ministers within the cabinet by the programmes that the particular department administers. Let's face it, it is part of our bureaucratic, democratic system that the bigger the programme, the more bureaucracy that can be built, the more important is the minister.

Now we have taken three of our supposedly most important ministers in the government and set them apart from complete programmes. Without having the political leverage to talk about what their department is doing, these ministers, in the eyes of the public, in the eyes of their colleagues, are going to go downhill.

Until something different comes along, a better way of developing policy than setting up three ministers who are responsible for policy, we will find that this, in my view, will be the breakdown of the present reorganization. Without programmes the ministers over there have no rating among the party, among the public, among the opposition. We have demonstrated this in the last few weeks in the Legislature; we can't get a decent answer out of any policy minister.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): No one knows the answers.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Why doesn't the member record that there are two of them sitting over there out of 26? Two of them.

Mr. Sargent: Two ministers.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): And only one is really sitting.

Mr. Bullbrook: The situation is anachronistic as far as the government is concerned.

Mr. Sargent: They are both good hockey players though.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Yes, they do great stickhandling.

Mr. Good: Constitutional reform is not a complete prerequisite, because such a tri-level mechanism can be instituted, I feel, without constitutional reform if we talk about discussing policies at the federal-provincial-municipal levels.

Ontario's proposed tri-level talks are, in my view, probably designed to give Ontario political advantage rather than work within the framework which has already been established at the Victoria conference.

I would like to speak about the other thing that caught my eye in the Throne Speech. That is the government's intention to institute regional government in Waterloo county.

On March 16, 1971, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) released the government proposal for our area. Shortly after that, on April 14, I wrote to the minister and I will quote from the letter:

> Dear Mr. Minister:
>
> I understand that most of the dialogue between the Department of Municipal Affairs and Waterloo county concerning the establishment of regional government will be through the intermunicipal committee which has now been set up. I am wondering if it is your intention to invite the three members of the Legislature from Waterloo county to the meetings between yourself and members of your department and the intermunicipal committee.

I thought there would probably be some useful purpose at that meeting.

Finally, on June 4, after all the meetings had just about been completed I got a reply:

> This is in reply to your letter of April 14 and please excuse the delay. I thought I made it very clear when I announced the proposal for regional government in the Kitchener-Waterloo area that we would be interested in receiving the views of all interested parties and I suggested that these be submitted before the end of June.
>
> In reply to your question about inviting the three members of the Legislature from Waterloo county to the meeting between

this department and the intermunicipal committee, I had not considered this and am not sure that any useful purpose would be served by it.

Now this includes one of his own members who is now Speaker of the Legislature, the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), and myself, the member for Waterloo North.

However, I would welcome receiving your views and the views of other members if they care to submit them either in letter or in a brief concerning the matter.

Yours very truly,
Dalton Bales,
Minister.

I was rather disappointed, to say the least, that he felt that no useful purpose would be accomplished by listening to the views of the members who represent the people in the area. I thought it was a nonpartisan request in that members from two of the three parties were representing that area.

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin): It sure would be nonpartisan if it was coming from the member.

Mr. Good: So consequently—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is that over there?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): A very objective fellow.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Put it to him!

Mr. Good: So consequently we were not invited to any discussions. However, in the meantime, as I have recorded in this House on previous occasions, my views and observations of the government proposal have been made known.

Mr. McNeil: They are all nonpartisan over there. That is what I like about those fellows. They don't have anything to do with the fellows in Ottawa.

An hon. member: Where was the member for lunch?

Mr. Sargent: Where are the member's fellow collegians?

Mr. Good: At the present time I would like to make the request to the government, and I hope it is conveyed to them, that they review very carefully the work of the local government review committee, or the intermunicipal committee as I have referred to it previously.

In this regard I would like to suggest that the first and foremost requirement of the people, of the municipal leaders and of the intermunicipal committee—which constitutes the representation of the complete county, my riding, the riding of Kitchener and the riding of the member for Waterloo South—is that the legislation be put on the order paper early in the session and not be left until the last three weeks of the session.

Mr. Sargent: Hear, hear!

Mr. Good: That is the first requirement for which we are asking, and I don't think it is an unreasonable request.

If you will remember, the legislation for the region of York was put on the order paper on June 3, 1970. In less than four weeks, and slightly over three weeks, the legislation was completely through this House and no one had proper time to try to figure out what the implications of that legislation would be.

Mr. McNeil: It is working well isn't it?

Mr. Good: I would suggest that the first reading be given early in the session and that the Department of Municipal Affairs be instructed to supply to the municipalities, and to the intermunicipal committee and to the members of the Legislature representing that area, the answers to many of the questions which have been of concern to the municipalities in the area.

Mr. Sargent: They aren't organized though are they?

Mr. Good: These requirements will fall into many categories. We will have to have information which was not supplied with the government proposal. As I have stated in this Legislature before, when I tried to contact the Department of Municipal Affairs to ascertain what impact the new boundaries or the area government would have on such things as equalized assessment, on population, on acreage, on the application of the Regional and Municipal Grants Act, there was no one in the department who had done any work in that area. No one could tell me what the area of each of the new boundary divisions was in acres. No one could tell me what the rateable equalized assessment was in the proposed new areas. And no one could tell me in what areas the density grant would apply.

I think this was absolutely shameful, that the government would present a proposal last year without giving any kind of backup

evidence. Now I'm asking, surely after a year this information should be available? It must have been figured out by now, and all we are asking is that we get the necessary back-up information.

I would like to make a few comments.

First, on the boundaries, I think it is imperative that the cities have at least 25 years of growth within the present boundaries as they are constituted in the proposal.

This would mean that the eastern boundary of the city of Kitchener as designated in the government proposal would be the Grand River. Crossing of the Grand River, which was formerly indicated by the city of Kitchener as being desirable, is now completely out of the question.

The reason for that is simply that Ontario Housing Corporation has assembled 3,000 acres of land across the Grand River and driven up the price of land in that area to such an extent that it is no longer feasible for the city of Kitchener to expand in that direction. So expansion on the westerly side of the city of Kitchener should be considered right out to the Waterloo boundary.

However, I think there is going to have to be a compromise there to take into consideration the requests of the religious community of Caryndale. This is a religious community in a rural setting where church, schools and houses are provided by a group of people. It is their sincere desire to remain in a rural setting and I think this wish should be accommodated even if it does mean changing the boundaries of the city to some extent.

The division between Kitchener and Waterloo I think perhaps will be adjusted, surely, at the time of regional government boundary changes. We now have instances where people lying in their bed, in their bedroom, have their feet in Waterloo and their head in Kitchener. They are paying taxes to two different municipalities. They are tied in with a lot of red tape, with statistical information, and I think some of these things should be corrected—and undoubtedly will be corrected.

The representation on the lower tier level, in my view, is completely out of proportion. We have members on the regional councils in some areas representing as few as 3,000 persons and members in other areas representing over 12,000 persons. Now surely we must make some variance between rural and urban representation, but I don't think a widespread difference of that magnitude is acceptable at all.

Another thing I would like to say is that now is the time for some serious consideration to be given to correcting many of the poblems that developed in the early stages of the other regional governments around the province; and all members know them. Members have all heard of the problems that have been encountered in other regions—in Ottawa, in Carleton, in York, in Muskoka.

They have heard the Leader of the Opposition say on many occasions how the Minister of Municipal Affairs has had to go down and literally bail out the operation with $2 million on the last little effort; a million dollars before that. Now these things have got to be corrected. There is just no way we can permit things to go on as they have.

I think perhaps the best way that this can be corrected would be to listen to some of the advice of the intermunicipal committee when they say that they feel that the regional governments should be permitted under the legislation to assume some functions at the beginning and other functions gradually as they go along, rather than all at once at the beginning of the setting up of the regional government.

In this way I think they could control their costs and have a more orderly development of the area. This applies particularly, I feel, in the areas of roads, transportation, water, sewage, police and fire protection—if it ever gets on a regional basis.

Another thing I feel is that once an official plan has been established in the area, and this should not take too long, then the minister should delegate all of his responsibilities for the approval of subdivisions and zoning to the regional council.

Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who is now also the Treasurer, when he occupied the post exclusively as Municipal Affairs gave one of his prime reasons for being concerned about establishing regional governments as the fact that more local autonomy would be given. In other words, a municipality would have a better say in its own destiny.

Well up to now he has not proven this. He has given lip service to it, but violated it in principle.

He has given no power to the municipalities. We asked him on the establishment of the regional governments how long after the official plan was created before he would turn over some of these planning functions—and the answer was just not forthcoming. They would have to wait and see.

Well there is no point in adding yet another layer of government in any area, including my area, unless there is some decentralization of authority from Queen's Park. And surely the whole basis of establishing a larger unit of administration and of government is to give it some of the authority which now rests here in Queen's Park.

An hon. member: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Good: Well, I think I must say something about the sewage and water services in the region. It is impossible—and I have found this in my area—for a small municipality to establish sewer and water facilities under the present arrangement with OWRC without causing undue hardship to the people who live in that area.

Last December the then Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) indicated to me, on questioning of this sort, that the government was about to make an announcement that the provincial share would be increased from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of works projects within small municipalities. We are still waiting for the announcement.

The other day one of the members asked the now Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld) when the announcement was forthcoming, because this is most important to many of the small municipalities around the province. They are still trying to work out the details.

But let's face it, it doesn't take long to work out the details of raising the provincial share from 50 per cent to 75 per cent. They are dragging their feet for some reason. The only other alternative in this situation is when establishing a regional government to work out some basis of area water and sewer rates.

I don't think this is as acceptable to the local municipalities as is the other system of having the province increase its share. Let me give you an example. Presently in the village of Baden—and this decision is going before an OMB hearing—it will cost the owner on a 100-foot lot $307 to have sewer and water put in on his property. In the city of Waterloo we get that same service for about $80 a year. In the city of Kitchener, maybe it is a little more. In some other municipalities in my area it is as low as $50 or $60 a year.

How do you expect to get sewer and waterworks into these small municipalities unless you change the present system? There is no way you can do it. You can't expect those people to pay $300 a year for something which they should be getting for $80 or $90 a year.

This is one of the problems of planning in the Province of Ontario. The high cost of lots in our urban municipalities is caused by this. If they took enough provincial money to put sewer and waterworks into our small municipalities and created 50 lots in each of these municipalities, it would take the pressures off our cities and bring the price of land down in no time. But you cannot get anybody to act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You can't get anybody to listen.

Mr. Ruston: It is common sense.

Mr. Good: The OWRC has to go to the municipality and the municipality has to sign an agreement. It is these iniquitous agreements that are driving the people away from putting in services, it is not because they don't need them. The people in these little municipalities know they need them, but they just can't afford them under existing arrangements. Something has got to be done about that.

Mr. McNeil: What is the solution?

An hon. member: What they suggested; but implement it!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Seventy five per cent as the provincial share! He told the member. Listen and tell some of the ministers.

Mr. Ruston: Nobody over there is sitting and listening.

Mr. Sargent: Where are the members?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North has the floor. Order!

Mr. Sargent: Have the government whip get busy and get some members over there. Have we got a quorum? Yes, we have a quorum on this side.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the—

Mr. Sargent: Let's call a vote!

Mr. Good: —to the vague section in the government's proposal for redevelopment dealing with roads. This is really pitiful.

Mr. McNeil: One policy for Cornwall and another one for St. Catharines.

Mr. Good: One of the greatest problems in Niagara regional government resulted from the number of miles of provincial highways that were turned over by the Department of Highways to the regional municipality of Niagara.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): We have the same problem in Essex county.

Mr. Good: Seventy five miles of roads were handed over. Under the Highway Improvement Act the Department of Highways can do this. The one short paragraph in the government proposal says that some negotiation will have to take place, but, "we are sure it will all turn out fine and dandy." I submit that before any roads are taken over from one jurisdiction to another, first of all they must be brought up to the proper standard, and this is not always done.

We had an example right in my riding this past year where the Department of Highways turned over a section of Highway 7, former Highway 7 near Baden, to the county. The condition of that road was deplorable when they handed it over.

Mr. Ruston: They have lots of them down in Essex county now.

Mr. Good: It should have been fixed up before.

Mr. McNeil: Ours are always brought up to a standard! Maybe they should have elected a Conservative member.

Mr. Good: Well I am suggesting that the various subsidies which exist at the present time be upgraded so that maintenance of the road systems will not be the burden in Waterloo county that it has been in the Niagara region.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Good: I must say a few words about a regional police force. I am sure the member for Welland South—

An hon. member: I hear they removed the subsidy on that deal too.

Mr. Good: —will know the problems that have been experienced in the Niagara region on this.

Although the regional government under the Regional Municipal Grants Act will be reimbursed at $1.50 per capita when a regional police force is set up, it has been conclusively shown that this nowhere begins to cover the cost of setting up a regional police force. Large infusions of funds will be needed for communications equipment.

Also, if areas now being policed by the OPP will be policed by a regional police force, I think consideration will have to be given so that the regional government will be reimbursed by the province for additional duties required there.

The next thing I think that is going to take some real consideration between now and the time when the legislation is handed down is the matter of transitional adjustment. These are adjustments which are given to the area municipalities to avoid any excessive increase in taxation in any one area for one year.

The terms of the legislation in the other bills were absolutely useless. They were sort of a Robin Hood affair. If one municipality is being hard-done-by you could take some away from another municipality to help this. It ended up that everybody was being affected adversely.

So finally we have the word of the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) that the aid being given to the municipalities under regional government is going to be very flexible. In other words, it will be at his whim and at his wishes. If the municipality is being hard-done-by the minister will drop down with more provincial money to help.

I don't consider that to be a tolerable situation at all. I think the municipalities deserve and have a right to know, in advance, what moneys should be coming to them. There should be grants of a sufficient nature, and on an unconditional basis, so that they won't have to come begging, cap in hand, to the provincial government to help them through the hard times which we know are going to arrive at the beginning of this readjustment period.

Unless the provincial government supplies the money for transitional payments there is no use even talking about them. This is what has to happen. I feel the reserves that have been set up by municipalities that are related to the development and the broad-range growth costs of that area municipality should be allowed to remain in that area government. This would include reserves under unit levies and impost charges which are now being collected by many of the municipalities in the area.

We have a situation which I think is going to cause some problems in the area, and that is the fact that the three cities within the area, Kitchener, Waterloo and Galt, are on an old-type of assessment and practically all the rest of the county is on a market value assessment.

Since the levies from the area governments to the regional government are basically figured on the equalized assessment, I feel that it is most important—and I cannot stress this enough—that the equalization factor which is taken into consideration on these levies be examined and reworked and refigured so that we don't end up with a situation in Kitchener or Waterloo or Galt similar to that in St. Catharines. There, with 27 and some odd per cent of the equalized assessment, the city of St. Catharines was asked to carry 47 per cent of the regional government cost.

Mr. Haggerty: And they wouldn't let them secede!

Mr. Good: No wonder—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Good: No wonder the city of St. Catharines wanted to bring in a bill to withdraw from regional government. I still think it was a phoney decision when they decided that the bill was out of order because you can't amend a public bill with a private bill. They didn't have to amend a public bill; all they had to do was be exempt from some of the provisions of the public bill.

Finally, I would like to make reference to one other issue, and this concerns regional government too. In June, 1971, after the government's proposal for the area had been introduced, the Waterloo area planning board, under its director, sent a letter to the former Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales) and also to the present minister (Mr. McKeough) offering to do an appraisal of potential regional municipal costs and cost apportioning.

This could have and should have been the most important work that was done in the area to precede the implementation of a regional government. But the area planning board didn't have the financial capabilities of doing it, so they asked the province for funds. I'll just read one short paragraph of this letter:

> Turning to the present situation in the Waterloo area regarding the restructuring of local government, it has recently become very apparent that there is a strong body of opinion in the area which holds that a much clearer appraisal of future regional costs and methods of apportioning such costs should be undertaken as a foundation for the establishment of a regional municipality.
>
> It is fully recognized that all future costs in restructuring local government are not measurable. However, it is felt that the Waterloo area is fortunate in that it probably now has a much clearer and more detailed assessment of future growth requirements than had any other regional municipalities prior to their inception, and that it should avail itself of this information in the process of restructuring local government.
>
> Thus emerges the proposal which we are placing before both yourself, as Minister of Municipal Affairs, and the Minister of Treasury and Economics.

The offer went in to the provincial government, to two departments: Let's get this cost study done well in advance of the implementation. The letter came back from the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and he just said a flat "no". No purpose would be served by it.

An hon. member: That is par for the course.

Mr. Good: A letter came back from the Provincial Treasurer and he said: "Well, perhaps it could have some merit." But he said —I think as a means of putting it off, and this you sort of had to read between the lines—that it should maybe be done closer to the time of implementation.

Well a recent check shows that no action was forthcoming; the province wasn't interested in doing a cost study. Consequently it will now appear as though the only cost studies that will be done will be when the municipality sees the first reading of the bill in the order paper.

I say again that it's not a desirable situation, nor a sound basis for local government to operate, when aid to the municipality is left in the hands of the minister concerned.

I would like to stress again the importance of an early first reading of the bill to afford an ample opportunity for study of the legislation. We must make use, in that regard, of the experience that was gained—if there has been anything learned at all—in the regional governments that were established in the other parts of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for London North.

Mr. G. W. Walker (London North): Mr. Speaker, I think it is entirely appropriate that the first words I should utter in this particular Legislature should be in reference to my predecessor, the Hon. John P. Robarts. I consider it a singular honour to have been his successor in that particular riding, and I know that like other Londoners, like all Londoners, I too am very proud to have been connected with such an outstanding Canadian citizen as John Robarts.

I think one only need to look at the major accomplishments of this particular man's administration, to look at the areas of Medicare and legal aid. Legal aid is certainly considered to be one of the finest in North America. Look at the area of the Canada Pension Plan—without the province's co-operation there wouldn't be a Canada Pension Plan. Look at the Ontario Housing Corporation. We're probably the second largest landlord in North America and I think they're doing a darn fine job. Look at the community colleges which I consider to be a great step forward.

Consumer protection and regional government are necessary but sometimes difficult steps to take. It wasn't always popular, but I think it showed the courage and the type of man that John Robarts was. School board consolidation and the Confederation of Tomorrow conference certainly ranked very high as very important matters.

I think at the Confederation conference the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Pearson, was certainly moved by the fact of Mr. Robarts providing the impetus for this voice of the provinces. Without this voice I'm convinced that today we would not be having our voices heard. These have been outstanding years for Mr. Robarts and we thank him today. I think we can also say that future generations will feel a greater indebtedness to this particular man.

It is my honour to have succeeded him in this riding. It's traditional, Mr. Speaker, to refer to one's own riding—that is, London North. I don't intend to describe the merits of such a lovely riding, merely to indicate to the entire Legislature that I invite the members to come to London. If they do I will provide them with a personal tour of the entire city and there they will see for themselves just how beautiful and attractive and pleasant this city is. There's no place I'd rather be. Is there any place you'd rather be?

Mr. Speaker, I should like to address some remarks to the Legislature relative to our news media. The first sustained and intensive contact with the news media that I had was in the election campaign of last year, although I had some prior contact with them as a municipal councillor in the city of London. Indeed, the media are a very important segment of any society and they have a vital responsibility and function.

However, I would be remiss if I did not direct some criticism — constructive but strongly held—toward the news media. They wield a very great influence in deciding what to report and what not to report. It is obvious that if the media fail to report something about which the public should know, that important function is not being performed. If this occurs the public cannot make considered judgements about public affairs without all relevant facts before them. This is a very widely recognized fact.

Not so widely recognized, but an equally important duty of the media, is not to report fact or rumours which, although relevant to public affairs, are so highly prejudicial either to the public interest or to the individual or individuals involved that they ought not to be publicized. The media tend to offend, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in this area not very often in the basic facts on which they report but in the emphasis and treatment they give these facts.

We can see a flagrant example of this in the United States at the present time in the reporting of airline hijackings. The front page, blow-by-blow description of hijackings inevitably encourages the sort of personality who is attracted to this kind of venture, to attempt a hijacking himself. More responsible reporting of these incidents by the media would greatly reduce the extent of this problem. This is an example of the media treating news stories in a manner highly prejudicial to the public interest.

Now if I may turn to an equally flagrant abuse of the media function affecting my own city. In the city of London in the past few weeks we have had an instance of the media reporting a news story in a manner that is highly prejudicial to the individual involved. One of the provincial judges in London has been placed by Chief Judge Klein on special assignment in Toronto. This, of course, required him to be away from his court duties in London. This absence was noted by the media and upon contacting the judge involved, the media found out the judge was on special assignment.

This was treated as front-page news in London. I do not know why it was so treated. It is not uncommon for provincial judges to receive out-of-town assignments from time to time and the nature of a judicial position means what a judge is working on at a particular time cannot always be divulged.

Not only was inordinate prominence given to this story, however, Mr. Speaker, but a further incident was reported in many of the stories telling of that judge's special assignment. More particularly, I recall a large front-page story that split a paragraph to refer to a report that the Crown attorney for Middlesex had ordered transcripts of certain criminal proceedings which had taken place before this judge over two years previously.

No facts were given to connect the two stories, but the fact that they were reported in the same article clearly suggested, with no facts whatsoever to support the suggestion, that the judge's conduct of that case was being investigated. How dastardly, how stupid and how damaging this is.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the media's handling of this case has been highly prejudicial, if not totally destructive, to the judge involved, although the media's treatment has rested entirely on suggestion and not on fact. In the past two weeks, this judge has been subjected to a trial by innuendo, fully in public view.

It is very reprehensible conduct by the media, by the press in particular, whose damage is more enduring when anyone is treated in this manner. It is doubly reprehensible when the person so treated is a judge who occupies a position of great trust and respect in the community and who is by the nature of his position unable to defend himself publicly.

If there are further facts with respect to this judge which merit public attention, they will be made public in due course. If there are no such facts, the judge will have been subjected to an attack on his reputation which was not based on facts, and from which he could not, because of his position, defend himself, and from the effects of which it will take a long time for him to recover, if ever.

All citizens in Ontario have a right to expect fair comment, fair report, fair play, and to expect that the news media will not engage in this sort of conduct. I trust that they will not do so in the future.

Mr. Speaker, when I was nominated a little over one year ago, I indicated at that time that there were three important issues, three important priorities and concerns to the province—in fact, to the nation. Those three issues were employment, environment and Confederation. Those priorities still hold firm today.

Certainly, with respect to employment we have a very important problem; we need jobs. There is no quick solution; there is no ready remedy; and the fast-buck people who come up with a quick suggestion to solve the problem are obviously doing a poor service. The answer can only be found in sound and consistent fiscal and monetary policies, both at the federal and provincial levels, in business confidence at the federal and provincial levels—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The London Life Insurance Co. knows something about that system.

Mr. Walker: —and in dynamic and progressive spirit among all in industry. The latter is perhaps the most important.

The short-term answer is, of course, the special initiatives taken to ease the slump by the various governments. In this regard, the Davis government has certainly provided leadership and obtains full marks from my point of view. It is a commendable record of pump priming and commendable it should be.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Walker: However, these short-term effects are not the final answer. The only answer is in long-term, sound government policies and dynamic leadership in business and in labour. The Davis government has a mandate to accomplish both of these—the short-term and the long-term sound government policies.

There was another party which attempted more radical and dramatic solutions and failed miserably on Oct. 21, suffering the largest setbacks in its own backyard—in the heavy industrial areas. The Progressive Conservative approach in these areas resulted in confidence at the polls. The other approach showed a lack of confidence. To this end, I would congratulate the Premier (Mr. Davis) on his appointment of my colleague from London South (Mr. White). We may only expect from him success in the area of obtaining jobs. That is our number one priority and, gentlemen, you can look forward to that.

The number two issue that I considered at the time of the nomination, and still holding firm today, is the question of environment. Undoubtedly that is the priority of the Seventies. It is a most important one and one

where Ontario has made fantastic inroads. Ontario is certainly considered among the most progressive jurisdictions, if not the most progressive jurisdiction in North America in respect to pollution abatement. And that, my friends, could go unchallenged.

In the next four years it is my opinion that you will see and we may expect far greater progress in the area of pollution abatement. However, the most important element in any pollution programme is involving the people. I think it is necessary for us to re-educate many of the people with respect to their habits—their habits involving litter, their habits involving the desire to have built-in obsolescence in vehicles and the like.

One example that I would like to relate, Mr. Speaker, to this House, involved a participatory programme that we attempted with a great deal of success in our city. We have, running through the City of London, a large and long river. The river for over 100 years has been extremely littered and messy. Our association was unable to organize a massive cleanup of that river on July 1, 1971. Over 250 people turned out to completely clean up six miles of river. It was a family project. There were all kinds of citizens participating, all kinds of organizations and clubs being involved in it. A service organization provided free gloves. There were trucks and there were buses, all provided. We cleared out 65 truckloads of litter and garbage, including one whole car, 13 shopping carts, two bucket seats and a garage.

As always, it is important to involve the people, but as always we must also balance the interest of pollution abatement. We must determine the most prudent course of action in any constructive move with respect to abating pollution. It concerns me that in some industries, where some people are clamouring for the elimination of the problem, that it would destroy the jobs of many, many hundreds of people. We must be very careful to avoid that kind of situation.

The third concern is that of Confederation. It is certainly of great significance, but of greater priority today is the question of jobs. A constitutional amendment is important, but not nearly as important as providing the jobs for our people. I do caution that we continue, however, our reasonable and moderate approach to Confederation matters that has been so evident in the past years. We must avoid the politics of confrontation, which is usually the way of that great benevolent government in Ottawa.

With respect to my riding, Mr. Speaker, there are a few matters that I should like to draw to the attention of the House. As member of Parliament for the provincial riding of London North, I have discovered the many individual problems that arise. They are numerous, and it is impossible at times to keep up not only with the paper work, but the telephone calls and so on. As far as Toronto goes, the facilities in this city for the out-of-town member are reasonably adequate.

With respect to the riding, I think it is very difficult for an individual member to carry on the functions that he is supposed to carry out. The MPP should be very accessible to his people. In London, my law office doubles as a constituency office and may I say that it is at my expense. There is a full-time secretary and a 24-hour telephone service and a weekly clinic which provides a service for the almost 400 people who have approached it in the last 5½ months. Approximately 35 to 50 new problems arise weekly.

It makes it very difficult without appropriate riding facilities and I urge our government to provide for each member in each riding appropriate riding facilities. I think this includes a full office; a fully staffed office; Telex communication to Toronto, to all government offices; free long-distance calls for any constituent who may choose to pick up the phone and have the same benefits as a person living in Don Mills who can call and talk to his member or who can call and talk to the Workmen's Compensation Board even! That should be provided for all citizens all over Ontario. I do not feel that those beyond the toll charge range of Toronto should be penalized further. While the expense is high I feel that the situation warrants it.

Mr. Speaker, it was an honour to have been chosen to sit on a select committee. The select committee on economic and cultural nationalism met a number of times over the period of January and February. In fact I think we sat in excess of 30 days and heard 33 presentations in about five weeks. The committee provided contributions from all parties and I think for some of us new members it probably showed us that not all opposition members have horns.

The committee was a shirt-sleeved group that worked very hard, often into the night. Perhaps one of the most important findings of the committee on economic and cultural nationalism was that really there was no available evidence on which to base any firm

position. For the first time we did have the opportunity of subjecting to severe cross-examination all the proponents of these special causes. As a result some of the positions were rejected out of hand and others were very persuasive.

Another finding was that some of the strongest economic nationalists feed among themselves. It is almost a vicious circle in many respects, Mr. Speaker. One relies on the other for his evidence and before long we are right back where we started and they are all believing in the same thing.

One of the evidences of this was a question posed to Professor Melville Watkins, that great proponent of that party to my geographic right, who indicated when asked what proof did he have that there was a problem: "Why, all the reports we have. We have got this report and we have got that report and we have another report, they all say the same thing." Of course, they rely on Melville Watkins, so before long we are working back into a circle and look what we have.

With our committee we did scent a problem and we think that there may be one. However, we know that we must find the evidence. I exhort this Legislature to take an approach which is cautious and suspicious, to ensure that the evidence of the problem is there. If one finds the evidence of the problem make darn sure that there is a remedy which is appropriate and it is not a remedy that is going to cut off the nose to spite the face.

An example—the boys who go around arguing "buy back Canada." Some of the basic questions are not answered by them. Who buys it? Who pays for it? How much is it going to cost? Where are we going to find the dollars?

I say here and now, Mr. Speaker, that we need foreign investment in this province, in this country. In the next five years $70 billion will be needed in Canada to create the jobs for the new people coming onto the labour market and to be sufficient to reduce the unemployment rate to a more tolerable 4½ per cent which, even at that, is not entirely satisfactory. That is 1,125,000 jobs in the next five years; $70 billion is 1½ times the entire Canadian banking system. That means all the investments, all the loans, all the money on deposit at all the branches and all the bank buildings. I don't think we have that money quickly available in this province and in this country today. Seventy billion dollars is 70 per cent of our gross national product for 1972. The conclusion we can draw from that is that direct foreign investment will be a large part of providing for those jobs.

Having expressed the caution, however, Mr. Speaker, with respect to economic nationalism, may I say that there are apparent faults that have to be corrected. It is our considered opinion that Canadians, by and large, prefer a large degree of Canadian participation.

There are areas of direct action that this government can take that will not damage the economy. Those areas have been outlined in the report of the committee, submitted and tabled March 1. As always, all factors must be weighed. We have to balance the interests. We have to balance the benefits as opposed to the cost. An example of where we may correct problems is in the area of information-gathering. We must improve that. Frankly, it is very poor right now; it's totally unsophisticated. The Calura reports are not very good. Statistics Canada information is not satisfactory. The corporate returns are not fully expansive.

I was pleased to see another area that can be tackled in the Throne Speech, in which it was indicated that preferential Canadian incentives will be forthcoming. I think this is a very good move in a very good direction. There are other areas where we can attack at the present time without great amounts of evidence, and that's in the Canadian content of boards of directors. In that regard, the committee recommended that at this time a tolerable amount would be 20 per cent of the directorate.

One of the larger problems that we had in our committee was defining the terms of reference that we had. What does economic nationalism mean? Does it mean Yankee imperialism? Does it mean American ownership of all our cottage land? Does it mean foreign ownership of our funeral homes? Does it mean ownership of our natural resources? We've got to determine that.

Each person who came before our committee had some special axe to grind and it was very difficult for us to hone it down to something comprehensible. We feel we have isolated the elements of economic nationalism in the report. I feel that it is a good report and that the committee should be continued.

One example of one of the tangents that groups go on would have to be the matter of the International Nickel Co. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) in his mind-boggling approach to it decided that this was his favourite bogey. If we've heard it once we've heard it 50 million times: "These huge

multinationals; the huge foreign-dominated companies; the big bad US companies; Inco is horrible; look what it has done to the 2,000 jobs; it's because those decisions are made in another country; it's because of the American influence; that's the problem, those guys on the other side of the border are ruining our country."

Inco had 2,000 jobs that were abolished. This is awful; there is no question that those jobs are regretted.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They took the landscape too.

Mr. Walker: We went to Sudbury at the behest of the member for Sudbury East and the House leader of the NDP. Lo and behold, what did we find out? We found out that maybe Inco wasn't that big, bad, terrible American company. We found out that Inco was not the subsidiary; the International Nickel Co. of Canada was not the subsidiary, it was the parent. The subsidiary was the United Kingdom plant, and the subsidiary was the US plant.

What else did we find out? We found out it is not American-owned. Forty-nine per cent is Canadian owned and 61 per cent of the shareholders are resident in Canada—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Where did the member go?

Mr. Walker: —and the largest single shareholder was the late R. S. McLaughlin, who held less than one per cent.

Mr. Young: Where's the control?

Mr. Walker: We looked at the directorate; the directorate operates from New York. There is no question of that. The directorate runs the administration from there. However, most of the decisions that affect Sudbury or Thompson, Man., or elsewhere, are made in Toronto.

Now, looking at the directors, there are 25 directors; 14 are Canadian—that is pretty high content—three of them are from the United Kingdom and, to give it a bit of an international flavour, they have included seven from the United States.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Where are the pension funds?

Mr. Walker: These are very interesting statistics, Mr. Speaker. We have found that perhaps the Canadian multinational is just as bad or just as good as the foreign multinational. The decisions, we found, were made in the marketplace, not in some board room in St. Louis or down in Tampa or some other place.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am bringing this forward is to suggest to you that a more cautious approach is wise. We may ultimately come to some conclusions with respect to economic nationalism. However, they should not be hasty conclusions. To hear some of the other parties making reference to them, I feel that the haste is there.

The committee has recommended that we search out the evidence and then render a proper opinion. That is what I hope the committee will do if it is restructured. Those wild-eyed economic nationalists, we found, basically lack the evidence—but they've got lots of emotion.

Now with respect to cultural nationalism, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter that is somewhat different. I think it is important that we exert here a very heavy influence. Educational materials certainly must be by, for and of Canadians. I don't think there is any question whatsoever. However, it needs a great deal more attention, it needs exhaustive study, and it needs far more time to look into the matter.

I would compliment the Prime Minister on taking the approach he has in this vast problem of economic and cultural nationalism The Prime Minister has taken the approach of having a proper group study the problem in a proper manner, not listening to the emotions of the odd select group that happens to appear before them with its own axe to grind but cross-examining all the material available and rendering good decisions.

In my opinion, the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism is a proper approach to the matter and in it again Ontario leads.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Was the hon. member for Sudbury supposed to speak next?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: It is not quite in agreement with the list.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Okay. Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope I am not infringing on someone else's schedule here.

Mr. Speaker: I would say the only difference is that another member of that party is on the list given to me.

Mr. Germa: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, in the short time that I have been in this House I have observed your handling of your very important post and to this date I am quite satisfied with your performance.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, that is nice. Nice of him to say.

Mr. Germa: I would say that we are going to have to rely on you in the future to hold back the great horde of people around us who seem to be opposed to some of our propositions. I would hope that you would consider this small minority group and give us the protection which we so obviously need.

I should also offer my sympathy, Mr. Speaker. I think you are going to have a little bit of trouble with the very noisy group that is to my geographic right. I think they are trying to overcome their frustration about the decimation they suffered in the election with a great noise—

Mr. Singer: That is really devastating.

An hon. member: Is this his maiden speech? I'll be quiet. I'll say nothing.

Mr. Germa: They are going to try to substitute for their numbers with a bunch of noise.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Seventy-two seats in 1972 for the NDP?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): The hon. member won't be back. Elmer will take him the next time around.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I think we can start writing the eulogy for the Liberal Party in Ontario right today.

An hon. member: An epitaph.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Don't worry about us. The member can just look after himself.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I feel quite inhibited coming into this House. As you know, my predecessor, Mr. Sopha, was quite a vociferous person.

Mr. Singer: Fine fellow, he always spoke well of the hon. member.

Mr. Germa: I intend to speak well of Mr. Sopha. I have a great deal of respect for him. I knew his power of entertainment. Almost everyone in the House who knew him asked me: "How is Elmer doing?" and they would interject the statement that he was a great entertainer. This I know about Elmer, but I think this was not the prime purpose for sending Elmer to Queen's Park.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I don't know about that.

Mr. Germa: I know the man very well and he has entertained us in Sudbury as well. On election eve, when an interview on the television station asked me—right in Mr. Sopha's presence, by the way—if I planned to carry on in the same manner as Elmer I said, I hoped that I wouldn't. That I would not come here to entertain you, but I would come here to try and bring the problems of the city of Sudbury, the riding which I represent—

Mr. Singer: Oh, that is a real dedication there. That is a real dedication.

Mr. Germa: —to the attention of this Legislature.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Singer: That is very inspiring. Nice.

Mr. Reid: Another religious fanatic.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I read Mr. Sopha's speeches in this House and I know the things that he talks about. The equestrian statue in the back yard here got a lot of guffaws. The rafters are still ringing from the laughter that Elmer generated when he talked about the position of the horse in the back yard. Each time I approach the Legislature from the back yard Edward VII disappears and I see Elmer Sopha sitting on the horse facing backwards with binoculars the wrong way round up to his eyes. The man was going backwards and looking in the wrong direction through the telescope.

Mr. Singer: And he speaks so well of the hon. member Mr. Sopha will just have to come back and defeat him in the next election.

Mr. Germa: Well, it's a fair game.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The member is starting early isn't he?

Mr. Germa: I don't know whether Elmer had some premonition. There are some peo-

ple who have an instinct for self-survival and they know when to leave the ship. Maybe Elmer was just a little bit smarter than most of the members who stuck with it and went down to defeat.

Mr. Reid: What kind of a maiden speech is this?

Mr. Lewis: It is a nonprovocative maiden speech and it deserves quiet.

Mr. Bullbrook: It may seem so to the hon. member but it doesn't to us.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, at a future date I might not feel so inhibited and I may have to say some other things.

I notice the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) is in the House. I think the gentleman does owe me a debt of gratitude. He does not know how close he came to losing his post when the Conservative candidate in Sudbury announced to the people that if we saw fit to elect him he would be the next Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, I think it was.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and Minister of Lands and Forests): I thank the member very much. The minister doesn't have to worry about losing it to the present member for Sudbury.

Mr. Germa: Yes. Well anyway, when one of the reporters asked him if Leo happened to know that Mr. Raftis was going to get his job, he said: "Well, Leo doesn't know yet, but Bill knows all about it." I think my efforts in the election—

Mr. Singer: Saved the province.

Mr. Germa: —saved the minister his present post.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is right. Look at the gratitude.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No thanks.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Got another entertainer, eh?

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, there was a reason, as you know, that the Sudbury district—the three integral ridings—are represented by Mr. Martel, Mr. Laughren and myself. It was a clean sweep as far as the New Democratic Party was concerned.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: So was Oshawa and Peterborough.

Mr. Germa: You must consider what the reason was that the voters in this particular area, after having been represented by the old-line parties for so many years, would all of a sudden change their minds. I cannot believe that it was my intelligence, or my beauty or my wit.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Germa: So there must have been some fundamental—

Mr. Lewis: It was a very large component of it.

Mr. Germa: —reason why the people of this district rejected the two old-line parties and why they were ready for something new and different and something more exciting.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Transients.

Mr. Germa: It is essential—

Mr. Reid: They didn't forget it.

Mr. Germa: All progressive movements seem to come out of the north and the member can expect more of it to come in the future.

Mr. Lewis: Using Sudbury as the focus for the march of the NDP across Ontario.

Mr. Germa: I think the people of Sudbury are disenchanted; they're fed up with what has been going on.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): And they never had it so good.

Mr. Germa: I was quite surprised to hear the hon. member for London North (Mr. Walker), which fine city I have been in, give us a story about pollution and the operations of the International Nickel Co. There is no one in this House, I dare say, who knows more about the International Nickel Co. than I do.

Mr. Singer: That is nice! Is there anyone as modest?

Mr. Reid: Pretty modest.

Mr. Germa: Because for the past 36 years of my life I have been in the employ of that company. Everything that the hon. member from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has said is absolutely true. Maybe I can elaborate a little more on the facts that he has brought to this House—

Mr. Reid: We will take the member's word for it.

Mr. Germa: –because he knows it from an academic point but I know it from being there–from the horse's mouth!

Mr. Singer: There is a difference!

Mr. Lewis: So we have theory and practice.

Mr. Singer: What more could one ask?

Mr. Reid: If the member for Sudbury East is his theorist, he is in more trouble than he realizes.

Mr. Germa: As far as the pollution abatement programme is concerned, as praised by the hon. member for London North, there's a saying in Sudbury that when a grasshopper goes through the city it had better bring its own lunch pail. That is pretty true about the state of affairs as far as pollution goes. This company has raped the nickel district in northern Ontario, in this province. There is no other area that has suffered–

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member for Sudbury East said that last year and the year before and the year before that.

Mr. Germa: –as much from pollution for the sake of profit than Sudbury and its environs. I say that without any doubt that anyone can refute it. Just a short trip through the city or through the outskirts will bring this very close to members' attention.

Mr. Lawlor: Tell the member for London North that.

Mr. Germa: Sudbury, you might think is, as a mining community rather new. But the first train entered this community in 1883. It was incorporated as a town in 1893. It had electric lights in 1897. Yet, even to this day, the services that the people of Sudbury are provided with–

Mr. Singer: Have to watch out.

Mr. Germa: –are very sparse. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk about the finances of the city of Sudbury for a moment. I have before me here a brief which was presented to the cabinet and probably some of the cabinet ministers who were in the city on that date will remember this brief.

It was presented to the hon. John P. Robarts, then Prime Minister, and members of the executive council on Oct. 28, 1964. The title of brief was "1964–the year of the dilemma." That was Sudbury's position in 1964. There have been some changes since that time. We now call it a nightmare, because the only thing that's happened is that things have become worse.

Apparently the cabinet took no recognition of this brief because they haven't done anything to alleviate the problems that presently face us. I think I will read one sentence from the opening remarks in this brief, which will indicate what was happening in the city of Sudbury in 1964. "If you live in Sudbury you will pay 20.7 per cent more taxes than the average for 29 Ontario cities, yet you will receive less in municipal services." The same situation applies today.

There were seven causes listed but I will pick out two of them which I think are the most important: Its foundation upon the mining industry and amalgamation with adjacent areas. Now these are two tricks that the government played on the city of Sudbury which caused our dilemma in 1964 and the nightmare that we are facing today. There is the matter of finances to provide the services for the people of Sudbury, which should be theirs and which are supplied to most of the other residents in Ontario. Yet the city of Sudbury has not got the proper financial base in order to provide them with this necessity.

Mr. J. E. Stokes: (Thunder Bay): What about that? What about those mining revenue payments? What is the minister going to do about them?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: What is wrong with them?

Mr. Germa: Now the picture in the future: The 1971 debt of the city of Sudbury presently sits at $24,509,000. Our capital expenditures, projected and approved by the board of control, will raise this debt by 1974 to $51,339,000. This is an unbearable burden which the people of the city of Sudbury cannot tolerate nor cannot even afford to pay. In 1935 the city of Sudbury had to go into receivership because it had such an unstable financial base to supply its needs.

Our debt charges in 1971 will have risen from $2.7 million to $6,014,000. The present per capita debt is $343. It is going to rise to $498 per capita.

Compare these figures with those of other municipalities, although just by reading off figures you cannot relate them properly. The per capita debt of Sudbury, as I stated, was

$220 in 1971. The next highest is $216 in Sault Ste. Marie. Cities like North Bay are at $116; Brantford, $181; Thunder Bay, $191. So you see, of 10 cities listed the city of Sudbury carries the highest per capita debt.

The percentage of debt to assessment is another indicator. Here again, Sudbury carries the highest percentage at 2.6 Cities like North Bay at 1.8 per cent; Burlington, 1.5 per cent.

So you see, the pressure has been for these many years and the people of Sudbury have got fed up with this and are demanding that something be done.

Other people have spoken about housing. The member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) had a great problem with housing. The member for Sudbury East outlined to you in very great detail the kind of things that have been happening in the city of Sudbury. And the reason he is having these problems is because the residents of the area, who I believe would rather live in the city, are just being priced out of the market and they have to go out to these subdivisions in what they call the swamps as the member for Sudbury East properly described them.

The vacancy rate, which is the indicator of housing stocks: In June, 1970, the city of Sudbury had a 0.3 vacancy rate. Saskatoon had a 20.3 vacancy rate. Now the city of Toronto—which you people would all know about, having been around here—even though it does have a housing problem, in June, 1970, had a 2.4 vacancy rate. So even understanding the conditions and the prices and the harassment the people who have to rent housing have in the city of Toronto, you can imagine what we were having to do in the city of Sudbury when we had only a 0.3 vacancy rate.

Another survey was done in June, 1971. Had conditions improved? Not at all, Mr. Speaker, the same situation existed. The city of Sudbury was still at 0.3, while the city of Toronto went up to a 2.7 vacancy rate. The city of Toronto had had some relief, even though this is a very rapidly expanding area; at least the housing vacancies had increased by 0.3 per cent. But the city of Sudbury had remained dormant. And, Mr. Speaker, the situation as far as I can see is not going to be solved unless the government sees fit to take direct action in the housing field to contain these land developers and these money lenders, because this is the biggest cost of housing. The cost of constructing a house has not gone up and you can dig up the facts and figures to prove that.

Now, I think the reason for this financial dilemma in the city of Sudbury has two root causes. First of all the old, established reason —which we have lived with—is the inability of municipalities to tax mining companies. Now, I realize legislation has been changed, a couple of years ago, which allows this to happen. But I will explain later how this has not been beneficial to the city of Sudbury and, in fact, we are still in the same dilemma.

In 1961, by order in council I believe, the city of Sudbury was ordered to amalgamate McKim township and the east half of Neelon and Garson townships for the purpose of protecting our water supply. These outlying townships did not have proper sanitary and sewer services, so that the city of Sudbury was ordered to amalgamate these two townships and go in and clean it up.

That was in 1961. Since that time we have spent over $21 million on sewer services alone in these particular areas, not to talk about roads, water services, hydro services or anything else. This is part of our dilemma.

At that time we had wanted to amalgamate the town of Copper Cliff and we had wanted the provincial government to change the law which would have allowed us to get the assessment of that vast complex, the International Nickel Co. But, at that moment, the International Nickel Co. was not willing to be amalgamated by the city of Sudbury. And, lo and behold, when the map for amalgamation was drawn, the town of Copper Cliff—which is, in fact, the International Nickel Co.—was excluded from amalgamation and we were denied the right to that assessment.

Now, things went along and finally the International Nickel Co. did change its mind and it did indicate to the government that they were now willing to pay municipal taxes and the government did announce in February, 1969, that there was going to be a regional government formed in the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Kennedy, the chairman of the Ontario Municipal Board, was appointed as the one-man commission to look into the problems of amalgamating with the city of Sudbury. And Mr. Kennedy spotted the problem immediately. I'll read one paragraph on what he said respecting amalgamation of Copper Cliff, or making sure that Copper Cliff came within the regional boundaries of the city of Sudbury. I am quoting now:

> In the respectful opinion of the commissioner there are strong reasons for uniting Copper Cliff with Sudbury. Copper

> Cliff has been an urban community for a great many years. It is fully serviced and it seems its municipal operations should be integrated into a large urban administration such as that in Sudbury. There may also be some important servicing changes to negotiate and work out and it would be better to have this in the control of a more sophisticated staff of officials.
>
> The general government of an area in which such a large industrial complex is situated will be better served by the administration of the larger city. To be frank, the large corporate presence will be less dominant and fit better into the city milieu.

So Mr. Kennedy recognized the influence of the International Nickel Co. in this whole area.

Mr. Stokes: Very perceptive gentleman.

Mr. Germa: But what has happened since that day, Mr. Speaker? Nothing has happened! We are still in the same boat. Even though the legislation has changed so that mines and smelters are now assessable, even though the assessment work has been done, the city of Sudbury is still denied—95,000 people are denied—its fair share of taxation, because the government has failed to institute a plan of regionalism. I realize there are some opposition forces in the town of Copper Cliff, but I think you have to understand what kind of a town Copper Cliff is.

The land in the town of Copper Cliff is 100 per cent owned by the International Nickel Co. Everyone in there is a tenant whether he owns his own house or not. They are on a 30-day lease. Through this control Inco has a large influence on how the people think in the town of Copper Cliff. There is a citizens' committee. I suspect that the mayor of the town, who is the administrative assistant to the general manager, is the instigator, but there is a man of straw at the head of this citizens' committee. It is not really a man; it is a lady, and I don't think she is made of straw anyway.

Mr. Singer: Other than that, it is correct.

Mr. Germa: Otherwise, I think the statement is pretty true. This committee, I know, has been down here to pressure the government.

I would hope that this kind of activity is not what is holding back the integration of these two communities, because I think that, as the supplier of most of the workers to the International Nickel Co. workforce, we people who live in the city of Sudbury have a right to this assessment.

Mr. Speaker, there was mention made just a few moments ago regarding the International Nickel Co.'s layoff in Sudbury. I think probably most people in this House don't appreciate just what it means to a community which relies on one industry, what a severe jolt it is, when this industry does start to curtail operations, because there is no place else for a person to go and look for a job. At least in a community such as we are in tonight, there is always another job down the street. There is always another shop to go to. But where do you go in the city of Sudbury when the International Nickel Co. decides to curtail production? Is their curtailment justified?

Certainly nickel markets are soft. There are indicators which show that nickel sales are down, but we have to ask ourselves whether or not these things could be or were artificially brought about. When the select committee was in Sudbury I presented a letter to it which connected International Nickel Co.'s activities over the past few years as they relate to the bargaining process with its workers. I went back as far as 1958. We found that in that year, which was a year of bargaining, in May, 1958, International Nickel Co. laid off 1,200 men in the Sudbury area and 200 at its Port Colborne plant. Those negotiations ended in a bitter strike. I am sorry to say I was one of the losers in the strike, because markets were down in that year and the layoffs and the curtailment of work hours inhibited the men. It pulled the guts out of the men, even though we struck the company for 90 days, starvation set in and we had to go back.

In October, 1962, negotiations were begun again to sign an agreement in the spring of 1963. Once again, the International Nickel Co., because of soft markets, laid off 2,200 men in its Sudbury operations. This hindered the bargaining atmosphere. The negotiations ended in a strike.

We finally got a settlement, but it is almost uncanny how this market can happen to soften up just when we wouldn't want it to happen.

We are in the same crisis right tonight. We are going into negotiations; our contract expires on June 10 next year. Negotiations are going to open up almost immediately and here we are faced with another layoff. Inco announced on Jan. 28 that it was going to lay off 1,965 men. The attitude among the workers and in the city of Sudbury is one of sheer fright! The International Nickel Co. doesn't seem to care, because of the glut on the market, whether or not we work, and it

certainly is going to restrain our bargaining power.

Mr. Speaker, I should say something about working conditions in the plant. It has been mentioned here; the member for Sudbury East apparently has mentioned it 50,000 times! I have here a compilation of reportable accidents at the International Nickel Co. from August, 1970, to July 31, 1971. It shows 13, 211 reportable accidents and it shows eight deaths.

One of those deaths is that of Mr. Rodney Long who died in Levack mine. He is only another miner, of course, and this happens so often that it doesn't get too much publicity in the city of Sudbury. You might get a little column in the local press, but these kinds of things don't get much publicity. Mr. Rodney Long was a workmate of mine and I miss him. I'd like to read what was said in the Searcher, of September, 1971, I believe; the date really doesn't matter. I am quoting:

> A month or so ago the workers in Levack suffered a loss when one of their fellow workers was killed on the job. Rodney Long was a young man who had worked for the company a short time. Rodney was found in an old manway, dead from lack of oxygen. There is not too much that we can do to help his family get over the loss of a husband and father. But what we can do and maybe it should have been done before is make sure that the possibility of this happening again is eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the end of Rodney Long for lo and behold, on March 1 of this year I received a letter and it says "Re Rodney Long." It is written by the chairman of the safety and health committee of my union. I'll quote one paragraph:

> What really disturbs me is the press report on Feb. 26, 1972, in the Sudbury Star which reads "Inco acquitted on technicality." A charge against the International Nickel Co. that it did not have proper ventilation in the Levack mine on July 29, 1971, was quashed in court due to a technicality.

This is a technicality in the courthouse, Mr. Speaker, not on the job. The writer asks for an investigation into the conduct of the inquest, because I don't think that a man's death should go without investigation for the sake of a legal technicality. I think that any time we are investigating such a matter the law has to be stretched a little bit in order to get to the bottom of this.

What really happened was that Rodney Long wandered into a drift which didn't have proper air circulation and he died for lack of oxygen. That's as simple as it is. I think that the facts should be brought out, how this kind of thing can happen.

Further, working conditions in the smelter: Mr. Martel's statement was greeted with some derision. I just happen to have a letter written by the chairman of the safety and health committee and it cites one instance of how this company acts. I will read one paragraph from this as well.

> The increased workloads distributed among employees are creating a safety hazard under the present working conditions. Recently, the International Nickel Co. redistributed the work in the Copper Cliff and nickel reverberatories, and I have no objection to that; but I do object to comments made by Mr. Bob Neil, superintendent of that department. His words are: "We will reduce the workforce, but we expect the same production."

This is called speedup, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite familiar with it. I have been told this same story time and again: "Each time that I happen to squeeze a little raise in pay out of the company, my boss would immediately tell me the next morning: 'You have now got a raise in pay. Let's see you earn it'." And after a few years of this, things got going pretty fast.

I continue with another paragraph in this letter.

> In some areas, men have to remain in excessive heat, up to 175 deg. F, and work alone with no direct contact in the event that they suffer from the heat and gas, which may result in unconsciousness.

That is what is going on in the International Nickel Co. smelters, March 2, 1972. Is it any wonder that the member for Sudbury East brought up the International Nickel Co. 50,000 times?

Among all the things that Sudbury doesn't have—and I am sure the former member for Sudbury has spoken about—is lack of health services. I think that the government of this province is collecting money under false pretences when it collects our Medicare premiums and our hospital premiums and then cannot supply us with the services we need. I attended a very interesting meeting of people interested in health services in the city of Sudbury which was conducted in Laurentian University on March 4, 1972. I attended just to find out what the doctors in

the city of Sudbury think of what is going on in this city. On the panel of doctors were: Dr. Prevost, who is the coroner in the city of Sudbury; Dr. De La Riva, who is a GP; Dr. Klusky, who is the president of the Sudbury Medical Association; and Dr. Parroga, who is a GP in the city of Sudbury.

Dr. Prevost, when asked what he thought about emergency services in the city of Sudbury, used one word: "Lousy." Then in further questioning he said; "Lives have been lost because of lousy emergency services."

Each doctor in turn blamed the operation of the hospitals in that no one, or very few people—the doctors don't have anyway—have any say in the operation of the hospitals, in that the board of governors seems to be a closed shop and it is more of a social club than it is a board of governors. I will tell you a little more about that later.

Dr. De La Riva, when asked about emergency medical services, said "the three emergency rooms in the city of Sudbury are useless." He also complains he has "no say on the boards of governors of our hospitals." That was those two gentlemen, the two doctors. Various other comments were made and they should probably be related to some other topic.

The shortage of doctors in Sudbury, as well as of hospital beds, is denying people proper services. Dr. Paraga, who comes from Spain, recited the fact—and he was quite upset about it—that when he came to Canada he had to serve a two-year internship. This apparently is the medical association's idea of what he should do. Then after his two years of internship, he had to rewrite his whole medical examinations over again, subject by subject.

Dr. De La Riva, who is also from Spain, complained about the same problem. It seems strange to me that if we have a shortage of doctors, and if patients are willing to go to foreign doctors—Dr. De La Riva happens to be my family doctor and I think the man is competent—and if these people are willing to come here and supply us with their services, I think the government should intervene, so that the people of Ontario can use the intelligence or the knowledge that these men possess.

Dr. McKlusky was quite critical of the operation of the hospitals in that they have been developed over the years on religious or ethnic lines. I somewhat agree with him that the religion of the people operating the hospital shouldn't have anything to do with medical services. Certainly I don't care. This has apparently retarded hospital growth.

On these boards of governors which control the hospitals in the city of Sudbury. Members of the city council were approached a few years ago when the government decided to go on an expansion programme and asked the participating municipalities to contribute one third of the cost. The assessment levied on the city of Sudbury was $4.6 million and the council was glad to pass just such a motion.

At the same time as we passed this motion, I did make the suggestion that maybe we should follow-up our contribution to the hospital services by putting a member of city council on the board of governors of the hospitals. So with this intent, one of the aldermen did approach the hospitals and we were told that membership on the board of governors is by invitation only and that until such time as we got that invitation, they must imply that we are not welcome.

This was six months ago, Mr. Speaker, and to this date there is no member of city council sitting on these boards.

The shortage of hospital beds in the city of Sudbury is critical and there was a move afoot to put in some convalescent beds to relieve the shortage of active beds. Here again, we face another impasse.

Central Park Lodges of Canada has a piece of property in the city of Sudbury on which they are willing to go ahead and build a hospital. Unfortunately, Cochrane Nursing Home has a licence to go ahead with this project, but doesn't have a piece of land on which they can put their licence into effect.

I have written the minister on this and he tells me that as the licence has been issued, the problem is solved. Well, just waving a licence around in the air doesn't provide a person with a bed.

I think in a thing like this, the impasse should be broken. When one person has a licence and another person has a piece of land, some way or other this problem has to be resolved. I think the Cochrane Nursing Home is going to have trouble in finding a piece of land they can afford to buy in the city of Sudbury.

There is one more item I would like to talk about, Mr. Speaker. This is the problem which permeates almost every area—the problem of paying people salaries for academic accomplishments not connected to their productivity.

This was brought to light in the Department of Lands and Forests; I have had communication with the minister. It concerns the fish and wildlife supervisor in the district of Sudbury. This man has a very large territory

yet his salary is not commensurate with the fish and wildlife supervisor in the Chapleau area. I will just give you a few facts.

In the Sudbury area, this man supervises 17 people, while in Chapleau his counterpart supervises 10. The resident population of Chapleau is 6,400; in the Sudbury district 220,000. The budget that is administered in Sudbury is $226,000; in Chapleau, $88,000. The area in square miles is Sudbury, 15,000; Chapleau, 10,000. Park users are: Sudbury, 260,000; Chapleau, 55,000.

One would suspect that the man in Sudbury had the bigger job. He has more staff to supervise, a greater area, a bigger budget—almost everything he does is double what the man in Chapleau does. Yet this man receives $3,600 a year less.

This violates the principle of equal work for equal pay. This man's workload is three to one against the man in Chapleau and yet, because he doesn't have biologist 3 rating, the man cannot reach his proper wage scale, even though he has been with the department for more than 30 years.

I think the people of Ontario are not willing to pay people just because they have an academic accomplishment. I think there has to be some relation to productivity. If this man in the Sudbury district, who is doing the job and has been doing it—and he must be doing it satisfactorily because he has been in the post for something on 30 years—then I think there is a great injustice in the Lands and Forests department and it indicates discrimination.

I think that's about all I have to say tonight, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to enter into the Throne Speech debate, let me take this opportunity to congratulate you on being elected Speaker. I am confident, as so many members have already stated, that the choice is an excellent one and that your decisions will be impartial in the interest of all members of this assembly.

I would also like to express my appreciation for the assistance and co-operation I have received from many ministers and from government officials during my first term in office representing the constituents of Welland South. It is my desire that our relationship will continue in the best interests of all those citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech debate also gives one the opportunity to speak on some important issues and happenings in one's riding. At this time I want to express my gratitude to the constituents of Welland South for once again placing their confidence in me and giving me their support in re-electing me for a second term in the Ontario Legislature.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, every effort was made by the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province to have me unseated. I can well remember him coming into the municipality of town of Fort Erie, and to my dismay there were only about half a dozen people to greet him—and I was one of them. This wasn't during the election, of course; this was one of those tours through the province to get the feeling of shaking hands with the people it the area.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Some political tour!

Mr. Haggerty: One of my disappointments about his tour through the riding was when he came into the city of Port Colborne—I hope I am right about this—when the Prime Minister toured the International Nickel Co. plant. I felt a little put out that I wasn't the one to go along with him. Some place along the line the Conservative candidate entered those premises.

But, again, I say: "Well, what did I miss?" I also worked at the International Nickel Co., so I do know something about the operations of International Nickel Co. In fact, I believe I did work in one section of the plant they call "the black hole of Calcutta". I won't go into detail on that; I have mentioned it at different times, but we'll let that go by.

But it is a pleasure for me to represent Welland South riding, and that is the municipality of the town of Fort Erie. It is known as "the gateway to Canada" and one of the largest ports of entries to Canada. It is a community that is one of the oldest landmarks in Canadian history.

In prehistoric times there was evidently a large Indian settlement in the vicinity. Large quantities of stone axes, arrowheads, celts and fragments of pottery were found in the sand mounds. Just a few years ago Indian skeletons were uncovered in a construction site. In about the year 1750 the French built a small wooden stockade and established a garrison which they maintained until it was captured and rebuilt by the British.

No place in the province has a longer or more eventful historic record. Fort Erie played an important role in defending Canada in the War of 1812. There was the Battle of Lime Ridge. Perhaps some members in this House can recall that as they are going out of this main building here, to the right is a bronze plaque that commemorates the Battle of Ridgeway. I believe there were some persons who were killed at that battle. The Battle of Ridgeway was fought on June, 1866, some eight miles west of the old fort, at which were encountered Fenians who were later forced to retreat to the Niagara River and to Buffalo, New York.

William Lyon Mackenzie King used the site of Fort Erie in the year of 1837 to escape to the United States.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Why are the radicals always praised after they are dead?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Because they are safe.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is the member in a hurry for some praise?

Mr. Haggerty: Listen to the member from Lakeshore talking. He goes into debates in this House and he can go back, quoting from the Romans and Corinthians and so forth, and we have to put up with it. Yet when I try to explain to him a municipality the size of the town of Fort Erie and what an important role it played in Canadian history he says what for?

Mr. Lawlor: The member didn't answer my question.

Mr. Haggerty: He is not interested at all in Canadian history whatsoever!

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member should hear him on the Peloponnesian wars.

Mr. Haggerty: All these episodes, Mr. Speaker, and the rebellion of 1837—the Fenian raids of 1866—helped foster the Confederation of 1867, I should say.

This year the town of Fort Erie and its 22,000 citizens will once again come alive with a great enthusiasm and spirit to celebrate Fort Erie's annual summer festival commencing on July 1—to the member for Lakeshore, that is Canada's birthday—to July 9.

Mr. Ruston: A good point!

Mr. Haggerty: There are a number of major attractions to be held, which will not be found in any other municipality in Ontario. The Cherry Hill Golf and Country Club of Ridgeway, Ont., will be hosting the 63rd Canadian Open, one of the world's top PGA tournaments. Such great golfers as Lee Trevino, Gary Player, Arnold Palmer and Jack Nicklaus are the hopeful starters.

Cherry Hill Golf and County Club will also be celebrating its 50th anniversary. The president, Mr. Ed Atwill, extends a hearty welcome to all members of this legislative assembly to celebrate one of Canada's most famous traditions in sport, that is golf.

As I can recall the history Mr. Speaker, in 1873 I believe it was, the first golf course—the Royal Canadian Golf course—was formed in the city of Montreal. Of course it is a great Canadian culture brought in from Scotland.

There will also be the Canadian Armed Forces flying aerobatic team on display. International boat racing will be held on the Niagara River. They tell me that one of the top British bands—that is a brass band—will be present. I believe this is being sponsored by the Niagara Parks Commission. Crystal Beach is one of Canada's largest amusement parks, and no doubt this will offer much for general interest and playgrounds for the youngsters in that area.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mayor John Teal and the citizens of Fort Erie I invite all members here, and citizens generally, to join him to celebrate that Fort Erie Summer Festival.

Mr. Speaker, the main issue facing the provincial government as well as the federal government is unemployment in Canada. The government has failed in its commitment in the budget speech last year to create full employment.

There were some grand announcements by the then Treasurer and the Minister of Trade and Development that deficit spending by the government will create full employment. The promise has never ben fulfilled and will not with the government and its ad hoc programmes.

It is time for the government in Canada to shelve many of its millions of dollars in short-term, work-incentive programmes for a more definite, planned economy to create and develop permanent industries. It is time we in government called a halt to our present day extraction of our natural resources.

The recent announcement of Ward Cornell, an Ontario businessman and communications expert—and they tell me an expert is a person who knows more and more about less and

less all the time—has been appointed agent general for Ontario in the United Kingdom. The announcement was made the other day by the minister of Trade and Development (Mr. White). I do not criticize the expert, but I do criticize the government's position.

One considers that there is a lack of communication with the federal government, a duplication of services and a lack of a clear understanding of the authority of the Canadian provinces and the federal government in such areas as trade and industry. Foreign businesses must look to Canada not as the Province of Ontario but as 11 separate states.

I believe there are many other examples in the matter of trade. One central government should be the spokesman for direction and for all practical purposes of trade. Too much is lost in the division of interest and authority in foreign trade in Canada. The duplication effort can be a waste of money and manpower. Canada can benefit from a closer provincial relationship in the area of trade and industry.

The entry of Britain into the European Common Market will no doubt cause some strong support and effort comes from this government in moving in a favourable export programme, especially in the pork industry.

There is a growing concern in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, from among members of large industrial corporations in the private sector about the need to maintain an adequate level of industrial productivity.

When the rate of productivity drops, particularly below that of wages and salaries, the door is open to inflation and an economic stagnation. Costs go up and the competitive edge on marketing is eroded, inasmuch as there are no longer any captive markets of trade in the world, a factor that once made costs a secondary consideration in each trading nation.

Countries now must seek new markets in an open and competitive manner. Successful trade means the ability to manufacture goods for sale and distribution completely abroad, in addition to ensuring a reliable delivery system and distribution of the goods and services.

Among producer nations Canada ranks second lowest in the rate of increased productivity. I list below trading nations and the respective percentage rate increases in productivity: Japan, 14.2 per cent; the Netherlands, 8.5 per cent; Sweden, 7.9; Belgium, 6.8; France, 6.6; Switzerland, 6.2; West Germany, 5.3; Italy, 5.1; Britain, 3.6; and Canada 3.5 per cent. The United States is below the two per cent level.

The Davis government, Mr. Speaker, has already embarked on a programme of tax credits to subsidize industry, but we suggest most strongly that the programmes as such are neither selective, nor were they well conceived in the execution. It seems fair to conclude, therefore, that the returns from these programmes to the people of the province are small.

By contrast, it is noted that there are a number of corporations in Ontario that have never had it so good. They have increased their profits by millions with fewer man-hours to produce that profit. There is not a week goes by that one cannot see the cost of living rise.

The banks, the trust companies—and I can think of the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) speaking here a year ago mentioning this—the banks, the trust companies and the loan companies have never had it so good in the Province of Ontario. The profits are greater and greater, year by year.

What this government should do now is to make inquiries as to how the government of Japan, and its industry, keep their employment rate up. The Japanese industry is looking towards Canada's labour market. Not on the low-cost labour market—not on the grounds of wages paid to Canadian workers —but rather because labour is available in this country.

What a shameful thing that we have this unemployment today, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Yano, president of Canadian Motor Industries Holdings Ltd., assembler and distributor for Toyota cars in Canada, told the Sherbrooke Record recently that there aren't enough bodies to fill vacant positions in Japan today. But in Canada the reverse was true. However high the wages prevailing in the automobile industry here, he was discussing the probability of the establishment of an auto manufacturing plant in Canada.

Often I have heard the hon. member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), in speech after speech in the Legislature, tell this government to introduce a programme through Ontario Housing Corp. to build modular homes, thus creating new jobs and easing the housing shortage in Ontario.

It has come to my attention that Misawa Homes Ltd., Japan, is signing an agreement with Greenwood Forest Products Co. Ltd. to set up a joint venture for construction of

modular homes in this country, particularly in British Columbia. It is the intention of the Misawa Homes Ltd. to provide 600 new housing units each year, and to that end the company has provided funds for the project to the extent of four-sevenths of the total capital expenditure.

Inasmuch as the Japanese commercial interests have publicly expressed an interest in entering into an additional cost-sharing programme in industry with any government, at any level, we on this side strongly recommend that the present government undertake to review this situation immediately.

Mr. Speaker, the hour of 6 o'clock has now arrived; I wish to pause for recess at this time.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

March 14, 1972

Department of Education reorganization re task force recommendations, statement by Mr. Wells 363

Reorganization of Department of Education, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon .. 366

Executive assistant's actions questioned re WCB press release, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. R. F. Nixon 366

Payments to former WCB vice-chairman, questions of Mr. Guindon, Mr. Bales, Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Deans 367

Alleged rescinding of compensation board penalties, questions of Mr. Guindon and Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman 371

Access to Robarts Library re U of T acting president Sword's statements, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Singer 375

University of Waterloo, bill respecting, Mr. Good, first reading 376

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne: Mr. Martel, Mr. Good, Mr. Walker, Mr. Germa, Mr. Haggerty 378

Recess, 6 o'clock 408



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 12

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 14, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: I believe when we rose at 6 o'clock the hon. member for Welland South was speaking.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(*continued*)

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I might continue, I am glad I have the attention of one hon. member to my left here, the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor). I think I caught his eye this afternoon. I am delighted he is back in the House this evening.

The select committee on economic and cultural nationalism in the first report had committed itself to another merry-go-round on foreign investment in Canada and Ontario. Surely there have been sufficient reports and studies in the last 30 years to have set government guidelines in force by now. To me the main goal in foreign investment is how many jobs will be created in the Province of Ontario and throughout Canada; not who is putting the money into Canada, but how many jobs can we create, how much can we increase the labour force? That is the most important thing to all of us in Canada today; how many can we get employed out of it?

The committee noted that the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) recently announced that the government is preparing a white paper on resources. I hope that the Premier and Stanfield find some agreement because they are miles apart. Stanfield, speaking in Nova Scotia—I believe at one of his meetings down in Nova Scotia one of the eastern provinces—was reported as follows, and I am quoting:

> One of them was a carefully worded speech delivered in Halifax last week by Progressive Conservative leader Robert Stanfield. He indicated fairly forcefully he is opposed to the restraints on foreign investments believed to be under consideration by Prime Minister Trudeau's government. He qualified his position a bit in order to leave himself free to apply some form of restraint should he win the election.
>
> His key statement was that he is against preoccupation with foreign ownership to the point where it denies needed capital for industry in urgent need of industrial growth. He pronounced himself against any policy which relies exclusively on controls to further Canadian ownership of businesses. By inference at least, he suggests that such controls should be applied, if at all, selectively—perhaps with vigour in Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What does Goodman say? Tell us about that.

Mr. Haggerty: I will tell the member; just sit still!

Goodman speaks in Thunder Bay, Ont., and as the article goes:

> It was seeing all those Canadian companies going under that got Edwin Goodman. "I really became a nationalist when I saw what was happening to my work as a lawyer with all those Canadian companies selling out to the Americans," Mr. Goodman said Sunday after being chosen national chairman of the Committee for an Independent Canada. The organizational talents of the former national chairman of the Progressive Conservative Party will be taxed in his new role as leader of the new movement.

It goes on to say that Mr. Goodman says he must gain members.

> Mr. Goodman said a priority is to increase membership in Quebec and added he is confident this can be done. Most Quebeckers believe in an independent Canada, he said. "As a group we are feeling more militant, more determined to secure our views," said the 53-year-old Toronto lawyer who organized Conservative Party federal campaigns in 1957, 1958 and 1962, and was Robert Stanfield's campaign manager.

What a split personality we have here.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should set the record straight. I believe our Liberal platform in the last provincial election on foreign

control was one of the best programmes put forth to the citizens of this province for their decision. There were many excellent editorials that thought it was a good sound approach. I would like to read these into the record.

Under a Liberal government, Ontario will no longer be for sale at cutrate prices to outsiders. Foreign investment will continue to be welcome but it will be welcome on our terms in accordance with a policy that will encourage Canadians to take the risk and reap the rewards that for too long have been left to others.

A Liberal government will also take steps to ensure that the education of Ontario properly reflects Canadian ideas and traditions. The main thrust of the policy of economic and cultural independence must originate in Ottawa. We do not believe it is exclusively a federal problem. There is much the provinces can do, especially in the constitutional areas of property rights, natural resources, the land and education.

Ontario could take the lead among the provinces in devising the policies which would mesh with federal legislation to create a set of sensible rules and incentives to promote Canadian control of the Canadian economy.

Under the direction of a task force reporting to the Premier and with the cooperation of the departments concerned, a Liberal government will do just that. We believe, as do the federal authorities, that a workable policy on economic independence can only be arrived at in the context of an overall industrial policy.

The task, in other words, is not just to discourage foreign control of our resources and industries. We also have to find new ways of bringing together Canadian talents, Canadian energies and Canadian capital to make this country, already one of the world's storehouses, into one of the world's great workshops as well.

Accordingly, a Liberal government will set up a foreign investment review board that will work toward our long-term goal, Canadian control of all corporations doing business in Ontario. The board will have the power to screen all proposals for foreign takeovers and substantially direct foreign investment in Ontario. They won't be approved unless it can be shown that: (a) all possible sources of Canadian capital, public and private, have been explored; and (b) the investment is otherwise in the public interests.

Mr. Stokes: If the Liberal Party could just sell that policy to Ottawa, they would be all right.

Mr. Haggarty: We will sell it.

One of the board's important guidelines would be that the foreign loan capital is preferable in equity investment. It is better to have outsiders loaning us money than taking a controlling piece of the action.

An hon. member: These members couldn't get investments from anyone.

Mr. Haggerty: To continue:

In other words, we want to see more Canadians starting new companies and we want to see established companies maintained in Canadian hands. To help this process along, a Liberal government will expand the present role of the Ontario Development Corp. whose main function now is to promote development in slow-growth areas of the province. The ODC, in addition to its present functions, will become a buyer in the last resort in cases where takeover is imminent in such key areas as communications or finance. In cases where the owners of Canadian firms in key sectors of the economy want to sell out to foreigners, the ODC could help that firm's employees to buy the company themselves.

If we had tried that a few years ago, Royal Securities might not be run from Wall Street.

But last-minute interventions in undesirable takeovers are not a substitute for overall policy. We are not out to discourage foreign enterprise so much as to encourage the Canadian variety. This means setting up machinery that will make it easier for Ontario residents with some commercial ideas to set up their own companies and for established Canadian-owned companies to expand.

What we propose then is that the Ontario government should go into a venture capital business as a silent partner. The big weakness of many government investment schemes, including ODC, is that they tend to be cautious, slow-moving and subject to political pressure. The way to get around this, we believe, is by the formation of a number of private venture capital firms. Their job would be to provide seed money to promising young ventures, not in the form of loans but in equity.

A Liberal government would be prepared to buy up to 40 per cent of the shares of those venture capital companies, and a

direct guarantee would make it easier to raise the remaining capital from the investment public, resulting in a pool of private and public money, managed by businessmen and not bureaucrats, that would invest, in the early stages, in young Canadian enterprises. The government investment in these venture capital firms could be made through the ODC, whose policies could be integrated with those of the federally incorporated Canada Development Corp.

In addition, the Liberal government would institute several basic reforms designed to improve our ability and to encourage Canadian control of the economy. Federal laws now require, for instance, that private companies with assets of more than $5 million, including subsidiaries of foreign firms, make full disclosure of their financial affairs. We believe that identical disclosure requirements ought to apply to Ontario provincially incorporated firms.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier of the province should obtain the services of Eric Kierans. Mr. Kierans claims that, in 1968, for instance, United States-owned subsidiaries had total funds available of $2.611 billion. Only $127 million of that came from over the border. They earned $1.027 billion in Canada and borrowed another $539 million from Canadian financial institutions and benefited to the tune of $864 million from depreciation allowance. The remaining $54 million is accounted for in sundry accounting adjustments. Says Kierans: "Our tax laws are such that increasing ownership and control of Canadian firms can be entirely financed from within our own economy. It is not what the Americans have done to us but what we have done to ourselves."

In the context of trade expansion in the Province of Ontario we Liberals recommend the following methods of ensuring a favourable rate of productivity in the private industry:

1. Increased capital equipment cost per worker;

2. Development of higher worker skills;

3. Higher educational standards requisites and improved methods of job training and retraining programmes;

4. Increased research and technology funds and programmes;

5. Fostering and discovery of new techniques and processes in industry;

6. Increased improvement of favourable working conditions in employment.

Mr. Speaker, a recent study of employment conditions in Japan has produced the following, rather startling revelations: Wages are determined by ability, education, length of service, type of jobs and the number of dependants. The same wage-determining formula is applied to all workers in Japan—clerical, production, administrative, sales and technical.

In a survey conducted by the Japanese Federation of Employees Association involving 100 large Japanese industries, the following conditions apply:

1. Labour unions exist in ninety-one per cent of all large corporations surveyed and ninety-four per cent of those unions combine blue- and white-collar workers;

2. A monthly, as opposed to hourly, wage system is in effect;

3. In ninety-five per cent of the companies surveyed, lump-sum retirement allowances prevailed;

4. Some 86 per cent of employers provided homes for the married employees, and ninety-one per cent supplied dormitories for single employees;

5. Twenty per cent of the companies surveyed provided subsidized allowances to most employees to help meet the cost of municipal utilities—for example, water and electricity;

6. Seventy per cent of the companies surveyed maintained company savings plans with interest rates on the level twice that of chartered banks;

7. Ninety per cent of the industries surveyed offer a paid-up life insurance policy for their employees;

8. Seventy-five per cent of those companies surveyed offer long-term low-interest housing loans to their employees—one-third the interest rate levied on the open market;

9. One hundred per cent of all companies sponsored some sort of athletic and cultural activities for their employees—for example, sports grounds and equipment, libraries, health centres, mountain and seashore resorts and vacational courses in education.

In summary, many Japanese industrial corporations in the labour field today base productivity, not on facilities available or demand, but upon the number of quality workers that can be secured. The lifetime employment concept is firmly entrenched in the Japanese economy whereby labour and management work together in unison to attain the objectives of the enterprise concerned.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech the government made passing reference to the industrial-commercial conversion to the metric system, which is now in force in most trading nations in the world—some 90 per cent, I believe. Several prominent documents have evolved from the many research projects related to conversion but it seems clear that when it is time for Canada to convert in industry we must make every effort at the national and provincial levels to set up a conversion system of Canadian origin. A native conversion of industry would provide an abundance of jobs nationally and provincially and, of equal importance, would pay for the conversion process, which would remain in and would be redistributed within Canada.

In a recent editorial in the Buffalo Courier-Express, Senator Peel of Rhode Island alleged that:

> Delays in setting up facilities for conversion to the metric system in the United States would cost the country $600 million in trading benefits each year. The commerce committee of the United States Senate has been asked by Senator Peel for legislation enacting conversion and that it be approved by Congress so that the process will implemented by 1982.

In addition to maintaining Canadian money in Canada and creating jobs, why should we pay for the services of Americans or of some other country for some other conversion industry when capital for the project is here in Canada already?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could go on in more detail here to discuss some of the other issues in the Speech from the Throne—and much of it is window dressing. I notice the Lieutenant Governor mentioned:

> My government will propose to hon. members that a commission be appointed to review the functions and processes of the Legislature and means by which these might be improved to give elected members better opportunities to serve their constituents and to enhance the role of the private member in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe we have to form a select committee or a commission to delve into this. I think perhaps what should be done now is that this House should sit four days and nights a week, Monday to Thursday, and have Friday, Saturday and Sunday off so that many of us living outside the limits of Metro Toronto perhaps could go back and tend to the business of our constituents.

Another matter I think should apply in this instance is that each member living outside Metro Toronto should have some sort of a facility, such as an answering service, set up in his riding so he could look after his constituents while he is here in Toronto.

I think these are some of the improvements that can be made and will be of great assistance to the members here. Too often, as I sit here on a Friday morning for two hours, I find that it is a waste of time of members to sit in this House for two hours in the morning—from 10 o'clock to 12 o'clock. By the time a member living 1,200 or 1,500 miles from here gets home and says hello to his wife and goodbye, he is back on the train again. Some of the ways and means of travelling in the Province of Ontario are not the best, and I feel these members, particularly from the north, should have better ways of travelling to their ridings, and I think one is by air travel. We're into that field now in the Province of Ontario.

Just this evening, Mr. Speaker, while taking some notes up to Hansard on the third floor, I walked into the room where the girls do the typing and I thought to myself, "Boy, this place is pretty warm in here." There's no fresh air at all. It wouldn't hurt to have a little air-conditioning unit put in to perhaps make it more comfortable for them to work.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): It's all the hot air from down here.

Mr. Haggerty: Well, that could be quite true.

On another matter, the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) spoke on regional government, and I know the government has made some announcements that it is going to implement regional government in other areas of the Province of Ontario. One area is Kitchener-Waterloo; the other is the Haldimand-Norfolk area. The minister was in that area, and a newspaper article reads: "McKeough in Cayuga: Counties Told to Decide Soon on Regional Government." He goes on to give some of the advantages for regional government. He says, for example, municipalities with a minimum of between 8,000 to 10,000 people can afford to hire good engineers and accountants. I can tell members this, from sitting on local government at the municipal level, I think it is a lot cheaper and more reasonable to get a job perhaps done better, to go out and hire consultants to come in to do a job for planning sewers and waterworks within the municipality.

All one has to do is look at the regional

setup of the Niagara region. One picks up the index book to find out who to contact in the region of Niagara and it is almost as large as the one we have here for the provincial members. There are so many. We get administrator; assistant administrator; another assistant, another assistant and another assistant. This is the red tape that we have to go through.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): And an executive assistant.

Mr. Haggerty: It seems that the regional governments have perhaps overstaffed themselves in many instances in certain personnel. A recent article in the paper here—past week, said on Friday, March 10, the regional government set their budget—the headline was "Regional Budget Up by $1.784941 Million." A $1.75 million increase.

The biggest hike in the cost of regional government in the Niagara area is the cost of policing that community. This year that cost alone will increase close to $1 million for policing the Niagara region. One of the amazing things about this is the elected representatives had little say in the policing of the Niagara regional police force. Sure they have two persons appointed to it but there are three appointed by this province.

The local autonomy is gone. I say to the members of this House, particularly those who are going to have regional government within a year or so—Waterloo and Kitchener and Haldimand-Norfolk—I wouldn't buy regional government for anything until this government comes through with the proper tax reforms. You know, after the last provincial election was over with the many tax gifts—the sales pitch was telling the people before the election "Sure, we are going to give you the basic shelter exemption to reduce the tax levy." Now that the election is over the government has taken that away.

I can see these candidates who are running for regional government again this fall—an election comes up this fall—are going to have a hard time going back to the taxpayers of that municipality saying, "Elect me." I can tell the House that in many instances the taxes are going to increase well over $100. I don't know where the taxpayer is going to get that to pay for policing and to absorb the loss of the basic shelter exemption tax. Whatever programme the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is going to come out with, I don't know. It is going to be based on ability to pay, I guess.

In one sense it is getting to the stage now in the Province of Ontario that it is not worth owning any property. It doesn't matter what paper one picks up, one finds that in the region of Niagara some of the municipalities are getting into a financial crisis and they will try anything to get revenue in to offset the increase in taxes.

Here's one for the town of Fort Erie: "Impost Fee Is Set at $500 by Council"—that's before you can even build a home. Plus the building tax that applies on a building permit; there's $75 or $50 there. This is going on all through the region of Niagara because those municipalities are hard up for money. When you have to go out and put a $500 impost fee on persons building on lots, who are trying to build new homes, it is getting ridiculous in the Province of Ontario. It is discouraging the building of houses. One would almost think that this government is going back to the stage—we're heading into a feudal system of government—where the government owns and controls everything. The government is taking what little rights there are left from an individual who wants to own a home in the Province of Ontario.

There are many faults with the regional setup in the Niagara area. I can't blame it all on the government here, I think. First of all, the regional government should have walked instead of run, because the legislation was set up that it had to get into services such as waterworks system and the sewage system programmes. It didn't have to get into that programme—the Ontario Water Resources Commission was providing that service—but now that we are into this thing it has cost a heavy tax on municipalities, particularly when the region is set and their budget or their income is based on what revenue they can collect, to say there is a freeze at $15 million and that's the most we can spend on treatment facilities within that region. It shouldn't be. Pollution is a problem in that area, particularly from the lack of sewage treatment facilities in municipalities.

What I suggest and I've suggested it here before is that this government should set up some type of a programme, either a federal or a provincial bank where these municipalities can go and borrow at a reasonable interest rate. I just can't quote you the figures of what it's costing that municipality of Niagara to borrow money from a bank to carry it over a period of about six to seven months until this provincial government comes through with the grants—it's high, I can tell you that much.

I think the member for Waterloo North mentioned the provincial government unloading a number of miles of highway onto the Niagara regional government. There were a number of miles of roads there. I just can't give you the quote; I think he said 75 miles of roads. You know, it's very odd that at this time that region is out now building new bridges and building these roads up to, say, par for the county roads which were not up to par before, even for a provincial highway, and in the meantime this government, under its provincial subsidies on roads, has reduced that subsidy—I'm not talking about the 50 per cent, but reducing the grants to that municipality – so that it doesn't have enough working capital even to go out and maintain these roads that the province has shoved off onto it.

These are the problems with regional government. It will work provided this government comes through with the proper tax reforms as suggested in the Smith report on taxation. It is going to have members of the regional council over here requesting more provincial grants. It was rather shameful when the mayor of the city of St. Catharines came in here with that private member's bill to try to secede from the regional municipality of Niagara and it was turned down. I think that council had good points, and the grievances were there, but this government and this committee would not listen to them.

There is an inequity in that system of government in the Niagara region and there are municipalities that cannot afford to stay in it. But just to cast that bill aside for some technicality and say, "No, we won't accept it here, it's a private bill" was shameful. Amendments can be made in the Niagara bill, and I think the government should have given them the time to present their side of the case. They were never given that opportunity, and I think this government was wrong in taking that stand in that committee.

There's talk about air pollution control in the Throne Speech. I come from an area that's pretty well contaminated by foul air. Here's an article from the Niagara Falls Review:

> $400 Air Pollution Fine for Sand Dredger Owner
>
> The Niagara Falls owner of a 170-ft. sand dredger was fined $400 in St. Catharines provincial court for allowing his ship to pollute the air near Queenston dock, and the president of Cadwell Marine Ltd. was ordered to pay the fine for two violations under the Canada Shipping Act's air pollution regulations.
>
> Joseph Lyng, an inspector with the air management branch of the Ontario Department of the Environment, testified that smoke from the company's sand dredge, the W. C. Cadwell, exceeded the density allowed by the branch on two days during 1971. Using a smoke density chart, Mr. Lyng said he stood by the ship at the Queenston dock and recorded the high readings Oct. 28 and again on Dec. 10.

You would have to question this action by this person employed by the government. The city of Welland location—and I think Ralph Nader, that great crusader in the States, has spelled this out in a report—that the area is within one of the most highly contaminated airsheds in North America. Dr. Coper of Niagara Falls—I believe he is a specialist in lung diseases—advises people not to live within the area of Union Carbide because it has a serious effect on a person's health.

The health hazards are there. Yet the Department of the Environment, as close as it is to this plant, totally ignores the emissions from this plant. You can go to the city of Niagara Falls, and there are days that you almost have to drive through that community with your lights on to get through the smog and pollution pouring from I believe it is the carborundum plant at Chippawa.

It seems this government has taken this stand. I know it has taken it at a certain plant—I shouldn't say certain plant; the International Nickel Co. at Port Colbourne—and has given them a licence to pollute. But in this particular instance of the fellow who owned the ship, it fined him $400.

So you wonder just how much pull do these large companies have with this government here in Ontario that it is allowed to give them a licence to pollute. I can tell you this, I believe that they have some pull or in with the government in the Province of Ontario. It is too bad that the former minister from Halton (Mr. Kerr) still wasn't in that position as minister of that department, because I think he was trying to do the job of cleaning up the air pollution in Ontario.

So I don't know what this government is intent on doing in the Throne Speech by saying we are going to add more pollution abatement programmes. I am still waiting to see the regulations that apply to the noise pollution abatement in the Province of Ontario. Remember the bill we passed here last year? I think it was in late July. I think we wound that debate up about 4:25 in the morning.

Those regulations are still not in effect as yet.

Yet I know of a plant in the city of Port Colbourne, the Port Colbourne Drop Forge, which is creating quite a noise nuisance within that vicinity. I have written to the Department of the Environment on this, and to the deputy minister, and he said: "The regulations are not available as yet. We are still working on them." Now, how long does it take this government to apply regulations to a bill that was passed last July? It was so important to pass it at 4:25 in the morning. It was that important. It was just another window-dressing for the election.

You still haven't come through with any decent pollution control on noise problems in the Province of Ontario. Police can go out and catch some youngster on a little motorcycle and bring him into court and charge that the noise level is higher than what it should be; and how the policeman arrives at this figure I don't know. He goes by his ear. But yet other vehicles can travel through a municipality where noise is just about driving persons out of their minds in a sense. People can't sleep over it and the authorities totally ignore it; and even this government does so.

Mr. Speaker, I think with those comments I want to conclude by endorsing the amendment moved by my leader on March 6. I believe there were six major amendments to the Throne Speech on the lack of effective policy to stimulate employment, attempting instead to place all the responsibility on the federal government, the downgrading of programmes and policy to improve the environment, the absence of farm programmes strengthening the egg marketing and providing incentives for expansion of the beef industry; the reorganization of government and cabinet seriously tangling lines of responsibility and reducing efficiency. That's about it, Mr. Speaker. I hope the hon. members on the government side will give consideration to some of these amendments. I think they have already spoken on some of them, but let's just see what they can do about correcting some of the problems in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Brantford.

Mr. R. B. Beckett (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, from the activities that have taken place in this chamber in the last few days I believe it is customary for a speaker to first of all congratulate the Speaker on his election to this high office and to wish him well in the very difficult task that is before him. I would ask you, sir, if you would convey this to the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) and if you would also convey to him my sympathy, because in my very short experience it would appear to me that he has to sit here through all the deliberations. He has very little opportunity to participate in them, and I feel sure he misses some of the enjoyment.

I have found the deliberations of this House and the speeches of the hon. members extremely interesting and certainly informative, and I feel it is quite presumptuous for a new member to speak on some of the facets of the Throne Speech unless he has had some experience with some of the matters touched on in that speech. Therefore, sir, I will not attempt to cover the whole Speech from the Throne, merely the points I feel I can make some contribution to.

I see by the order paper that the subject is, "Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session." I have felt several times that perhaps I was not in the right place because of some of the things that have been said, but I am sure this is an indication of true democracy when elected representatives can speak their minds freely and express their opinions on the Speech from the Throne.

On page 2 of this document the ministers are charged as follows:

> That, as a result of their recent mandate, they have a renewed responsibility to make the growing complexity and scope of government services more efficient and productive while, at the same time, bringing government closer to the people, so that it may be more responsive to the continuing needs for change and reform.

From my very brief experience, sir, I would hope that the government will do as has been stated in this speech—bring government closer to the people and be more responsive to the continuing needs for change and reform. I do not wish to be cynical, but I would hope that our government will do everything that it can to become more responsive, so that our citizens will feel the government is actually working toward the betterment of the citizens, regardless of their financial condition or location in the province.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): All devoutly to be desired!

Mr. Beckett: On page 3 there is an indi-

cation of the government's interest and its objective for citizen endeavour, from which all of Ontario's people may draw inspiration and example.

Regarding the conditions of my own riding of Brantford, of which I am very proud, I think the number one thing we need in our riding is jobs, because I feel that if we had more jobs available for those who through no fault of their own are unemployed we would have a much happier community. So my hope would be that there will be an accent on the provision of jobs. I have been impressed by the hon. members who have spoken along this line in speeches earlier than this evening. They have accented, I believe, their desire to see that jobs are created.

Further on, on page 3, it states that: "It is, therefore, the primary objective of the government's economic, social and fiscal policy to attain the highest possible rate of employment." I would hope, sir, that some of the regulations and some of the manipulations that apparently now go on in the Ontario Development Corp. would be hastened so that we could actually see the results of this Ontario Development Corp. programme transmitted into jobs. I am afraid my experience to date with this department has been one of frustration because of the apparent complexity and red tape within that department.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Beckett: Further on, on this page, there is indication of the government's desire for "co-ordination of federal and provincial policies and programmes." I would hope, sir, that it will be possible that we could put an end to the programmes within this country of ours whereby some government money is used to move industries from one part of the country to another to the detriment of one part of the province, apparently merely to assist unemployment in other areas. I fail to see the logic of diminishing unemployment in some parts of the province and increasing it in others.

On page 5 there is an indication that there will be stronger representation to the federal government:

> Emphasizing the need for full provincial consultation and participation in formulating national policies of vital concern to the provinces, including future considerations of national policies relating to agriculture, communications, energy, foreign investment, international trade, and urban affairs, with particular emphasis on urban renewal and housing.

I am very pleased to see the emphasis on urban renewal and housing, because I feel that if my own city of Brantford is representative of the communities within our province, the need for urban renewal and housing is very great.

I was extremely pleased to see there is indication there will be a tri-level conference this year in Ontario in which federal, provincial and municipal governments will be represented. As a former municipal elected official I am delighted that this tri-level conference will once again be carried out. I was fortunate enough to attend the last one at the Ontario Science Centre—I believe it was the last one. I hope that such a conference as this will go a long way towards convincing municipal people—people elected at the municipal level—that they are part of the government of our province and our country, because it is my strong feeling that municipal people today feel that they are left out of decision-making that effects their day-to-day operation in a municipality.

Also on page 6 there is an indication of a new ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Once again I will probably be presumptuous, but it would appear to me that these are extremely important ministries. For all three of them to be the responsibility of one man, I feel, is a most difficult task for one man and an unnecessary load on one man if the departments are to operate at their maximum efficiency.

The same paragraph indicates that the ministry recognizes the need for stronger and more independent local governments. This I am delighted to see, Mr. Speaker; stronger and more independent local governments. When the time comes that a local government can receive a request from a citizen for such an important thing as a stop sign on a street; can investigate it with their own forces; recommend it by their traffic committee, for example; approve it by the city council—and then have to send it to Toronto to be approved, I hardly feel that this leads to stronger and more independent local governments.

So I would hope that when this department is gone into, such things as this would be left in the hands of the municipalities, giving them a little more authority.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Does the member think the municipalities don't have

enough intelligence to know where the stop signs should go?

Mr. Beckett: On page 7 there is an indication of development reports which will indicate the potential pattern of development in all regions of the province. I would hope, sir, that the potential pattern of development will be produced in such a manner as to provide an opportunity for local input.

I think it is absolutely essential that local municipal governments be given an opportunity to express their local feelings and their wishes on the development patterns. I will be the first to admit they will undoubtedly be parochial, but on the other hand they are elected representatives who have a certain amount of local experience, which I feel will be valuable when contributed to the overall picture.

I think the Haldimand-Norfolk study, which has been in operation for some time now, is an indication of the necessity for local input, and it's my belief that this study had received a great deal of input from the local elected officials.

Also, there is an indication that as a result of the study by the committee on local election law the government will introduce a bill designed to reform election procedures, which will include the abolition of property qualifications for voters in municipal elections. On this point, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter I would like to draw to the attention of the House, and at the same time to congratulate the voters in several ridings within our province; notably the voters in Scarborough North who exhibited a pride in their electoral procedures in that 80.2 per cent of the persons in Scarborough North voted.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, but they voted badly!

Mr. Beckett: In Wentworth North it was 80.4 per cent. And I will indicate with great pride that in Brantford it was 80.6, the highest percentage of voters in any of the ridings of Ontario.

An hon. member: Very wise ones!

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is just possible one can't count on them to vote intelligently.

Mr. Beckett: The provincial average, according to this fine document, was 73.1 per cent. These three ridings all were in excess of 80 per cent and they all returned members of the Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Shulman: You can fool some of the people some of the time.

Mr. Deans: You can't count on them to use their heads even when they go to the polls.

Mr. Shulman: In those ridings!

Mr. Beckett: Mr. Speaker, also on page 7 there is an indication that the significant role of the Ontario Municipal Board will be reviewed and it will now be appropriate to examine the relationships of this board with the municipalities. I would feel this is long overdue and I would welcome this examination of the Ontario Municipal Board, from the viewpoint of the Ontario Municipal Board and also from the viewpoint of the citizens and also of municipal councils.

On page 8 there is indication of the government's forecast for youth programmes, and we have now received an indication of what these programmes are. I would hope that as time goes on the government will see fit to extend the programme. I would feel that if my riding is any indication there will be a very large number of students who will require jobs this summer in order that they can have sufficient funds to return to educational projects in the fall. I would hope that we would devote as much money as possible and practicable to allow these students not only to have a good job, a worthwhile job this summer, but to allow them to continue their education.

Mr. Lawlor: In the public sector!

Mr. Beckett: On page 9 there is an indication there will be studies of automatic data processing. I feel this concerns me very greatly. I would hope those who are studying this automatic data processing will bear in mind the difficulties that many of our citizens are undergoing as a result of the computers in Belleville allegedly producing unemployment insurance claim cheques.

I am very much in favour, Mr. Speaker, of the suggestion that there will be a commission appointed to review the functions and processes of the Legislature and means by which these might be improved to give elected members better opportunities to serve their constituents and to enhance the role of the private member in this Legislature. I feel very strongly, from my very short experience but mostly from the experience of members who have served this House for many years, the necessity of assistance so that the member can better serve his constituents. I feel the members who must come from long distances must be at a tremendous disadvantage in attempting to fulfil their duties in this House

as well as look after their constituents in a proper manner.

On page 10 there is also an indication that legislation will be introduced that will enable school boards and municipal authorities to share in the development of various facilities for both school and community use.

I am very pleased to have been appointed to the select committee for utilization of educational facilities. I have enjoyed very much the committee work and I have also enjoyed the amount of effort that all the members of the committee have put into the examinations they have been fortunate enough to make of a number of communities. I have been very impressed by the dedication of the members of this committee. I am sure that when the committee does present its report it will come up with certain factors, one of which is that after 4 o'clock the principal doesn't run the school, it is the caretaker.

Also, I think it has become quite clear that for a programme such as has been indicated on page 10, for the greater use of school facilities, it will be necessary to divorce the cost of this utilization of school facilities from the school boards themselves if a meaningful programme is to be conducted.

There is also an indication that there will be a re-evaluation of the Ontario housing industry. I am very pleased about this. I would feel that one of the basic things and difficulties in the deficiencies of housing at the present time in the Province of Ontario is the high cost of serviced land. I would hope that it will be easier for municipalities to get into the land bank business far in advance of the need in order that the cost of serviced land may be kept down to a more reasonable figure.

On page 12 there is an indication that the government will take steps to improve the availability of essential dental and medical services to people in more isolated parts of the province. This, I am sure, is necessary in the isolated parts of the province, and I feel it is also necessary in some other parts of the province which are not normally considered to be isolated; but because of their geographical location, or perhaps their lack of industry, they do not enjoy dental and medical services that are available to larger centres.

Mr. Lawlor: He will be running out of pages pretty soon. All these golden words. That was one of the poorest Throne Speeches in years.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Beckett: Mr. Speaker, on page 15 — members will be glad to know it is 15—there is an indication there will be support of the arts. I am very sure such awards as are indicated here will go a long way to the assistance of what is now called the arts.

There is also indication that means will be provided to make cultural organizations and resources more to be enjoyed by the whole province. I think this is a very vital point, certainly in my opinion there are parts of the Province of Ontario where it has been impossible for the citizens in those areas to enjoy such things as the Ontario Science Centre and the Royal Ontario Museum because of their geographical location. I feel that school children in some of the northern areas should have the opportunity to see these marvellous institutions.

Page 17 is an indication of assistance for smaller enterprises which will be broadened, and I hope that the Ontario Development Corp. will take this seriously and realize the necessity of the smaller enterprises, because I am quite sure there are many of our medium size industries in Ontario today which have come from small two- and three-employee enterprises which at the present time, in my experience, have not received assistance from the Ontario Development Corp.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the government will have sufficient funds available to make sure Highway 403 will be extended westerly from Highway 2 to Highway 401 in order to open up that portion of the Province of Ontario.

I hope someone will finally indicate to the citizens in the Brantford area whether or not a large dam will be constructed on Whiteman Creek by the Grand River Conservation Authority. We are told that it is on, it is off. I feel that the citizens in that area should have an answer, once and for all, as to whether or not this conservation project is going to be built.

I am very pleased that the minister responsible has indicated that there will be a local government review in Brant county. This is something that is long overdue. I would also hope, Mr. Speaker, that some thought will be given, in the form of a direction to Ontario Housing, that they will look into the situation of the geared-to-income rents. These, in my opinion, make it so difficult for those persons who are in this housing that they can never get out because of the geared-to-income rent. They never are able to gain sufficient funds to make a down payment so that they can get out of this type of housing and into their own house.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the government will consider as the No. 1 priority for their programme in the forthcoming months the creation of more jobs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I add my best wishes to those of the proceeding speakers and wish you well in your new position.

I noticed in tonight's edition of the Toronto Star that there could have been much more stimulating speeches here in the Throne Speech debate had a certain candidate in Kitchener not lost. The independent candidate in Kitchener who was defeated has turned stripper; he campaigned on a promise to fight for improved sex education. So there's hope for all of us, even those people who may go down to defeat the next time. A precedent has been set.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He must have been a very independent candidate!

Mr. Laughren: In the actual speech read by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, what disturbed me most was the emphasis on the private sector. It was typical, of course, that they would offer encouragement to the private sector and urge prudence and restraint in the public sector.

I think I know what kind of encouragement the government will give to the private sector; it is the kind of encouragement, for example, that has meant in the 1971-1972 year that whereas the budget brought down last April predicted the estimated revenue from mines' profit taxes would be $24.5 million, the revised budget brought down in December has a revised figure of $17.6 million.

Mr. Lawlor: It means we will not have any natural resources at all.

Mr. Laughren: That is the kind of encouragement they want to give to the private sector; at least that's the kind it will get.

Mr. Lawlor: Like the weather, they can give it back to the Indians.

Mr. Laughren: Some other areas of encouragement, of course, will be to lay off on strict control of pollution—returnable bottles and things like that—and to take it easy on the corporations that might be anticipating layoffs. For example, we are all familiar with what happened at the Sudbury operations of the International Nickel Co. where almost 2,000 men were laid off. Of course, as the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) pointed out, this happens during years when the contract with the steelworkers is due.

In case you might think it was just bad planning, which I noticed Mr. McCreedy, a vice-president of the International Nickel Co. told the select committee when he was in Sudbury, let me tell you what the annual report of the International Nickel Co. has to say about that. The report, just released, under the heading "Inventories", says: "Total inventories were $465,448,000 at year-end, an increase of nearly $180 million during the year." That was the argument they were using for the cutback.

But when we look at the extended financing of the International Nickel Co. during the year, the report says: "During the year the company borrowed $287,088,000 to meet its cash needs"—and here is the crux—"principally for capital expenditures and a buildup of inventories." Obviously it was deliberately to build up inventories.

Mr. Speaker, I was sort of hoping that the Deputy Speaker would be in the chair, because he is going to have trouble when that select committee makes its final report, since he is going to have not one minority report but two. He is going to have one, possibly, from the New Democrats, if the attitudes that have been expressed in the House today are an indication, and he is going to have a minority report from the member for London North (Mr. Walker). I am sure he will not be able to accept the rather liberal position on foreign ownership.

Other areas of encouragement to the private sector will be perhaps to extend the forgivable loans substantially or at least just continue the way it is going now; with a few more trade missions, which are really a form of a subsidized holiday to businessmen.

The Landlord and Tenant Act should not be beefed up to allow things like collective bargaining on the part of tenants, or to institute a standard lease for the protection of tenants. There is, of course, the problem of union certification, but I want to mention that a little later.

Then the Throne Speech mentions restraint of the public sector. I think it is fairly easy to predict how the public sector will be restrained by building a limited number of public houses. At the present time there are over 3,000 families on the waiting list for public housing in the city of Sudbury. That will not be met.

We can continue to have a shortage of

medical and dental services in the remote communities, which we have now, and we will tend also to ignore the dental problems of young children in the elementary schools.

I wonder what would happen if we just turned it around and said, rather, let's encourage the public sector and restrain the private sector. Oh you will throw up your hands and say that is going to cost us too much money and taxes will go up. I have heard that song before.

But let's just see. If we cut back on tax credits to the corporations, like the $125 million, is that going to cost the taxpayer money? Not likely. If we institute tough pollution laws, is that going to cost the taxpayer money? If we crack down on the shutting down of plants, for example allowing a company to lay off up to 10 per cent; that's not tough.

The International Nickel Co. can lay off nine per cent of its work force and 1,400 men are out of work in the Sudbury district and they haven't broken the law.

We could cut down on forgivable loans. That hardly costs the taxpayer money. If we repatriate the economy and start processing some of our resources in this province, indeed it could have the impact of creating more jobs—as a matter of fact, it certainly would, so that would not cost the taxpayer money.

Improving the landlord-tenant legislation will not cost us money. Neither will beefing up the union legislation laws to protect the unorganized workers. So if we restrain the private sector, it is not going to cost the taxpayer money.

If we encourage the public sector, will that cost the taxpayer money? I suppose you could say the public housing will, but of course Ontario only provides 10 per cent of the funding for Ontario Housing anyway. Medical and dental services in remote communities are not going to cost very much, considering the cost is spread over the entire province.

I think that perhaps the time has come when we encourage the public sector rather than restrain it and lose this whole idea that as soon as you encourage the public sector you raise the taxation in the province, and vice versa with the private sector.

I would like to spend a few moments on my own riding, Nickel Belt. It has been said that whether I was speaking tonight or whether my predecessor was speaking tonight it would still be a maiden speech. So I want to point out some of the problems in Nickel Belt, which I am sure—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): That's why the member is here.

Mr. Laughren: —the government has not been made aware of in the past eight years.

It is a truly beautiful riding of some 80,000 square miles. It has tremendous hunting, fishing, timber and minerals. Take note, would you, that all those things were there even before this party formed the government, so the Conservatives cannot take credit for what is in Nickel Belt.

Very little has been done for that area, and on Oct. 21 the people in Nickel Belt voted against the kind of neglect that has been typical of this government's attitude towards northern Ontario.

The government has heard members of its own party speak out today on this. It is time for a return to the north of some of the riches that have been taken out of there. I hope the government gets the message, if not from us, at least from its own members. The people in the north voted for a political party that will put the rights of the individual first, regardless of the number of voters in that riding. That's why I am here and that's why I shall continue to fight for the rights of the people in Nickel Belt.

There are problems in Nickel Belt, however. One cannot border on Sudbury, which Nickel Belt does, without encountering, for example, a pollution problem. And Nickel Belt almost touches the superstack at Copper Cliff. You will know, perhaps, that people in the Sudbury area have often referred to the superstack as a phallic symbol, not because of its peculiar shape and size but because of what it is doing to the people in the community.

But what bothers me more than the fact they have got a superstack there is that the government, the Department of the Environment, air management branch, is doing something that I cannot express in words other than to describe it as morally dishonest. They have put one meter in the Sudbury district, right downtown in Sudbury—on Ash Street appropriately—and that meter measures the pollution from the stacks at Copper Cliff. Now if the wind happens to be blowing away from the meter you can get a very, very low reading while people are choking elsewhere.

About a month ago there was a case where people driving up Highway 69 north about 4:30 in the afternoon had to turn on their lights to see through the pollution and be seen through it, and the index on Ash Street was recording less than 20. An index of less than 20!

And then of course there is the index in Happy Valley, near Falconbridge, which isn't in Nickel Belt, but I feel I must comment on it. The readings are not made available to anyone. Now what is the sense of having the index there? I call upon the government, as the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) has called upon them many times, to install a number of meters in the area, or better still install them at the top of the stack.

Mr. Stokes: They probably haven't got one designed for such a high reading.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It might be useful if the minister were even here to listen.

Mr. Laughren: It is really, truly misleading when the people turn on their radio and hear that the index is only 18 or 16 and they step outside the door and they choke and they cough.

But air pollution isn't the only problem; there is a soil and water pollution problem too. Just northwest of Sudbury there is a town called Chelmsford, and there are about 9,000 people in Chelmsford being serviced by two sewage lagoons. These sewage lagoons are greatly overloaded and the overflow goes into a creek called Mackenzie Creek which flows about six miles into Vermillion Lake. It flows through farms owned by a number of farmers, such as Mr. Shannon, Koskiniemi, Tranchemontagne, LeClair and Brosseau.

Now Mr. Shannon witnessed the destruction of a creek that runs through his farm, and back in 1970 he wrote a letter to the member of the Legislature in that area who could help him. Of course people in Nickel Belt in the last eight years have turned to the member for Sudbury East when they have had a problem. This is the letter—I'll read most of it—that Mr. Shannon wrote to the hon. member for Sudbury East:

> Since the installation of the Chelmsford sewage lagoon we have witnessed the depletion of game, fish and wildlife in the creek to where it is an open sewer flowing into the Vermillion River, where people have summer camps and permanent homes and have not been made aware of this.
>
> The crowning blow has come in the last three years when raw sewage has escaped into this creek. The town council has been aware of this situation and upon being questioned the reeve informed me that they were pouring lime into the lagoon to keep the smell down. He also informed me the OWRC had been informed of the existing situation and the flow of raw sewage into the Mackenzie Creek.
>
> The OWRC was supposed to have been sent to my farm to take samples. Upon no response from the OWRC I contacted the Department of Lands and Forests and Mr. Charles Bibby, who immediately sent out representatives of his department who observed the flowing of raw sewage into Mackenzie Creek from the Chelmsford Lagoon.
>
> The contamination of the creek has forced me to move my cattle to a different location eight miles away and board them for the summer where clean water is available. The use of this water for our market garden is useless, as disease can be present and be transmitted through this water into the vegetables. As is well known, clay land will only move water on the surface or through top soil. And thus because of the location the lagoon will never be a success.

That comes from Mr. Don Shannon, RR2, Chelmsford.

Then the member for Sudbury East wrote to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr), and the minister wrote back sympathizing with him. And the last sentence in the letter from Mr. Kerr to Mr. Martel reads:

> I want to assure you that the matter is being dealt with and the municipality will be required to put these problems in order at an early date.

That was June 17, 1970. Well to this day nothing has happened.

So I wrote to the same minister; his reply is lengthy and it just explains what I had told him in the letter. He reaffirmed that this is happening and his last sentence is:

> We have asked this municipality to proceed as quickly as possible to have improvements made to alleviate the situation which you have presented.
>
> Yours very truly,
> George A. Kerr.

Mr. Speaker, that was in 1970. This is 1972. It should be clear that with regional government coming into the Sudbury basin what is happening is—and the government must accept the entire blame for this because of the tactics they've used in the installation of regional government—the municipalities are stalling and saying: "We'll wait. We don't want to rush into something like this. We'll

wait until regional government comes in and the whole area will absorb the cost of the sewage treatment plan."

The government must assume the responsibility for this. Consequently in my letter to the minister I have asked for two things and I don't think either one is unreasonable:

(1) That the sewage treatment plant for that area be brought into operation this year. The municipality must not be permitted to stall until the advent of regional government; and

(2) That Mr. Shannon is compensated for past and continuing costs of boarding his cattle elsewhere.

Mr. Deans: Very reasonable!

Mr. Laughren: Hardly unreasonable when it is the fault of this government and the OWRC that something was not done over two years ago.

Mr. Deans: Too bad the minister was not here to answer it.

Mr. Laughren: Well, I'm not too sure it would make that much difference.

I cannot apologize for the polluters in this province the way the member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) can, either in the short run or the long run. Of course I wish the hon. member for Scarborough Centre was here because I wanted to point out a couple of areas of differences between us. He is affectionately known as the "hired gun" in the Sudbury district, to those of you who know the trade union story in the Sudbury area.

I have somewhat of an affection of academics. He has no respect for them and when the hon. member for Scarborough Centre mentioned the affluent society in Ontario, one of the most affluent areas in the entire world, I see that affluence too. I also see the layer of misery underneath it on which that layer of affluence feeds. The only thing that permits that layer of affluence to be there in the first place is that layer of misery underneath it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Laughren: I would like to move a little further north in the riding of Nickel Belt. There was a new highway opened up less than a year ago. It is called Highway 144; it runs between Sudbury and Timmins. That is about 150 miles long; and for 150 miles, all but the first 40 or so, there is no habitation on that highway at all. In the last month a service station has opened up at the Gogama turnoff. Other than that, no habitation whatsoever.

It is beautiful country but nobody lives on that road and yet it has a speed limit of 50 miles per hour.

Now one might ask is that so people can enjoy the beautiful scenery as they drive up 144? Not at all, Mr. Speaker. It is because the road is so bad, it is so twisting and so narrow that to go above the speed of 50 would be dangerous. The back of the hand for northern Ontario again in the building of a brand new highway! That is the highway that the hon. member for Sudbury mentioned in December as having two ends and no middle. There is still a section in the middle that hasn't been completed.

Halfway up that road, about 100 miles north of Sudbury, there is a private road that runs from Highway 144 and cuts across through a private reserve, the timber stand on which the Eddy Forest Products have the cutting rights. It is a private road. When one wants to use that road there is an iron gate and virtually a guardhouse at each end. There are about 40 or 50 miles between the two gates. When one wants to go through there it is rather demeaning to have to go in and ask them if they will let you through. Indeed, they are entirely wihin their rights to turn you down.

During the election I wanted to go through there to speak to the constituents, and the gentleman at the gate wanted to know what I wanted to do there. I told him that I was a candidate in the provincial election and I wanted to talk to some constituents. He said: "Which ones?" Now really! An aspiring member of the Legislature cannot go and talk to constituents except at the whim of somebody at the guardhouse, paid by Eddy Forest Products.

After all, they do not own the land; they only have the cutting rights granted to them by this provincial government. Here they are having the rights as to who can go over that road and talk to people on it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the government open up that road to the public. We've had enough of company towns and company roads in Nickel Belt.

Mr. Deans: It's shameful, shameful.

Mr. Laughren: I think it is too.

Last year a number of hunters, about a hundred of them, just had enough of that and shot the lock off. I hate to suggest that that's the answer, but it was for the hunters.

When you have gone through that private preserve and get out the other gate—assuming that the gentleman at the gate feels you can do so and you're not trapped in there—if he lets you out, there's a little town called Sultan.

Mr. Stokes: That's on the Canadian Pacific line, isn't it?

Mr. Laughren: That's on the Canadian Pacific line, yes; nice little town. Not much doing there any more, but there is a Lands and Forests office. I'd like to tell you a little bit about that Lands and Forests office in Sultan, because the people in Sultan are being had by the Department of Lands and Forests.

Now that is a sad thing to say, that a department of government is exploiting the people in Sultan. But let me tell you.

You see there's no Ontario Hydro service in Sultan and they rely on the Lands and Forests Delco plant to supply their electrical energy. I've taken as an example one citizen of Sultan who wrote to me complaining about his rates. More than one wrote to me but I'll use this one as an example. This compares the rates between Ontario Hydro and Lands and Forests.

Lands and Forests charges a flat eight cents per kilowatt-hour rate. Ontario Hydro would charge 3.5 cents on the first 250 kilowatts and 1.45 cents on the remaining 96 kilowatts. At this rate the hydro bill for Mr. Viens for the month of November, I guess it was, would have been $10.14. For the Department of Lands and Forests, at their exorbitant rates, the bill was $27.68, for one month of electrical energy!

Mr. Deans: It's no wonder they can have—

Mr. Laughren: In my letter to the then Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), I asked him about it very specifically. I didn't want to get the answer back that: "Well, you know, it costs us a lot and we just pass it on." I said, other than charging the people in Sultan what it costs Lands and Forests to provide the energy, what justification can there be for charging eight cents per kilowatt hour? Well I got my reply.

In the reply the minister stated that:

> The Department of Lands and Forests has certainly not derived any profit from this service, nor have we attempted to recover all the costs from the people of Sultan. Although you mentioned you were not concerned about any surplus or deficit accruing to the department, I would like to point out that in operating costs alone we have incurred a deficit of over $7,300. This deficit does not include capital outlay nor administrative costs.
>
> I do regret that the people of Sultan are paying a little more than most people in Ontario for their electrical energy, however under the existing circumstances and with the existing operation I do feel that these rates are quite reasonable.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much would it cost this province if we equalized the rates of Lands and Forests' hydro in places like Sultan? How much would it cost the people in this province?

There are a couple of hundred people in that little town. It would cost not pennies even on the average consumer's hydro bill, and yet here we are charging almost three times the rate that Ontario Hydro would charge for the same service. That's just not fair.

Just a little bit north of Sultan there's a town called Kormak. There are several towns that have a tie-in with Kormak. There's a little town called Island Lake, one called Bigelow and one called Kormak.

The name Kormak is part of another name; it comes from the name Korpela, and the Korpela brothers are three brothers who own a lumbering company; and they really own those three towns. In Kormak, for example, during the election when I was in there campaigning, people were hesitant even to be seen talking to me. They hadn't seen me before, so it wasn't because I had a reputation in there or anything like that. They were just afraid to be seen talking with a New Democrat.

Then, of course when election day comes and the deputy returning officer is appointed, guess who is the deputy returning officer in Kormak? Mr. Elmer Korpela.

Mr. Speaker, there should be an end to this whole idea of a small town putting the boss in as the deputy returning officer. I could tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are some wild tales coming out of those little towns where deputy returning officers can take a ballot and fold it and bend it and see how people voted—and people have had phone calls after it was all over.

Mr. Stokes: The member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) knows all about that. That is when they tell them that they lose their cutting licence unless they vote for the government.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): The member for Thunder Bay is getting very cynical.

Mr. Stokes: Up around the Madawaska, the member knows all about it.

Mr. Lawlor: I can't believe he would do that.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): He is just being a realist.

Mr. Laughren: In Island Lake, another Korpela town, there was a lady by the name of Mrs. Bernier, who was appointed as an enumerator for the New Democrats. After enumeration was over she was taking around some pamphlets for us and she was told that because she had enumerated she was therefore a public servant and would not be permitted to take around pamphlets for the New Democrats. That is the kind of intimidation that goes on.

Mr. Stokes: It is all right if you can get away with it!

Mr. Laughren: I want to leave the small lumbering town and get into the larger metropolis of Chapleau, about 3,600 people. Chapleau is a railroading and lumbering town and the railroaders are unionized. They have a decent wage and a decent standard of living. But this is not the case with the lumber workers. They are unorganized and they live in deplorable conditions, so there was an attempt by them to form a union last fall.

Mr. Stokes: I can well understand why you fellows are so attentive; it is the first time you have ever heard anything about the riding of Nickel Belt.

Mr. Meen: From that side of the House, yes.

An hon. member: From any side.

Mr. Deans: From any side of the House.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): On the other side it was only a request to get into the cabinet.

Mr. Stokes: He is still waiting for the call.

Mr. Meen: Like a few of the rest of us.

An hon. member: He has his phone in his car.

Mr. Laughren: I don't know if the energy for his phone was supplied by Lands and Forests or not.

The people in Chapleau pay enough of a penalty for living up where they do because of the increased cost of living—and that was itemized for you by one of your own members this afternoon. But on Nov. 24, the International Woodworkers of America applied for certification for the workers at Martel Lumber and they had 80 per cent of the workers signed up. It was enough for automatic certification.

To this day, three and a half months later, because of stalling tactics by the Labour Relations Board they are still not certified as the bargaining agent for the employees of Martel Lumber; 3½ months later!

And because of the fact that they are underpaid and the fact that during the month of December, in an unprecedented action, the company decided to have a Christmas layoff for over a month, the ranks of the workers were decimated during that time. So it makes it that much more difficult for the workers to get the required percentage for certification.

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is here now and I would urge him that when he comes across the International Woodworkers of America request for certification to the Labour Relations Board, to keep in mind that that certification should have gone through back in late November, and now 3½ months later, through stalling tactics by the Labour Relations Board, they still have not been certified; and it is just not fair.

The inequities in the north are legendary, of course, to the people up there, and I was very happy to hear one of your members talk about unorganized territories this afternoon, because they really do have no representation. It is a sad, sad affair, but in most of those places there is a government department—Lands and Forests or Transportation and Communications—and it seems to me that it should be the responsibility of one of those departments, whichever one is in the town, to provide some kind of forum or to encourage the organization of a community council so those people in that community can make their needs known; to help them organize, to help them apply for grants and so forth. I mean that is the least I ask. The ideal solution, of course, would be if this government would provide those communities with a minimum level of municipal services. But, I don't have too much hope for that.

It was in one of those towns that a local resident—he must have been 85 years old—set me straight on the ideology of the Conservative government; he said it was a middle-of-the-road government. As I didn't know what he meant, he said: "When you go out of here—it's snowing out now—go out on the

highway and there'll be a sanding truck out there. Watch what the sanding truck does."

Sure enough, I went out on the highway to head back home and there was this sanding truck driving down the middle of the road. Up there they don't drive down one side of the road and sand it and drive back up the other side of the road and sand it. They drive down the middle, and that's enough sand for people in northern Ontario. Then when they come to a hill they pull over to the right and on they go. Why they don't do it both ways and then go back, I don't know.

Mr. Stokes: Sometimes they don't even do that. They don't even plough, each car takes a rut.

Mr. Laughren: When they plough, it may be they plough it down the middle of the road too.

I want to leave Nickel Belt for a moment and talk about some problems in general. The one that bothers me a great deal, and I've written to the—he was then Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs. I must admit I am a little lost as to where I'll direct the next letter—I guess to Consumer Protection.

Regarding pyramid selling in the province, Toronto has been besieged by a company with the delightfully free enterprise name, the Dare To Be Great company. Maybe members have heard of the Dare To Be Great company. It is a subsidiary of Glen W. Turner Enterprises in the United States, a world-wide company. It's a pyramid selling operation, but this is the ultimate in pyramid selling because it has no product. What the Dare To Be Great company sells is the concept or the idea that people can "dare to be great." If only they will join the Dare To Be Great company they will show them through cassette recordings how they can dare to be great and how they can go out and accomplish wonderful things in the world of business and finance, and maybe even in government I don't know. Let me tell you, just very briefly—

Mr. Deans: I think the cabinet has been using it.

Mr. Laughren: How to succeed as an executive assistant and this sort of thing!

Let me tell you very briefly how it works. They really are predators, parasites or whatever, and even you free enterprisers would do yourselves a favour to divest these people, to get rid of these people. They shouldn't be in society even.

The Dare To Be Great company—the name itself is bad, but wait until you hear its plan—has four schemes into which you can buy. Each scheme is called "an adventure."

Adventure 1 is $600 to get in; Adventure 2 is $1,000; Adventure 3 is $2,000; and Adventure 4 costs you $2,000—$5,000, sorry. It is $5,000 to get into Adventure 4. When you get into Adventure 4—you say why would you buy Adventure 4, why not Adventure 1? —well, you get more cassettes when you get into Adventure 4. Not only that, it allows you to sell Adventure 4 to somebody else for $5,000, and you get your higher percentage depending on the level of the adventure you're in.

I received a reply from the minister indicating that he was doing everything he could, and that he agreed with me that they were a terrible kind of organization and something should be done. But they are still going. I read at one point they are taking $100,000 per week out of Metropolitan Toronto.

There have been articles on this company in Time magazine. They were taken to court in BC and, I think, in Quebec and New Brunswick, and in I don't know how many states. We allow them to continue in the Province of Ontario. It is a disgrace, because they really are parasites. Of course they've got the finance companies behind them. In this case, Avco Finance is backing them in the Sudbury district. They will take a $5,000 loan just on your signature and you pay them back over so many years. One young couple I know who went in for a $5,000 "adventure", or misadventure or whatever, had to sign post-dated cheques for $5,000. In the first two months they earned less than $100 in commissions. That is the sort of organization that the government is really condoning by allowing them to stay here.

Another problem in society at large in Ontario is the whole bundle or the whole package of social assistance. It has always intrigued me that New Democrats get accused of being the party that would encourage social assistance or welfare; I'm sure the government members have used it on us. But we've never had the chance in Ontario to create a welfare system—the Conservatives are the people who have done it. They have created the incredible bureaucracy and all the different levels of assistance in this province, not us, instead of providing meaningful job opportunities.

Let me tell you about one of the job opportunities that this government is providing up north, Mr. Speaker, in the Foleyet

area. It's called winter works and what they are doing is cutting the brush off at snow level. Now if you know how deep the snow is in northern Ontario—

An hon. member: About 5 ft!

Mr. Laughren: —when the snow melts in the spring and the summer they are going to have a summer works project which will cut off the rest of the bush. I suppose that is looking ahead; it is like planting more elm trees so you can cut them down when they grow up.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It is called phase two.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, it shows a lot of imagination.

Mr. Deans: It is part of the "adventure" programme.

Mr. Laughren: It is using the environment to create jobs, I suppose.

The entire attitude toward social assistance is one that really has been sold to the public —the whole idea that people who require social assistance somehow require it because it is their choice. This is really sad because the worker—I don't think that the people in this Legislature or people who hold interesting jobs really resent the person on welfare—but the man who is alienated from his job, who works eight hours underground for 20 or 30 years, the man who does not enjoy his work, he truly believes the package the government is trying to sell and he adopts the attitudes they are creating in the minds of people in this province toward those unfortunates who do require social assistance.

I have a letter from a constituent in which she was asking for emergency assistance. As a matter of fact she was on it and the cheque hadn't come. The worker from the Department of Social and Family Services told the lady to shut up or he'd cancel her emergency assistance cheque. A truly sick attitude for someone in the social assistance field. The director of the Sudbury district welfare office tells me on the telephone that he will provide assistance to people whose unemployment insurance payments are not in on time. Then when they go down there he tells them he can't help them. That's the kind of attitude the people who require assistance are faced with when they need help.

I sort of hate to jump on the bandwagon and attack the Workmen's Compensation Board and I'm not going to refer to the problems of the last day or so. I'm sure that members of the government who are besieged by calls from constituents to help them with compensation problems, whether it be an appeal or just how they go about it, if there was a free vote would support what I'm going to say. I know the Liberals would, no problem there.

Mr. Deans: I wouldn't count on it.

Mr. Laughren: I've attended the appeal tribunals. I've walked in knowing within two minutes that the decision had been made. In one very recent case the answer was no, but we anticipated this and we said in our presentation to the tribunal: "If you turn us down will you tell us where to turn now? Where do we go for rehabilitation?" The answer came back: "Your appeal has been denied, period." No attempt to indicate to that injured workman where he should turn now. That's left up to him to find out.

It's evident that this man had 14 years of good work record with the railroad; he gets injured. I agree there is what they call functional overlay involved here, but nevertheless there were no problems in that man's work record until he was injured. It may be impossible to identify his attitude to work now with the actual injury. But how can you deny it was the injury when he had a perfect work record until the time of the injury?

Mr. Deans: Well, they can deny it!

Mr. Laughren: They rely entirely on the medical records. At least in this case they did.

That's why I would like to propose a—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Toast!

Mr. Laughren: —form of social legislation. This is not something that is new. The New Zealand royal commission headed by Mr. Justice Woodhouse, of the Supreme Court of New Zealand, recommended it for that country. It would provide immediate compensation to every injured person regardless of fault and regardless of where the accident occurred. More specifically, the scheme would be financed by the whole community from a levy on employers based on wages and salaries paid; from a levy on operators of motor vehicles and, as appropriate, from universal premiums and/or general revenues; injured persons to receive compensation both for permanent physical disability and for income losses on an income-related basis with regular adjustments in the level of pay-

ments to allow for inflation; similar compensation to be provided to those incapacitated by illness; the right of court action based on fault to be abolished; the Workmen's Compensation Act to be repealed; and private insurance carriers to be excluded from the field of accident and sickness coverage except for supplementary coverage.

The problem of social assistance goes beyond the compensation area, of course; in the Sudbury area it is complicated by the housing shortage and the high cost of housing. And let me, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The headline says—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Singer: —"Shulman Calls Stephen Lewis a Disaster."

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: I don't believe it.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Not only Shulman. There were others.

Mr. Singer: Sad. Unfortunate!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Laughren: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: It's in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Mr. Deans: Where did the member for Downsview have supper?

An hon. member: What did he have for supper?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nickel Belt has the floor.

Mr. Laughren: It's debatable, Mr. Speaker. A lady in the Sudbury district with five children was paying $255 a month in rent. She was receiving assistance of $340 a month from the Department of Social and Family Services and from the Sudbury district welfare office. When we tried to get additional assistance for her—because that left her only $85 a month on which to feed and clothe herself and five children—we received the answer that she was already receiving the maximum assistance. I thought there was an understanding in the Department of Social and Family Services that something could be done for people who are paying extremely high rents.

Mr. Deans: Is the member for Ottawa East applying for a job as executive assistant?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): I understand it's not open.

Mr. Laughren: To bring my remarks to an end, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Hey, the member for Kent (Mr. Spence) is in the chair!

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, would you keep that zoo to our right a little quieter please?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Remember who called Stephen Lewis a disaster?

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, there is a wildlife sanctuary about 30 miles north of Sudbury that could use some animals. I wonder if the members on the right would care to drop in some day? We would slap a fence up.

Mr. Singer: Is Stephen really a disaster? I thought he was rather a nice fellow.

Mr. Laughren: I would like to make some —Mr. Speaker, do I really have to—

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the members to give the hon. member a chance to speak.

Mr. Laughren: I realize the Legislature is unaccustomed to hearing someone speak from Nickel Belt—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Laughren: I would like to make a few comments —

Mr. Lewis: If Gaston hadn't been defeated, he could have made his maiden speech.

Mr. Singer: " 'I think he could have done a great deal more for the NDP by not running', says Shulman." It says it here. I don't really know why, but that is what he said.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, I know.

Mr. Singer: Really, it made the Kitchener-Waterloo Record.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, a few comments on the state of post-secondary education in the province. Post-secondary education in this province is something that in order to know what kind of state it's in you really have to experience it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: If the member for Downsview keeps making such idiotic speeches he will qualify for the House of Commons in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Singer: It reminds me of what the member for Riverdale used to say about the member for York South.

Mr. Stokes: The member is embarrassing his own colleagues.

Mr. Singer: I know. I really don't think he would have done a great deal by running.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, it would have seemed appropriate to have had the Wright commission on post-secondary education include a few remarks in its deliberations on the current status of post-secondary education in the province, but it didn't do this. But before I throw any bricks at the report, I would like to toss a bouquet or two if I might.

The recommendation to make education, for example, a life-long experience, is good. Of course people have been saying it for years, but I really do give the commission credit for picking it up and realizing that this was something that really was going to pass them by if they didn't pick it up anyway.

The recommendation to make education more accessible is one, of course, that is commendable. Mind you, since the taxpayer is footing the bill I don't see how we could possibly justify excluding any group anyway, but at least they realized that.

I think most people realize that the draft report, which is out now, is really a trial balloon. It's going to reflect the philosophy, or it does reflect the philosophy nevertheless, of the majority of the commissioners. I say majority, sir, because it is not entirely unanimous.

As a trial balloon it will serve the purpose of attracting opposition to its most unpalatable recommendations. Of course they will drop those and the main thrust of the report, which is structural, will slip through. I think that is inevitable.

I must admit that the report disappointed me early on in the discussion of the aims and objectives of post-secondary education, and I want to quote here: "It would be wrong to conclude that the only way to correct social injustices and inequities is through a radical reform of our educational system."

Note the use of the word "only." Then a page later: "We also reject suggestions that the chief way to correct our social injustices and inequities is through the educational system."

Not only is it not the only way to correct social injustices; it is not even the chief way. I admit it would be unwise to think that our educational system would precipitate radical social change. Surely it should be the aim of the post-secondary educational system to bring about corrections and constructive change in society?

I suggest that only an architect whose insecurity prevents him from designing change is fearful of that change; fearful of change because it might be interpreted as a correction of something he had built that might be left imperfect. I can only assume that the chief architect of this report was afraid to criticize what he had built.

Of course the fact that he had to continue to direct post-secondary education in the province adds support to this argument. Imagine being the playwright, the actor, the director and the critic all at once. How can you miss?

I want to take issue with one basic assumption in the report, and that is the assumption of accessibility.

First of all, it's one I think the commission did grapple with rather seriously. I believe they put considerable thought into it, but they still haven't produced a coherent, tangible guideline. I will quote something else on accessibility.

> Integration of living and learning can be achieved only when all the barriers to accessibility are removed, when educational services are provided to all citizens when they need them and when citizens know they can obtain the education they want at any time throughout their lives.

An admirable comment, but surely a most objectionable one when specific recommendations do not endorse it. I could not help wonder if the ghost who wrote the general statement was the same ghost who wrote the specific recommendations. I doubt it.

Mr. Singer: Would Shulman have been right when he said Stephen could have done a great deal more by not running? That is what he says.

Mr. Laughren: If all barriers are to be removed, surely the number one barrier for practical as well as symbolic reasons, Mr. Speaker, must be tuition fees. But the commission recommends that tuition fees be raised—

Mr. Singer: I am only quoting Morty.

Mr. Laughren: —to 50 per cent of operating costs. True, grants will be available for low-income families, but why grants for low-income families? Why not a restructuring of the taxation system so that people who have the incomes now pay for the costs and not the people who, as a result of that post-secondary education, might have the income some time in the future to pay for it? Why not restructure and graduate the incomes more steeply now? How can the commission recommend less bureaucratization in one breath, and in the next a means test to establish tuition fees? How can it recommend post-secondary education become more accessible and at the same time raise tuition fees?

A more equitable tax structure will provide the fees, with no need whatsoever for another level of arbitrary decision-making in the Department of Colleges and Universities. I object to this cynical—

Mr. Sargent: Who wrote this speech?

Mr. Laughren: Why does the member ask?

Mr. Sargent: Well, it's not very strong.

Mr. Deans: It's very good—right on.

Mr. Laughren: I can appreciate the—

An hon. member: This speech is more coherent than yours, Eddie.

Mr. Deans: The one thing you were granted that you are not granting him, Eddie, is an opportunity to give it.

Mr. Laughren: Eddie, would you like to hear some logic?

Mr. Singer: "'Stephen Lewis could have done more for the NDP by not running,' says Morty." That's in the Kitchener-Waterloo Record.

Mr. Sargent: I can't believe that. Is it real?

Mr. Laughren: Here is some logic. In arguing against the taxation system for free tuition—

Mr. Singer: That's what it says.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Fnancial and Commercial Affairs): It's authentic.

Mr. Laughren: —the commission says, "The commission cannot accept the belief that we are helpless victims of linear projections of history." Now there is a quantum leap: providing free tuition would be endorsing the theory that we are "helpless victims of linear projections of history." I would suggest that if the hon. Minister of Colleges and Universities goes for that quantum leap he may find himself in a more painful stretch than the one he must assume now on the problem of access to the Robarts stacks.

This superficial attempt to make education more accessible is so shallow as to be offensive. How can this commission recommend more accessibility, and at the same time virtually guarantee that students from low- and middle-income families will not be able to enroll in post-secondary programmes of more than three years in length—the very programmes that will provide the highest returns in years to come.

Perhaps the aspect of the report that is most repugnant, Mr. Speaker, because of its particularly hollow rhetoric, is the stated commitment to education as a lifelong experience. How is a man of 40 with a family and mortgage supposed to return to school? How will he finance, not only his education but the cost of raising his family? The reports and recommendations are based, according to their own admission, on six principles:

1. Universal accessibility—The students, faculty and public are all offended by this hypocritical pronouncement. Universal accessibility for the life of the citizen, and yet little or no provision for achieving it.

2. Openness—the principle that all educational services should be more open to the public. An admirable recommendation, but what hope is there that it will be implemented? We have heard how the Minister of Colleges and Universities himself feels about openness at the post-secondary level. He himself supported the stand that the Robarts Library stacks be closed to the public and to undergraduates.

3. Diversity—the commission quite rightly expresses the need for more diversity of educational services. I am concerned, however, that the education may become less diversified if it is all brought under a system of credits and degrees. And they express concern that post-secondary education is vulnerable to the pressures of homogenization and uniformity; yet, right or wrong, the universities are to be brought more firmly under government control.

4. Flexibility—I'd like to quote from the report here—"We must therefore have a post-secondary educational system which is sufficiently responsive to new social demands, yet is also prepared to abandon those that are no longer deemed necessary."

Well if ever there was a definition of motherhood that has to be it. It is forcing students to pay more and at the same time they are staffing the co-ordinating boards in an undefined way and I have very great concern for the way that those co-ordinating boards are going to be staffed. I am not opposed to the co-ordinating boards per se, assuming that they have representation from the community; and true representation, not people who would adhere only to government views.

Transferability is the fifth principle. At first reading I was somewhat taken in by the rhetoric in this section, since they recommend there must be more opportunity to transfer between institutes, programmes and professions. Yet there's another contradiction here, when they recommend that there ought to be credit given for any relevant activity in one's life. So the commission is willing to bestow academic credits on virtually anything, but at the same time decrying the undue emphasis on degrees in our society.

The last principle is public accountability. Now the plot thickens, because I've had some experience at the post-secondary level and I know what a lack of public accountability can lead to. The argument used by the colleges of applied arts and technology and the universities was that local autonomy should reign supreme. I was a faculty member in a post-secondary institution and I saw some of the dangers in local autonomy. That's why I come down in favour of supporting the idea of more public accountability, but I take issue with the report statement that they're trying to move away from bureaucratization. Why don't they admit that setting up co-ordinating boards is a form of bureaucracy. I think they should admit it.

Assuming that the increased bureaucracy is necessary, I urge them to make sure that the co-ordinating boards are more representative of the communities than the boards of governors are in the community college system—the college of applied arts and technology.

I have in my files a letter from a faculty member in a community college. By the way, I should just point out the process in the community college system. If a faculty member has a grievance, he can take that grievance to the president. The president is the one who lays down the policy in the first place. So he can go back to the person who made the policy and launch his grievance procedures. Then if it's serious enough they may allow it to go to the board of governors, who are appointed.

When a faculty member on one of the colleges wrote to me suggesting that he had been dealt with unfairly, I wrote to the Minister of Colleges and Universities. He wrote back and said, quite bluntly, the decision-making body in the colleges of applied arts and technology is the board of governors. Their decision must stand. To whom, then, is the college of applied arts and technology responsible—only to themselves and to the board of governors who are appointed?

So the Wright report is really a document, not on educational philosophy – we should be so lucky – it's an assurance that what we've had isn't too bad and an assurance that we're going to get more of the same. So, in light of recent events I'm very, very concerned about the direction that education is going to take in this province. I fear we're heading back to the Sixties and a series of sit-ins, walk-outs and confrontations.

This saddens me. It's all unnecessary if the government would come to grips with a very simple axiom, Mr. Speaker. People today want a piece of the action, whether they be tenants, whether they be workers, whether they be teachers, whether they be backbenchers or whether they be northerners. They want a piece of the action and a part of the decision-making apparatus that shapes their lives.

It's really a simple desire for more democratization in our society. Yet this government will react, just as Saul Alinsky so accurately predicts, in an entirely predictable fashion to stifle those desires.

It's really sad, Mr. Speaker, because really that's what alienation is all about. Thank you.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by reconfirming my support and undying loyalty to the free enterprise system. I was fortunate actually to have a part in that free enterprise system tonight. The member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) had a very good day at the office and he therefore agreed to buy dinner for all of his colleagues. It was only the free enterprise system which we have in this province, Mr. Speaker, which allowed him to do that and for that I'm truly grateful.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Did the hon. member have turkey for supper?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off as—No, as a matter of fact we didn't have turkey for supper.

An hon. member: Was it eggs?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It was something under glass.

Mr. Gaunt: It was under glass, but it wasn't turkey.

I want to start off by congratulating the Speaker as is traditional in this House and in this case his replacement.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear. Fine fellow.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to say that the replacement is just as good as the Speaker.

An hon. member: Better!

Mr. Gaunt: I have a great deal of respect for the Speaker of the House. I have dealt with him on many occasions. I've always found him to be impartial, he exhibits a sense of fairness and I was very pleased with his appointment. I am sure that he will have the support of all the members in the House.

I also want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Both are new members and one can therefore assume that the Premier (Mr. Davis) has his eye on these two men, he wants to see how they perform.

It's traditional that the job is given either to promising new members or to old party faithfuls whose ridings are in some difficulty. I think the two members in question fall into the former category and so I can only conclude that the Premier does have his eye on them and we'll be looking forward to seeing them perhaps moved upstairs. He's undoubtedly grooming them for the next cabinet shuffle.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): I will vote for the member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Thanks! I want to congratulate the members who have been anointed as executive assistants. One of them is the chairman of our select committee—a young man whom I respect, and for whom I have a great deal of admiration.

We have a very good committee—the select committee on utilization of education facilities—and the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) does a great deal of work and he exhibits the type of fairness and sensitivity, perhaps, that is required in that sort of position. I just hope he can stay on and accommodate us by acting in both capacities. I'm sure he'll be able to do that and I express my hope that he will continue as the chairman of our select committee.

We are all looking forward to a very busy summer. I want to say more about the select committee in a moment—

Mr. Singer: Want a five-day week?

Mr. Gaunt: Five-day week? That is really what we've been undertaking since January. It's rather onerous, but—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Those fellows are trying to carry too much.

Mr. Gaunt: —nonetheless it is very educational and I find it very much worthwhile.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): The money isn't bad either.

Mr. Gaunt: Most of the previous speakers have mentioned the October election. Certainly the Premier is to be congratulated on leading the Conservative Party to victory. The Premier pulled out all the stops—he was running scared and he made no bones about that. My leader has already catalogued the fact that he did use the civil service and public funds to aid him in the saturation campaign which he undertook.

However, there is an interesting side effect to which I would like to make reference. It came to my attention really by accident, but because my area is a farming area I do have occasion to call up the Department of Municipal Affairs and inquire from time to time about the farm tax rebates. Before the election, the farm tax cheques were being kicked out from Queen's Park by the thousand. After the election the whole process started to wind down, and now, to get a rebate cheque mailed is almost like pulling hen's teeth, if you will excuse a farm expression.

Mr. Bullbrook: That sounds like the member.

Mr. Gaunt: One can call the department and the story is usually the same—the cheque will be mailed out in two weeks. One calls about a month later and once again, the story is the same—the cheque will be mailed out in two weeks' time.

Mr. Deans: I thought that was only for me. I didn't realize they were telling the member the same thing.

Mr. Gaunt: There was a specific cheque that I inquired about around the end of January and that was supposed to have been mailed two weeks later. I checked just a few days ago and I found that it still has not been

mailed. So it is obvious that everything was geared for the election.

But really what puzzles me in this whole piece is the fact that obviously it can be done before the election, but for some reason after the election fades into the sunset—it is just impossible, it cannot be done. I find that very hard to believe and to understand. Of course, the only conclusion that I can come to and that anyone can draw from that sort of thing is that after the election the government really couldn't care less about the whole process. It is a pretty cynical and jaundiced view of the democratic process.

Some of these times—I say, some of these times; perhaps we will have to go through another election or two but—some of these times the electorate is going to realize what is going on and the attitude that prevails in this government, and they are going to toss the government out.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Next time!

Mr. Gaunt: Really, if I may pick up on a line that was used by the leader of the New Democratic Party, just today as a matter of fact, the only thing that stands between us and the government is the NDP, and some of these times we are actually going to cope with that obstacle. We are going to overcome it, and I look forward to that day.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Deans: You have to be pretty far-sighted I would say, but nevertheless.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): So far you have been reducing your popular vote at a rate where it almost equals our own.

Mr. Gaunt: That is about to turn around as well.

Mr. Lewis: That is one point of egalitarianism.

Mr. Gaunt: That is about to turn around as well. I mean, we do have our ups and downs but we are heading into an up cycle, and I look forward to that.

Mr. Lewis: Do you realize that even the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) is amused —and very little amuses him these days.

Mr. Singer: "Stephen Lewis could have done much more for the NDP by not running —Morty."

Mr. Gaunt: The member for Middlesex South (Mr. Eaton)—

Mr. Lewis: Who is this Morty the member for Downsview is talking about?

Mr. Gaunt: —took the opportunity in his speech to talk about agriculture.

Mr. Singer: He is up there behind you.

An hon. member: He's not here now.

Mr. Lewis: It's his spectre.

Mr. Gaunt: He talked about agriculture. I think that was really the main burden of his speech, I suspect, for two reasons. He has always been associated with that particular industry, and secondly, I suspect that the member for Middlesex South is being groomed for higher things. I think that he is eventually going to move into that Agriculture portfolio because I can see the present minister is just plain and simple running out of gas and—

An hon. member: He's got his eye on the OWRC.

Mr. Gaunt: —I think the government has recognized this. The member for Middlesex North (Mr. Stewart) has suggested that the Premier better start looking around for a replacement, and I think the obvious replacement is the member for Middlesex South. I am sure the optic of the Premier has been cast on the member for Middlesex South and he is the obvious heir apparent to that portfolio.

Mr. Lewis: I would have thought the member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) would be the obvious choice.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I think the member for Algoma-Manitoulin and perhaps the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) are contenders. I don't think there is any question about that. But I suspect that the member for Middlesex South will beat them both to the post and eventually take over that portfolio.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: There is a member with lots of ability to be the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, I am very pleased that the member for Middlesex South mentioned the egg situation, which in my view is certainly the most pressing problem on the farm today, as you will recognize, Mr. Speaker.

I spoke at some length about the egg situation in December when we were considering the supplementary estimates. I pointed out at that time that in my view, and in the view

of this party, the only logical step that should be taken by the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) was to bring in an agency marketing plan to alleviate the conditions which were then being felt in the egg industry.

The industry has gone on suffering since that time. Prices fluctuated slightly and became slightly better shortly after the New Year, but then sank right back to their former level where they have remained since that time.

I suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he take another look at that recommendation. I think it is still valid. His position at that time was that he couldn't do anything because he had appointed a royal commission to look into the industry, and until the judge reported he was not in a position to do anything, to take any steps at all, to alleviate conditions within the industry itself.

I think the situation has gone on long enough. I don't think we can wait any longer, Mr. Speaker. I think the minister is going to have to take steps in the direction I indicated previously, bringing in a marketing plan—on a temporary basis until this situation is corrected—whereby the board is given agency powers and in that fashion can bring some semblance of order into the marketing of eggs in this province.

As I pointed out in December, we have an over-abundance of eggs. This is our problem. We have something in the neighbourhood of 13 million laying hens in the province, and all our markets can accommodate at the moment is around 10 million. So we have that surplus situation which is depressing the price and causing many farmers in this province to go bankrupt and to be forced out of business, in some cases throwing away their entire life savings because of the situation that is now prevailing in the industry.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The hens should go on strike.

Mr. Gaunt: Perhaps the hens should go on strike; almost everyone else does these days, and it might be a way to make a point. In any case, I want to underline the fact that we can't wait any longer. This situation is demanding immediate attention.

I think it is fair to say that it could be at least another month before the judge brings down his report. I am told on a private basis that the judge is taking this assignment very seriously indeed. He is calling people in on a confidential basis. He is interviewing them in camera in an effort to try to find out really what is going on in the industry.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: I do say that to the minister, and I hope he takes note of that. I know the member for Middlesex South has similar feelings and perhaps he can lend his weight to that of the other rural members in trying to get the Minister of Agriculture to act in this situation.

There is one other matter that I do want to mention and it has been referred to by the federal member for Bruce, Mr. Whicher. I noticed that he made a speech —

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That is the TV man, is it? He said all we have to worry about is TV in this country, nothing else.

Mr. Gaunt: That was taken out of context. I am sure if the member for Grey South had read his entire speech —

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have a copy of his speech and that's what he says very plainly.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What—that all we have to worry about is TV?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That's what he says.

Mr. Gaunt: Who?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Everybody here.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, the minister ought to worry about it.

Mr. Singer: Come on! The member for Grey South knows —

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Did the member get a copy of that speech? Too bad!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are they talking about Whicher?

Mr. Gaunt: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I thought it was —

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the minister run against him and find out whether —

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister resign his seat and run federally?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The members are wasting their time.

Mr. Lewis: The federal member for Bruce has never made an observation as intelligent as that to my knowledge!

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister have some conviction and run federally?

Mr. Gaunt: As a matter of fact I –

Mr. Singer: They had him once; they might want him again.

An hon. member: They wouldn't give him a job there.

An hon. member: Stanfield needs him!

Mr. Singer: They might make him whip again.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They might.

Mr. Singer: They might; one never knows.

Mr. Gaunt: As a matter of fact I thought it was a reasonable speech. There were many things in the speech –

Mr. Lewis: Which were clearly indefensible!

Mr. Gaunt: No, which I endorse.

An hon. member: How does the member for Huron-Bruce like getting it from his own troops? They are really helping him out, aren't they?

Mr. Gaunt: One of those things was the fact that the member for Bruce – and I am not talking about his reply to the Speech from the Throne, I am talking about another speech he gave shortly after that in relation to the matter of transportation and the need for rail service in our area. I am sure I would enlist the support of the member for Grey South in this –

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, 100 per cent. He will have nothing to say about it because the Canadian Transport Commission won't listen to him.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Gaunt: I would hope that the Canadian Transportation Commission would listen to him–

Hon. Mr. Winkler: They won't The member knows it.

Mr. Gaunt: If they won't, perhaps the member for Grey South would take it upon himself along with a number of his colleagues –I would be glad to join them–in a parade to the Canadian Transport Commission offices to see if we–

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They would go down there in government limousines.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have done it once already, and Jack Pickersgill is too sharp for the Opposition!

Mr. Gaunt: I don't know whether–maybe he is too sharp for the minister! Maybe that's why he doesn't intend to go again but in any case perhaps there might be safety in numbers. If we went–

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister resign?

Mr. Gaunt: –en masse maybe we could–

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will join in the argument, but I won't waste my time.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, all right. Join me in the argument. Perhaps that's the best I can hope for!

Mr. Bullbrook: When the minister joins in the argument, he wastes all our time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is what is being done right now.

Mr. Ruston: Very true!

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, I just reiterate the need for rail transportation in northwestern Ontario. The hearings which were held in Owen Sound were in my view a rather useless exercise.

The premise upon which the Canadian Transport Commission hung its decision to eliminate the train service was the fact that the bus companies had agreed to provide good service in the area. They had agreed at the public hearing that they would certainly take up any slack experienced by the cancellation of the train service in the area.

However, that has not been the case. The bus service in the area has declined from that point forward until we have a situation where the bus service in my particular area, for instance, leaving Kincardine on weekdays at 8 o'clock in the morning doesn't arrive in Toronto until 4:30 in the afternoon–a trip that takes 2½ hours by car or 3½ to four hours by train. I really don't think there is any excuse for that kind of service. Granted the service is better on the weekends–going up Friday night and coming back Sunday night–but to the large majority of the population it is next thing to useless.

As far as I am concerned, I think the Transport Commission should have another look at its decision. If we could take $1 million of the money that is given to the Canadian Broadcasting Corp.--I believe they get something in the neighbourhood of $166 million—and run a train through my part of western Ontario on a daily basis, it would be much more worthwhile and would receive much more endorsation from the public at large.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not exactly. It would be more equitable for our people.

Mr. Gaunt: Certainly it would be more equitable for the population in that area.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): If they won't give you a train, get them to build you a highway.

Mr. Gaunt: I am glad to enlist the support of my friend from Grey South in that, and perhaps we could make a joint effort to see if we can't come up with something in this regard.

I want to turn to another matter having to do with the select committee of which I am a member.

Mr. Deans: Why not do it in the morning?

Mr. Singer: Come on. He's got five more minutes.

Mr. Gaunt: I made reference to the select committee earlier on in my remarks. I want to say that all of the members are very dedicated individuals. We have a good chairman and I think, generally speaking, we have a very good committee. However, there is one situation that disturbs me very greatly.

Mr. Deans: That's the trip to Ottawa; you had to cancel it. Tell us about that.

Mr. Gaunt: No, that is another one. It is the fact that the Committee on Government Productivity recommended that the youth and recreation branch of the Department of Education be removed from Education and put into the Department of Social and Family Services. That disturbs me greatly, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the fact that on Dec. 17 the Premier instructed our select committee to study the utilization of educational facilities in this province; yet at the same time he and his cabinet colleagues were thinking about removing what in my view is a very vital part of the Department of Education from that department and putting it into another department, which in my view does not have the close association with that particular function that the Department of Education has.

I think we were just getting to the point in this province where the recreation people were starting to co-operate with the Department of Education in a very real way. We had some problems in that regard. We have had problems over the years. Just when we were almost on the threshold of a breakthrough the government decides that particular branch is going to be removed from the Department of Education.

Really, I have to wonder to myself just how serious the Premier was in regard to setting up this committee; because if he were serious I don't think he would have entertained for a moment the proposition of removing that branch from the Department of Education. When one is studying the use of community schools and the philosophy behind the community school concept, it is obviously very closely attached to education and to the functions of education. If one removes it from that department, then I think the whole tenet upon which the select committee was founded, was formed and its purposes stated, becomes redundant. I think it is thrown out the window.

I cannot understand for the life of me why the government has done that. I would certainly urge it to reconsider that particular move, because I think it is a retrogressive step. I think it takes us back to 1964 where we were trying to get the recreational people in the province to co-operate with the educational authorities. The philosophy behind the use of schools by the community is the fact that once the students move out at four o'clock the recreation people move in at five after four and utilize those facilities. They use the gymnasia, they use the swimming pools, and they use the other facilities associated with the schools.

What is the difference between a person or a branch having jurisdiction over someone roller skating and having jurisdiction over someone taking a knitting class? Both in their own way are recreational facilities. Yet under the move undertaken by the government in the latter part of February these two functions will be separated.

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between knitting and roller skating. It is marginal I will agree, because they are both spectator sports. But I would have thought there was a difference which would separate them departmentally.

Mr. Gaunt: There is a difference, but it is marginal. On that point I think I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. I want to continue that point at a future time.

Mr. Gaunt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 14, 1972

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Gaunt 413

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Gaunt, agreed to 440

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 440

No. 13

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 16, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Once again we have visitors with us. In the Speaker's gallery we have students from the Red Lake District High School of Red Lake; in the east gallery students from Ecole Secondaire Algonquin of North Bay and from Smithfield Middle School of Rexdale; and in the west gallery students from Glen Haven Senior Public School of Mississauga. A little later in the afternoon, in the west gallery, there will be students from Huron Centennial School of Brucefield.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table in a few minutes in this Legislature this afternoon the report of the Ministerial Commission on French Language Secondary Education. I am also pleased to tell the House that I am happy to welcome here to the House as guests Prof. Tom Symons, president of Trent University, and Mr. Gerard Raymond, the superintendent of French-language schools for the Niagara South Board of Education and Mr. Berchmans Kipp, an assistant superintendent of the curriculum branch in my department, who served as the commissioner and his associate on this important commission.

You recall, Mr. Speaker, that last fall the Minister of Education appointed Prof. T. H. B Symons, president of Trent University, to review the legislation providing for French-language secondary education in Ontario schools, directing particular attention to the establishment, operation and progress of French-language secondary schools and French-language classes in secondary schools.

Professor Symons' terms of reference also included a review of the jurisdiction of boards of education to provide French-language education, the functioning of French-language advisory committees and the effectiveness of the safeguards for the continuance of English-language education where education in the French language is provided.

The terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, were sufficiently flexible to allow and encourage the commission to make recommendations on any other related matters considered relevant.

The report submitted today by Prof. Symons is very extensive. In all it makes 76 specific recommendations covering many aspects of this very important matter of French-language instruction in Ontario. It includes a great deal of valuable background information. I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank Prof. Symons, the members of his staff and his colleagues for the excellent work they have accomplished in what I think is really a very short period of time.

During the course of the next few weeks, I know that there will be much public discussion of the report—and we welcome and invite such discussion. I would be especially pleased to receive written comments if there are individuals or groups in this province who might wish to submit their observations in this way.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, important and far-reaching reforms relating to the education of French-speaking young people in Ontario were introduced in 1968. It is quite clear that there has been great progress since that legislation came into effect. In just a few short years tremendous strides have been made toward a fuller equality of educational opportunity for the French-speaking population of this province.

Six years ago, for example, the enrolment in French-language public secondary schools was just over 8,700; this year it is over 28,000 —more than a threefold increase. Today there are over 115,000 French-speaking students in Ontario elementary and secondary schools receiving instruction in their mother tongue.

As a concrete indication of the government's interest in continuing these trends, I am pleased to announce that we are now ready to accept one of this commission's major recommendations. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech from the Throne the government stated its intention to name a senior francophone official in the Department of Education with specific responsibilities for integrating and co-ordinating the various existing programmes and activities

which the department provides in support of French-language instruction programmes in Ontario elementary and secondary schools.

Effective today, we have established a permanent council on French-language schools as an integral part of the Department of Education. Its main function will be long-range planning to ensure the continuing development of a first-rate programme of French-language education in this province.

The council will have three major responsibilities: To interpret existing policy for French-language schools; to ensure that new policies are examined with respect to the needs of French-language students; and to make recommendations concerning any aspect of the education of French-language students in Ontario.

We are also pleased to announce today that Dr. Laurier Carrière has been appointed full-time chairman of this important council. Dr. Carrière has been assistant director of the department's regional office in Ottawa, and his varied background in education suits him very well to the significant challenge that is now before him. He is well known and respected among the French-Ontarian educational community, having served as a teacher, principal and inspector in several areas of the province. Over the years he has made a major contribution to the preparation of French-language textbooks in Ontario.

As chairman of the council, Dr. Carrière will have the rank and status of an assistant deputy minister in the Department of Education. He will thus have senior responsibility and an opportunity to exercise real and meaningful leadership.

He will advise the deputy minister and the minister on all matters pertaining to French-language education for francophones, and he will be able to draw upon the resources and experience of all French-speaking officials of the department. He will also work closely with the francophone educational community across this province.

The other members of the council will be named in a few days and they will begin their work almost immediately. Their first task will be to take hold of the Symons report, to examine its implications in detail and to give us guidance relating to its implementation.

Mr. Speaker, this government has a firm commitment to the principle that English and French-speaking students in Ontario have a right to receive an education in their native language. We do not foresee any great lapse of time, therefore, before the significance of the Symons report is felt in a very real way by our French-speaking citizens.

The year 1968 was a landmark for the advancement of educational opportunity for French-speaking young people of this province. There is every reason to expect that 1972 will also be such a year as we move forward on the firm foundation that has already been created.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the members of the Legislature that I have directed an application for leave to appeal to be taken to the Supreme Court of Canada in reference to the case involving the Attorney General and Stockton and Walker, which relates to the title of the Lake Erie beaches.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Why not just amend the bill?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): Why not amend the bill?

Mr. Lewis: What is this endless court case the minister is going through? He'll lose again. Just amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act and –

Hon. Mr. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): What do you mean, "again"?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Like the government did in 1941.

An hon. member: Have a little respect.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement today on the conversion of the Queen's Park telephone service, which will take place this weekend.

At 6 o'clock tomorrow, Friday, March 17, Bell Canada will start to convert our present Centrex telephone system to a fully automatic system, known as Centrex ESS, or electronic switching system. This highly complex operation has taken more than three years to plan and engineer, but at 8 o'clock on Monday morning, March 20, the changeover will be complete.

I think it important, Mr. Speaker, that I should outline briefly the reasons the conversion became necessary, what the changes are and how they affect the user, and the tremendous advantages of the new system to the government and people.

The current equipment has outlived its usefulness and in order to provide and maintain an acceptable level of service for the

public and the government it had to be replaced. The present Queen's Park telephone system is a complex of 12,000 phones and 6,000 lines, channelled through a switchboard which is the nerve centre of the government. This operation, which is partly automatic and partly manual, takes up some 5,000 square feet of office space on the seventh floor of the Whitney block.

The demands made in recent years on the staff of 29 operators to provide the service expected by the government, with the equipment rapidly reaching obsolescence, have been extreme. I am sure you will join with me in praising the very high standard maintained by our telephone operators over the years.

The new system is based on computerized, fully-electronic switching service through equipment housed on Bell Canada premises. With this new system it will be a great deal easier for a citizen to reach the government office that he wishes to contact on his first call. This is true because the electronic switching system is more capable of automatically diverting calls from busy locals to other open lines in the same area.

Because the technical equipment will be housed away from Queen's Park the new switchboard area will occupy 2,103 square feet less than at present. Based on current market value this represents an annual saving of approximately $15,000. A further advantage will be faster service to people calling outside numbers from Queen's Park and improved, more efficient handling of outgoing long-distance calls.

All these features will contribute to the reduction of time spent on the telephone and, consequently, to total dollars saved. They will also, especially as more lines are added to heavily loaded circuits, help to free numbers that are now often difficult to reach. Not only will the caller be saved time but his frustration with constant busy signals will be avoided.

The cost to the government of converting to the new system is negligible. As a matter of fact, this entails a non-recurring charge of $2,500, which is more than offset by the saving in space mentioned earlier.

From the user's point of view we have tried to keep the dialling changes as simple as possible, and this has been accomplished by only changing the first digit of the present prefix. For example, the main switchboard telephone prefix 363 and the direct-in-dialling prefix of 365 are now changed to 965. The new dialling features have been explained in detail and are contained in the new Ontario government directory, which will be placed before you.

All departments were notified well in advance of this conversion to enable them to reduce their inventory of stationery items quoting the 365 exchange.

Mr. Speaker, the timing of the conversion has also been planned to coincide with the major restructuring of government departments now in the course of implementation. The inevitable telephone changes and possible expansion required for the reorganization to proceed efficiently would have been beyond the scope of the old Centrex system.

I can state confidently, Mr. Speaker, that every foreseeable precaution has been taken for the conversion to proceed safely, smoothly and economically and with the least disruption to service.

When the new Centrex ESS system is in operation it will serve not only the 12,000 telephones in Queen's Park and more than 100 other building locations in Metro, but also the 183-line intercity network and 400-odd miscellaneous circuits involving fire alarms, elevator phones, teletype and computer installations and broadcast programme facilities.

The Province of Ontario will have the most technically advanced telephone communications system currently available on the continent. This will be a major contribution toward the goal of improving communications between the government and the citizens of Ontario.

An hon. member: Hear; hear!

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a statement concerning the air pollution problem surrounding the Canadian Gypsum Co. in Weston.

This company manufactures mineral or rock wool for insulation purposes. The product is produced by the melting of a mixture of steelworks slag, sandstone and coke in two cupolas. Gases from these cupolas are exhausted through a 185-ft steel stack, and wool particulate emissions from a 125-ft brick stack.

Hydrogen sulphide gas, with its characteristic "rotten-egg" smell, and rockwool fibres have been the cause of numerous complaints by residents of the area of the borough of York.

After passage of the Air Pollution Control Act in 1968, partial control equipment was

installed on the cupola exhaust system in 1968—following a survey by the air management branch. This equipment did not adequately control the odorous emissions and a ministerial order was served on the company in the spring of 1969. This order required the company to control all particulate and odour emissions from the two cupolas and it was the opinion of the branch that emissions from the whole processing line would be reduced to acceptable levels.

In compliance with the order the company installed a new waste-heat boiler on the cupola exhaust system in late 1970. The odorous gases were incinerated in the boiler furnace. The company says they have spent $350,000 on correcting this problem.

Urban expansion in the plant area now has resulted in further air pollution problems, giving rise to numerous citizen complaints. In one case, two 27-storey apartment buildings have been built adjacent to the stack.

The ministry is aware of the situation and is meeting with company officials to correct the problem. As a matter of fact, I am personally meeting next Wednesday evening, March 22, with members of the Upper Humber Clean Air Committee to discuss the whole situation.

There are two courses open to the ministry.

1. To place pressure on the company to take corrective measures; and this has been done. Violation notices have been issued; three court actions have taken place; the company has been fined by the courts on two of these occasions; hearings are scheduled to set dates for trial on three counts on April 7; there are hearings to set dates for trial for three further counts on April 14; and one further count is scheduled for trial on March 20, 1972. Currently, two further violations have been recommended for prosecution.

The other alternative would be for the ministry to place a stop-order on the company under the Environmental Protection Act. The relevant sections states:

> When the director upon reasonable and probable grounds is of the opinion that a source of contaminant is adding to, admitting or discharging into the natural environment any contaminant that constitutes, or the amount, concentration or level of which constitutes an immediate danger to human life, the health of any persons or to property, the director may issue a stop-order directed to the person responsible for the source of the contaminant.

I want to stress that part of the section which emphasizes "an immediate danger to human life, the health of any persons or to property," and particularly the phrase, "an immediate danger."

Thus far there has been no evidence placed before me that this is the case. My legal advisers counsel that until concrete evidence is available, no such action can be taken successfully. I want to stress that I am prepared to make such a move if I am able to obtain evidence.

There may be those who allude that it's the Environmental Protection Act that's at fault. As with any humanly contrived legislation, it possibly could be improved. Right now I have a committee at work reviewing the entire Act and if improvements are required to strengthen this legislation for the further protection of the environment of our province, I assure the House that amendments will be presented. As a matter of fact, at the present time the Ford Motor Co. is appealing a conviction sustained under this legislation and we are awaiting the result of this further action.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): We could always sue them like Dow. That is a good idea.

Hon F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I promised the House that I would inquire into the sequence of events which led to the unauthorized distribution by my executive assistant, Mr. Perdue, of a General Motors news release regarding a story about the Workmen's Compensation Board published in last Saturday's Globe and Mail.

After questioning Mr. Perdue and others, I learned that the existence of the General Motors news release first came to the attention of Mr. W. R. Kerr, assistant executive manager of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Mr. Kerr, in a conversation with an officers of the company concerned, was informed that a news release had been issued. The text was then communicated to Mr. Kerr's office by telephone on Monday morning.

Mr. Perdue was informed of the contents of the news release and, without my knowledge, asked the Workmen's Compensation Board to make sufficient copies for him to distribute to the press gallery members in the gallery and the members' lounge last Monday afternoon. And here again I wish to emphasize that these copies were made in the office of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

I informed the House on Tuesday that I had reprimanded Mr. Perdue, that he had tendered his resignation and that I was considering it. Although I cannot condone his action, I feel—and I am sure the members of this House will agree with me—that one serious mistake of judgement should not by itself result in ruining a young man's career.

Mr. Perdue joined me approximately a year ago and I have found him to be an efficient and extremely helpful assistant, both in my former portfolio and in my present position. He acknowledges that a grave error in judgement was made and he should not have distributed the company's news release.

In considering the entire question I have decided to return Mr. Perdue's resignation and asked him to withdraw it. I hope that the action I have taken is with the approval of the House and I trust that the matter, insofar as it involves Mr. Perdue, can be considered closed.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): So much for responsible government. It's the head man who resigns not his executive clerk.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): The member is hoping to be a head man himself.

Mr. Bullbrook: He's bearing the brunt of this liaison with General Motors and the minister's party's liaison with General Motors.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

SHELTER GRANT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question of the Premier. Can he assure the House, and through the House the municipal taxpayers of the province, that the withdrawal of the shelter grant will in fact be at least balanced by tax credits applicable this very year, so that the announcements of substantial increases in municipal taxation will be balanced by at least equivalent tax credits that will be redeemable or receivable in the next following income tax year?

Hon. W. F. Davis (Premier): Yes Mr. Speaker, the proposal is for the tax credits to start in this current fiscal year, but because they have to be filed in 1973 for this current year, the actual amounts of course, will be paid next year. There will obviously be a time lag, depending on when the municipalities made the shelter relief grant applicable—some municipalities in June, some in September, some somewhat later. There will be a time differential of, say six to seven months. But the plan of the government is that they will have effect as of 1972, but the credit will in fact be received by the person filing in 1973.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it not a fact, however, that a large amount of the money that would ordinarily have been paid in the shelter grant, probably amounting to at least $130 million, will be available for the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), when he brings down his budget in a week or two, as a credit in his current account?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, quite obviously that is a matter for the budget. The Leader of the Opposition will have all of this information on the evening of March 28.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is no secret, that the government is not making the payment.

A further supplementary: Is the Premier concerned that although the shelter grant would average something between $45 and $65, depending upon the community, in many municipalities the tax increase, even with ceilings on education expenditures, in many areas will amount to $100 per tax bill?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very early to determine what the increase will be for the real property owner around the province. I've only gone by what I've read in the press. The indication, I believe from some of the municipal people in Metropolitan Toronto, is in the neighbourhood of $100. I don't think this is true across the province. I don't think this is necessarily general. Of course to answer this at this moment is impossible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Is the Premier concerned to the extent that he would ask the Treasurer, or someone in Municipal Affairs—which is also the Treasurer's department—to have an ongoing survey as to how the policies of this government, particularly the shelter grant removal on this timetable, are going to affect local taxes in the taxation year immediately before us?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is very hard to determine to, because the establishment of the millrate by the municipalities is their responsibility. Quite obviously those

funds that were previously available under the shelter relief grant, whether they average $40 or $50 per homeowner across the province, will not be available, although those same people—not the same people necessarily in terms of actual amounts—will be receiving this by way of return on their income tax in the next fiscal year.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the Premier not agree, however, that it is the policies that have been enunciated in the last few months, since the election, which in fact are causing tax increases in this province, not at the provincial level as promised, but at the municipal level where they are already too high.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess we could debate the semantics of this. In fact, the tax increase will be the responsibility of the municipalities. The shelter relief grant did not reduce the total tax imposed by the municipalities, it was a rebate to offset it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It helped pave the way.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, there is no question about that and the tax credit system is in substitution for it. There obviously will be, in any change of this size, a time lag as between when the tax credit was—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It is a real fraud.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —available and the time when the rebate will be coming from the income tax. There's no doubt about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One year!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. It is not one year.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is it correct that for senior citizens and those on fixed pensions the result of what is being done will be an increase in the monthly rental simply because in actual application of the shelter rebate they did receive a lower monthly rental because the owners knew it would be deductible at the end; and in fact they have to now wait a full year in order to get any benefit that will accrue to them?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on whether or not there would be an increase in rental per se. The Treasurer will be dealing with this matter in his budget on March 28, and of course, as I think the Treasurer indicated, there is the likelihood the province will continue with its assistance to senior citizens in any event.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

FRENCH-LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAMMES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education pertaining to the statement he made a few moments ago. How many boards of education will in fact be introducing new programmes in French-language education if the basic recommendations of the report are implemented?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition how many will be introducing it. This will of course be up to the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Probably there would be no new ones though?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We expect that there might be new ones. The trend as it continues, I think, would suggest that new schools might be established, yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does this report give some kind of guidelines as to the percentage of French-speaking population in a community that would lead the government to give special grants furthering French-language education. Is such a specific guideline laid out in the report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am not aware that a specific guideline is laid out. I think the case is made that in order to provide this type of education it may be necessary for the government to have special financial incentives and considerations.

Nothing is spelled out in detail but this is implied, I think. Of course we now have, for instance, in the weighting factors presently special consideration for school boards which introduce French programmes in the elementary schools. It may be that special arrangements could be made like that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What constitutes a significant francophone ingredient in a community? A percentage or an absolute number of families having French as their primary language? How is it decided which communities will in fact embark on new programmes? It seems to me that most of those which would be served have French-language programmes already.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course as the hon. member knows, the original 1968

legislation provided that if 10 families asked, a committee could be set up; or if 20 francophone students wished to have a French class that would be set up and that constituted the setting up of a classroom in a school.

It may be—as I say, I don't know at this present time—that the programme in its beginning has already started in most of the boards across this province. The expansion may not be in more boards beginning the programme but that the programmes are expanded in those boards.

If the hon. member would look at the table at the end of the report it indicates the number of French-language students in mixed schools, for instance, at the present time. Some areas of the province have over 1,000 French-speaking students in mixed schools. They may build separate schools in those areas. The programme may expand in various ways in those particular jurisdictions.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Supplementary, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: To the minister: Does the government support the strengthening of French-language committees, which is recommended in the Symons report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think, as I indicated in the statement, we have accepted a major recommendation which is the setting up of the council on French-language schools. We are waiting for their input and indeed public discussion over the next period of time before announcing any intention in regard to the strengthening or the other recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon member for Ottawa East with a supplementary.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, in relation to the minister's statement about the appointment of a chairman on the standing committee on French-language schools, I wonder if the minister might explain—he has explained already that he is accepting some of the recommendations of the report, and I take them to be recommendations 34, 35 and 36 which say that the chairman would be in a position of responsibility with an opportunity to exercise real and meaningful leadership. I would like the minister to explain, if he is to follow the corporate structure in the statement last Tuesday, how this gentleman can express or have this leadership if he is outside the decision-making process of the department as outlined in exhibit six?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, to begin with I stated he will have the rank and status of an assistant deputy minister. I realize that the organizational charts showed him outside the management function. He is now going to be part of the management committee function, which was the three assistant deputy ministers and the deputy minister. These were the people who would form a management committee for the day-to-day operating policies of the department. As we saw it, this person, as chairman of the council on French-language schools, would not perhaps be a permanent member of the management committee but would certainly have input there and would sit with that committee on many occasions.

Mr. Roy: Is the minister saying that he is, in fact, outside of this management committee, outside of his dark lines, as outlined as exhibit number six?

Hon. Mr. Wells: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, yes, he is; but that committee would not take any action or make any decisions without the input from this council and this permanent chairman in any questions pertaining to French-language schools.

Mr. Lewis: What is this "input" stuff?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: By what date can we expect government action or government decision on the strengthening of the French-language committees and the other recommendations of the Symons report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is very difficult for me to give any date. As I said the council will be operative within a couple of weeks. The chairman has been appointed. They will be considering it and we will be receiving suggestions. We are going to move ahead. I cannot give the member any definite date though.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The hon. member for Scarborough West.

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question initially to the Minister of the Environment: If I understand his statement correctly, is he saying that after 30 years of systematic and

continuous pollution on the part of Canadian Gypsum Ltd., with three prosecutions—one, if I recall, unsuccessful and the other two rendering fines of $1,000 and $200—the only alternative left to him now is to pursue some other prosecutions? Is that what he is now saying?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. I said that there were two alternatives, one to prosecute and one to issue a stop order.

Mr. Lewis: But the minister is pursuing prosecutions?

Hon. Mr. Auld: We have not sufficient evidence to issue a stop order and we are proceeding with prosecutions. We are also meeting with the company again to make it a little more clear to them, perhaps, that we want the problem solved.

But I want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that when the company increased the stack and put in the equipment the problem diminished considerably. The municipality in its wisdom permitted at least two, I think 24- or 27-storey buildings near it.

The hon. member knows, as far as gaseous emissions are concerned, the real question is the point of impingement, where the noxious gas lands and how much of it is dissipated into the air before it reaches people. This changed the whole pattern. I am told—I haven't had it verified—that the manufacturer wants to raise the height of the stack to alleviate this problem, but he is in a flight path and has to get permission from the Ministry of Transport of Canada to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of supplementary question, is the minister aware of the fact that the medical officer of health on a number of occasions over the last 20 years has made representations with regard to the threat to the health of the people in that area, before the 27-storey buildings were set up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not aware in detail, Mr. Speaker. I know there has been a problem roughly since the plant was first built. As I stated earlier today, on the passing of the Air Pollution Control Act in 1968 the province then had the authority to step in. Previous to that time there were municipal bylaws, which I understand for one reason or another were not effective.

Mr. MacDonald: One further point of clarification: Must the department get evidence, after the accumulation of evidence of the last 30 years that will stand up in court, before it can issue a stop order, since we are almost now on the eve of a third request from the local municipal council for the factory to be shut down if it cannot clean up?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is what I am advised, Mr. Speaker, because, as the hon. member knows, there is an appeal procedure from any order issued by the minister. My legal advisers say that at the present time, in their opinion, we don't have sufficient evidence. I have asked that a further inquiry be made to see if we can establish evidence.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, is the minister not at all perturbed by as abject a confession of ineptitude as has been made in this House in a long time, when he says: "Really, there's nothing we can do about it, because the lawyers say there isn't enough evidence?" The minister has advised us that the operation pollutes—pollutes badly—and the minister stands up and says: "We have another committee that might change the Act."

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, what I said was that we were proceeding by way of prosecution. I outlined to the hon. member, even though he doesn't want to hear it, that we have eight charges pending. Assuming that there are convictions, I would think that this will indicate that we are very serious and it may speed up the solution to the problem.

Mr. Singer: Well by way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker; if the minister's legal advisers tell his he has not got enough evidence to issue a stop-order, why does the minister think he would have enough evidence to be successful in his prosecutions? Or has the minister got another Dow case on his hands and it will never be settled?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well Mr. Speaker, as I read to the hon. member—and he did not listen—the provisions of the Act which would permit a stop order are quite different from those which permit prosecutions for offensive odours and particulate matter which may not necessarily be an immediate danger to health but is highly unpleasant to a lot of people—as I understand the situation there.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the apparent unwillingness of the court to levy fines, other than those that are mere licences to continue to pollute, is the minister giving consideration to changing the Act so that on second

offences there will be mandatory fines of a really punitive nature?

Hon. Mr. Auld: As a matter of fact, yes, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things we are presently reviewing, based on the experience that we have had in the department in the last couple of years.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has had lots of experience.

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is sufficient supplementaries on this question.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): That is up to the judge in each case.

Mr. Lewis: Three hundred and sixty dollars; an average fine!

A question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Who levied those fines?

Mr. Lewis: Three hundred and sixty dollars is the average fine for the air management branch for the 25 cases that the minister has brought and prosecuted. Some deterrent that is!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: It wasn't high enough so the minister got personally moved up. Right!

Mr. Singer: He isn't paying any attention to the member.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

ONTARIO AIR ROUTE APPLICATION

Mr. Lewis: May I, Mr. Speaker, direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications?

Is it the intention of the minister, on behalf of the Province of Ontario, to intervene on Air Ontario's behalf in its efforts before the Canadian Transport Commission to preempt many of the internal Ontario air routes now served by Air Canada in order to fashion another regional carrier?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, this whole matter is being discussed presently at the very top levels with everyone concerned. I have been working on this now for the past two weeks and there will be some decisions made very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a supplementary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): By way of supplementary, does the minister have within his department any kind of complete plan for regional air carriers within the Province of Ontario? And does the minister recall that his predecessor admitted during the estimates—the Minister of Transport, Mr. Haskett, at that point—that he had no idea there was any kind of plan or programming for regional carriers in Ontario? Does such a plan now exist for the entire province or are we playing this on an ad hoc basis?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, we have an outline of what we require. Implementation, of course, depends upon co-operation with the air transport committee of the CTC, Air Canada and the other carriers operating in Ontario at both the regional and third levels. We, of course, want to make certain that we are implementing this in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister tell us if Air Ontario has exercised its option with American Airlines to buy the eight BAC planes on which it had an option?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is not a government matter. This is an internal matter with Air Ontario.

Mr. Ferrier: A supplementary then: In light of the statement made by Air Canada recently that it intends to strengthen its flight system within Ontario; and in light of the fact that many of the communities served now by Air Canada are entirely satisfied with this service; why would the Ontario government entertain an action that might undermine this service and replace the service that is entirely satisfactory to the residents of those communities?

An hon. member: Hear! Hear!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, Air Ontario, as the hon. member knows, has filed an application before the CTC and we will be dealing with it.

Mr. Ferrier: But the minister will be supporting it.

Mr. Stokes: Supplementary Mr. Speaker: Does the present Minister of Transportation

and Communications agree with the statement made by his predecessor on numerous occasions in the House that Air Canada was, in fact, going to get out of the regional air carrier service in the province?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is the former minister giving him the message?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Air Canada, like other organizations and people, can change its mind from time to time.

Mr. Stokes: Have they? Have they in fact changed their mind about getting out of the regional air carrier services?

Hon. Mr. Carton: This will be resolved at the hearing.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: When will the minister be making his statement to the House, when so much is at stake with this? When will this information come?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): During recess.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I would say very shortly.

PAYMENTS TO FORMER WCB VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Lewis: Shortly? Fine!

Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: Since, as I understand it, the minister has had on his desk since last night the figures relating to the money paid and tabulation of those moneys for Mr. Jack Cauley, the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, could he now tell the House more precisely what he was only able to recollect vaguely on the last occasion?

An hon. member: The member's secretary phoned and told him.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I wondered who was screening my mail.

Information came to me yesterday and there was not sufficient detail and I have asked for more. I haven't been back to my office since first thing this morning. I hope it will be available tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: I see, the minister still has not been able to acquire the simple terms of a settlement arranged some time ago with Mr. Jack Cauley.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I want to give information to the House in full detail, not just a token.

Mr. Lewis: Well then, I have some questions about the statement that the minister might some time give the House. May I put them, Mr. Speaker?

First to the minister: Is the minister aware that there is a regulation of the Workmen's Compensation Board—which regulation I confirmed by speaking to the personnel department at 1:55 p.m. today—that sick leave credits accumulated can be paid on a half-the-total basis up to a maximum of six months salary? If there is a maximum of six months salary, can the minister explain to me how the accumulated sick leave credit total would have allowed for the payment of two years four months equivalent salary?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it is up to the officials of the Workmen's Compensation Board to deal with their regulations. The member may have consulted with staff and received some of their regulations; it is my understanding there are other regulations as well, dealing with those who are approaching retirement.

Mr. Roy: The minister's own regulations.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): They change each day.

Mr. Lewis: A further question, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain, and I have the photostat in front of me, the notification of credits which was given to Mr. Cauley on Dec. 31, 1968, indicating that he had 351 days of attendance credits and leave of absence plan, and 25 weeks of outstanding vacation credits? Can he explain to me how that can possibly, at a level of $27,000 a year, equal the two years and four months, or $62,000 which was ultimately paid; even when taking into account a further few months of employment in 1969?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the figures I saw were in reference to his total sick credits and holiday credits as of May, 1969. I asked for them in detail and they are being prepared for me; they will be available shortly.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. By way of supplementary, when they are tabled could the minister show how it is possible to bridge the gap of more than, at the least $10,000 that that would entail?

Mr. Speaker, another question: What is meant when Mr. Cauley receives a letter

dated Aug. 18, 1971, by the personnel officer of the board, Miss A. M. Johnston, saying: "Dear Mr. Cauley: Attached is your final salary cheque under the board's early retirement plan." What is the meaning of the continuous salary payments from which regular and normal deductions were made throughout the entire period of time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, the moneys that Mr. Cauley received were sick credit and holiday credits calculated on the basis of salary.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. Well one last question, Mr. Speaker: Is it not in fact true, without denying Mr. Cauley anything, that what in fact Mr. Cauley received was an additional two years and four months of salary arranged by the board through the minister; that he never went off salary; that the question of sick leave credits is now under discussion as it was left in the hands of the board, and the minister hasn't even been informed of it to this day. He still doesn't have the information and it was raised in the House two days ago.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't have the total information. I want to have the breakdown provided by the board, and that is being sent to me.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been sufficient supplementaries on this question today.

Mr. MacDonald: Too much for you fellows.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have one question—

Mr. MacDonald: We've been out in the open. They have been doing the sneaking.

INFORMATION ON SAVINGS IN HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS

Mr. Lewis: I have one question for the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. I shall read it to him because I'm not sure I can carry it off without reading it.

In relation to the recent amendments of the Hospital Services Commission Act and the Health Services Insurance Act, which brought into being the Ontario Health Insurance Commission; is an employer obligated to discuss and reveal proof of the transmittal of savings of persons insured with the union that has an agreement covering such persons? Is the employer obligated to tell those representing the employees what has been put aside by way of savings under the scheme?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): I'll have to think about that one, Mr. Speaker. It's not quite clear. The savings are to be returned the employees, right?

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would assume they have to make it available or the employees wouldn't know what they're entitled to. What the member is getting at is that the savings under this must be returned to the employees, right?

Mr. Lewis: I'm asking whether the representatives bargaining on behalf of the employees then would be entitled to such information in terms of lump sum.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would expect so, but I'll certainly check it for the member and make sure that it is available.

Mr. Lewis: All right. Thank you.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister seems reasonable.

Mr. Lewis: No further questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development has answers to a previous question.

OPERATION OF ONTARIO PLACE

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information): With reference to questions concerning concessions at Ontario Place, I should like to inform the House that the government's financial interest is the return on capital that is received on these public investments. The government spent $32 a square foot on concession structures at Ontario Place. This includes the cost of services such as water, sewers, electricity and so on.

Rents at Ontario Place are based on a minimum rent of $8 a square foot, plus a sliding scale or percentage of gross sales. This means that the greater the concessionaire's sales volume, the higher the rent paid. For example, the minimum rent is $8 a square foot —and let me emphasize that this is for 4½ months a year—and regardless of what the concessionaire's sales or profits are, he has to pay us a minimum of $8 a square foot, which

represents a minimum return on capital to the government of 25 per cent. The 25 per cent return on investment is collected by us, regardless of how well a concessionaire does.

The actual rate of return to the government last year was as follows: There were eight snack bars in operation at Ontario Place last year and they paid rents ranging from $12.16 a foot for the operator with the lowest sales volume to $79.22 a foot for the operator with the best sales volume. The average rent worked out to approximately $35 a square foot, which means that the government received on its investment a return of approximately 110 per cent.

There were five restaurant concessions at Ontario Place last year. This year there will be seven. Two operators had to pay the minimum of $8 a foot because of low volume of sales. Three other operators exceeded their minimum rents and the highest paid rent of $9.31. Therefore on our restaurants we have an average on investment of approximately 30 per cent.

There is a contractual obligation on the concessionaires to provide the minister with an audited statement showing figures for gross sales, cost of supplies and direct operating payroll by Dec. 15 of each year. The gross sales figure is to provide the basis for the calculation of any adjustment to the percentage rentals over the basic minimums occasioned by seasonal fluctuations. That is to say, because the percentage rentals are calculated on an increasing scale based on annual gross sales, but are paid in instalments during the operating season, some adjustment in the rentals may be needed at the end of the year when the final audited gross sales figures are available.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why not tell us what we asked for instead of all that befogging dissemblance again?

Mr. Lewis: That is pettifogging.

Hon. Mr. White: The financial statement also provides cost of supplies and direct operating payroll figures, which are the basis for the comparison of the operational efficiency and financial stability of each of the concessionaires, and as such, contains information of such a nature that if made public it would place the concessionaire in an unfair position in relation to his competitors both on and off the Ontario Place site.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): How could it hurt them to reveal their profits?

Hon. Mr. White: The critical nature of this essentially private business information was recognized by both of the parties to the contract when these agreements were originally negotiated, and it was recognized in those discussions that confidentiality would be maintained. To unilaterally change that understanding at this time would, in my opinion and in the opinion of our legal advisers from the Attorney General's department, amount to a serious breach of contractual faith, which I am not prepared to do.

I now table for the information of the members a copy of the concession agreement—

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister doesn't have the legal right to tell the public what they are entitled to know. Isn't that astounding?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. White: —and a copy of the Ontario Place general—

Mr. Cassidy: He would be a bust in the property market too.

Hon. Mr. White: —rules and regulations and a copy of the Ontario Place food standards for all restaurants, which are the documents relating to this question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He has no grounds at all.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: No supplementary, new question

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Has the hon. minister completed his answer?

The hon. the Provincial Secretary also has the answer to a previous question.

Mr. Lewis: The minister must surely have answered the member and would therefore allow for a supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: I wasn't rising on a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: No members rose on supplementaries.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: The person who had asked the question said he had no supplementaries.

Now the hon. the Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question previously asked by the hon. member for High Park.

LUNCH HOURS AT LCBO STORE

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr Speaker, the hon. member for High Park asked the question:

> Can the minister inform me why it is necessary for all of the employees of the Liquor Control Board on Freeland Street to take their lunch simultaneously?

Mr. Speaker, that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order before the minister answers, that was not the question. The question was: "Why do all the employees in the shipping department who serve the public have to take their lunch simultaneously?"

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I will read the whole question as recorded in Hansard.

Mr. Shulman: **A question of the Provincial Secretary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister inform me why it is necessary for all of the employees at the Liquor Control Board on Freeland Street to take their lunch simultaneously from the shipping department and from the department where packages can be picked up so that the public can be served?**

Now mind you the Toronto Sun records his interest as saying "Why do all the employees of the LCBO have to take their lunch together?"

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't know how much the hon. member gets paid for every word in the Sun; he uses more words in Hansard.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Quit clouding the issue.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the answer is a very simple one: the necessity for security. The objects in question are very valuable. A case of brandy, some of the finest, I guess—$360 worth—isn't something that you leave lying around.

An hon. member: Wow!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the member told me that was per bottle.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Imagine what drinking the brandy would do, Mr. Speaker. And, of course, it is for the protection of the employees so that all of them are off and staff isn't less than required for protection. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements have been made to make sure that everybody who comes during the dinner time will be properly looked after, because other physical arrangements are being made.

Mr. Shulman: One final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker, on a light note. Did the minister in his inquiries find out why darts—and I watch my pronunciation—have been banned in our public houses by his department?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was more interested in how you spell dart, I think. That is something I haven't been able to get around to, Mr. Speaker, but I will in due course.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Public Works also has the answer to a previous question.

PROTECTION FOR CLEANED BUILDING

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener) asked whether the stone work on the legislative buildings would be coated with silicone when the sandblasting was finished.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the department to carry out this treatment, nor was it specified in the contract.

I might say, in explaining the reason, there are really two schools of thought. One, of course, is that a silicone finish would protect the stonework and probably it would stay clean longer. The other concern is that it also seals the surface, and as this building does not include a vapour barrier, when the air conditioning system is added there is concern in my department that moisture from within the building would be held under the silicone treatment and might spall the stonework.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister might become all wet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

ABSENCE OF JUDGE FROM DUTY

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General in connection with the absence of Judge Marshman from his normal duties at London. Is the Attorney

General aware that an application for a writ of prohibition has been taken under section 409 of the Criminal Code which permits a judge to carry on in the absence of another judge where the original judge dies or is unable to perform his duties? And is the Attorney General in agreement with his Crown attorney at London that the judge is unable to continue because he is simply not here, he's on duty elsewhere? And finally, doesn't the minister think the reputation of this judge of Her Majesty's court would be better served, and the public right to know better served, if the minister made a statement rather than continuing this charade in public speculation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I cannot make a statement in reference to this matter at this present time, but I shall as soon as possible.

Mr. Bullbrook: One supplementary: Would it be possible for the minister to edify us and protect the reputation of this judge by telling us whether the Crown attorney at London is correct when he says that "the judge is on duty elsewhere"?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The chief judge of the provincial court has authority to ask a judge to go on a special assignment and that's what has taken place.

Mr. Singer: Has this been done?

Mr. Bullbrook: One further supplementary on my part, if I might. Most respectfully, Mr. Speaker, and to the Attorney General through you, that doesn't answer my question. I am not interested one tittle in what the rights and perquisites of the chief judge are; I ask as a member of this Legislature, as is my bounden duty, to the Attorney General, whether he agrees with the statement made by his Crown attorney at London?

Mr. Speaker: Well, that was part of the question that the hon. minister answered previously.

Mr. Bullbrook: I say to you, sir, that he didn't answer it; he evaded it.

Mr. Speaker: He indicated he would look into the matter.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary. Doesn't the Attorney General feel that he has a duty to—

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me. Was this a supplementary?

Mr. Singer: Yes, supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has indicated that he would provide an answer later when he has a chance to look into it. How can there be a supplementary to the question?

Mr. Singer: It's supplementary to the original question. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to pose additional questions that are supplementary to the one that was asked and see if perhaps the Attorney General might change his mind.

Mr. Speaker: Well when I hear what the hon. member has said I will determine whether it is a supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Yes. Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I ask the Attorney General if he does not believe that the people of Ontario have a right to know what, in fact, is going on in the incident involving Judge Marshman and that he should enlighten them now?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I said before that I would not make a statement at this time but that I would as soon as possible.

Mr. Reid: The minister has had more than two weeks already.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does that bother the people of Rainy River?

Mr. Reid: It bothers us all as members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wentworth.

COMPENSATION BOARD PENSIONS TO WIDOWS, DISABLED

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Does the Minister of Labour believe that it is necessary in this province at this time to upgrade the pensions presently being paid to widows and permanently disabled persons under the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this matter is always under review by the board. I have not heard from them lately but I would be glad to find out from them at a later date. It is always under review.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What is this business about "always under review by the board" and the minister "hasn't heard from them lately"? Has it ever occurred to the minister to summon the board to

discuss with it a matter which the minister initiates, rather than forever being dictated to?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West must understand that I've been in this department for just about eight weeks and it is my intention to get a very close relationship with the board. I've met the board already on a couple of occasions but we haven't discussed the whole spectrum of matters that comes under the Workmen's Compensation Board as yet.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question; Does the minister recognize the inadequacy of the payments that are presently being paid to many of the recipients at this time? Does he recognize the ever-increasing cost of living and the need to upgrade those pensions now?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: This is always a critical area. I am not saying that I don't recognize the needs in many cases, but I certainly would like to have time to see if it is feasible. We mustn't forget that the benefits come from the employers, of course.

Mr. Deans: Perhaps we could use some of the $0.5 million we gave back.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: These are matters that I would like to get more familiar with before making a final pronouncement in the House.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe the minister could discuss with the board their issuance of GM press releases. He doesn't want to discuss them?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

EMPLOYMENT SITUATION FOR CASUAL WORKERS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Public Works. Could the minister advise us if he plans to do anything to assist the same 70 casual workers—some of whom have been working for the government of Ontario for as long as 26 years in a casual fashion and a great number of whom have been working for more than 20 years—who apparently are going to have their term of service with the government severed on March 30? These gentlemen are skilled tradesmen who would be disowned by their union if they accept the wages offered by the government, but unless they accept the wages offered by the government —which they can't do—they are out of jobs. Is the minister going to do anything about these 70 people?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker. I think it's well known that my department offered all the temporary or casual employees employment with the department in the permanent service under the conditions of the agreement with the Civil Service Association and under the rates that were established.

I haven't got a right up to date figure, but the last I heard the majority, certainly probably close to two-thirds, of the employees had decided to join the civil service. Other tradesmen such as electricians, for instance, decided rather than join the civil service they would sooner go and work in the private sector, in construction.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Is the minister aware that the choice is no longer left with these some 70 people; that as of March 30, they have no employment. They will be losing an average of 40 per cent in their salary and they have been working for this government, many of them, for over 20 years? Isn't that a shameful situation?

Mr. Deans: Certainly it is.

Mr. Martel: They wouldn't do it if they were in the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that these employees certainly did have a choice. I'm not saying they have now but they had ample time and the time was extended, I believe, by my predecessor in this department by an extra week to give them additional time to—

Mr. Deans: A whole week!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —consider their status. This week, as I said, was in addition to considerable notice they had before that.

Mr. Singer: By way of final supplementary on this, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister not aware that if the so-called choice was accepted they would lose all of the money they have paid into their unions for pensions and other benefits, and in addition take a very substantial salary cut? Does the minister really believe this is the kind of choice that should be given to people who have worked for the government of Ontario for as long as 26 years?

Mr. Martel: The Attorney General didn't do that to Jack Cauley. Maybe he would work out an agreement for them.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this was the proposal that was made to these men—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He should have consulted the member first.

Mr. Martel: It should work both ways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Probably.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I think in some ways there can always be a review of the classified salaries that are being paid. It is being continually reviewed all the time. I'm sure these classifications can be looked at but I feel they must either be civil servants or not be civil servants; one or the other.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the report of the ministerial commission on French-language secondary education.

Mr. Clement from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr1, An Act respecting the City of Waterloo.

Bill Pr2, An Act respecting the County of Simcoe.

Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Saint Peter's Seminary Corp. of London in Ontario.

Bill Pr6, An Act respecting Esbeco Ltd.

Bill Pr16, An Act respecting Sue-Carib Industries Ltd.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill Pr24, An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.

Mr. Henderson from the standing procedural affairs committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices as published in each case sufficient:

Peterborough Racing Association Ltd.

The city of Sault Ste. Marie;

The city of Sarnia;

The city of Kitchener;

The city of London;

St. John's College School (Elora);

The city of Toronto (No. 1);

The city of Ottawa.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

NURSING HOMES ACT, 1972

Hon. Mr. Potter moves first reading of bill intituled, the Nursing Homes Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing a new statute, revising the present Nursing Homes Act as of April 1, 1972. Under the new Act, nursing homes in Ontario will be required to provide skilled nursing care to persons who require that level of care as an insured benefit under the Ontario Hospital Insurance Plan.

Qualified residents and homes licensed under the Act will pay $3.50 per day starting April 1. The plan will pay $9 to cover the remainder of the homes' approved daily cost for medically necessary services in standard ward accommodation.

The residents of nursing homes who don't need this specialized care, and who are in fact using the facility as a retirement home, will not be covered under the plan. Naturally we have no intention of relocating these people, Mr. Speaker, but they must pay their own way just as they do at the present time.

In future, admission to this type of residence and nursing home will be limited. Licences for new nursing homes will also be issued only where public need has been established. Procedure is also provided in the new Act to authorize interim management of nursing homes where the health, welfare and safety of residents are in danger.

The integration of nursing homes into our present system of hospitals and other facilities will relieve the demand for beds in active treatment hospitals. It will also provide for a level of health care that has been a gap in the benefits programme in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, this government believes the approaches I have just outlined and which are detailed in the Act will bring us another step closer to providing the effective and economic pattern of health care services needed by the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Simcoe East was on his feet.

SIMCOE DAY

Mr. G. E. Smith moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Simcoe Day.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. E. Smith (Simcoe East): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to change the name of the public holiday celebrated in many municipalities on the first Monday in August from civic holiday to Simcoe Day in honour of John Graves Simcoe who was appointed first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada on Sept. 12, 1791, and who convened the first legislative assembly and established the capital of the province at York, now Toronto.

Some hon. members: Good legislation!

CITY OF KITCHENER

Mr. Breithaupt moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Kitchener.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. Bennett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PERSONAL REPORTING AGENCIES

Mr. Deacon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to regulate Personal Reporting Agencies.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the registration of personal reporting agencies and to provide a means whereby the persons who are the subjects of investigations may examine, and if necessary have corrected, the report resulting from such investigations.

CITY OF SAULT STE. MARIE

Mr. Rhodes moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sault Ste. Marie.

CITY OF SARNIA

Mr. Bullbrook moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. Walker moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Wardle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PETERBOROUGH RACING ASSOCIATION LTD.

Mr. Turner moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Peterborough Racing Association Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have an appointment with a government department official at 4 o'clock—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He'll wait, he'll wait.

Mr. Gaunt: —so I will endeavour to wind my remarks up as quickly as I possibly can.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Gaunt: When I adjourned the debate on Tuesday night, I was—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Is he crossing the floor?

Mr. Gaunt: No, I am not going to cross the floor. It's an appointment having to do with something else other than crossing the floor.

On Tuesday evening I was berating the government somewhat, I think, for moving the youth and recreation branch from the Department of Education to the Department of Community and Social Services. This move is puzzling to me, particularly in light of what the Premier (Mr. Davis) did by setting up the select committee on the utilization of educational facilities on Dec. 17.

As I indicated the other night, I am a member of that committee. I think it is a very worthwhile study, but it is very puzzling to me, in view of that action on Dec. 17, that the cabinet made the decision in the latter part of February that this particular branch be moved from the Department of Education into the Community and Social Services Department.

Obviously there has been very close co-operation of late, and I suggest there has to be close co-operation between the education officials and the recreation people if the maximum use of the schools by the community is going to take place. As far as I am concerned, the most recent move removes that possibility and further fragments the authority through which maximum community use of schools can be achieved. To say the least it is going to make the job of the committee even more difficult than it already is.

As far as I am concerned, our committee should make the strongest possible representations to the government in an attempt to reverse that decision. I see the chairman is here, and perhaps he will have something to say about that, as I understand he comes on later on in the debate.

All of which raises the question: Is it fair to expect the education authorities at the local level to inflate the size of school libraries, gymnasiums and other facilities over and above their student requirements in order to accommodate the needs of the community at large for such facilities?

In my view the answer is yes, provided the government can adequately compensate, by way of extra grants, not only for the physical structure but also for community use of schools.

From the school board's point of view there are pressing problems from the budget angle, because they have ceiling limits now imposed on their spending. When groups make requests for use of schools, the board, in addition to the building and facilities, usually has to provide janitorial or custodial services, which cost money and for which it is not compensated by way of grants.

For instance, if all the public schools in Metropolitan Toronto were to be used on Saturdays and Sundays for community events, the estimated cost of salaries and overtime for custodial staff alone would be $2 million per year.

Toronto Board of Education will be forced to cut its budget to the extent of about $5 million because of the current guidelines set out by the Department of Education and, according to one board member, this could well preclude the further use of school facilities by the community because the more we use the schools the more it will cost, as I have aready indicated.

While taxpayers have a huge investment in our schools and must reap some benefit in order to get their money's worth, quite frankly I think the grant structure is going to have to be revamped in order to encourage and compensate. To encourage the use by the community and to compensate boards of education for the extra costs involved. Frankly, I think this is the only real solution to the problem. I don't want to say anything which would jeopardize the position of the other committee members but as far as I'm concerned those are my feelings with respect to that matter.

However, I want to turn to another topic which involves the Wright report. This report was dealt with very adequately, I think, by the hon. member for Nickel Belt on Tuesday evening last. He gave a fairly detailed analysis of the Wright report and what it said and what it should have said in his view. I don't want to go into that kind of analysis with respect to it.

However, I do want to refer to it in the course of my argument. As far as I am concerned, the Wright report can be summed up very simply. I agree with many of the pronouncements, the proposals and recommendations in the report; some I do not agree with.

However, I think the matter having to do with the setting up of the University of Ontario is a good one. I think that proposal has real merit. It's long been supported by this party and I'm glad that it has the endorsation of such an august body as the Wright commission.

The one thing that struck me most about the Wright commission report was the contradictions in the report. I want to take one of the more glaring ones and apply it to

what I want to talk about. Last year, in the House, during the estimates of the Department of University Affairs, also during the health committee meetings, I spoke on the subject of expanding opportunities in medicine for Ontario students.

At that time the Minister of University Affairs, the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), said he didn't want to do anything. He didn't want to take any steps at that point because the Wright commission report was pending. He wanted to wait and see what it had to say about this matter before he took any action. The draft report is now down and instead of making the matter better, the report makes its worse. Instead of being part of the answer, the report is now part of the problem.

It comes down to this matter of universal accessibility. Everyone, young and old, must have ready access to all the educational institutions according to their needs and their desires. Yet the report recommends a substantial rise in tuition fees particularly for the professions in an attempt to have a larger proportion of the revenue of the university come from tuition fees.

May I say right now that I feel the entire system of tuition fees should be scrapped as well as the proposals for the student loans as suggested by the committee. They're unworkable; they're unreasonable; and they're running in the face of the committee's stated purpose of universal accessibility.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Does the member really mean free tuition?

Mr. Gaunt: I don't want to go into that but I'm simply saying that as far as I am concerned the doubling of tuition fees with respect to some of the professions is, in my view, indefensible. I want to take the one particular profession with which I want to deal this afternoon—medicine.

Students entering the professions—particularly medicine and dentistry—are faced with a doubling of the tuition fees from $700 in medicine to $1,500. The fact is that the gifts necessary for a good doctor have nothing to do with the parents' pocketbook. This recommendation is equality of opportunity in reverse.

Let's consider a bright young man from a poor family. He would have to take out a student loan for at least four years, perhaps five years. He would need a minimum of $3,000 a year for tuition and accommodation and hence he would be in debt approximately $12,000 to $15,000 at the end of his course and it would be even more than that because the loan's interest would be added on to it. So the members can see what I mean by equality of opportunity in reverse.

This type of thing takes us back, in my view, 10 years and I don't think we can allow it to happen. I think there have been, and will continue to be, just as good people from the poor- or middle-class families enter medicine and make just as good doctors in the long haul as those from the more wealthy and more affluent families in this country. I don't think the fact of a person's wealth should have anything whatever to do with his ability to be able to get into a medical school if he so desires.

Mr. Renwick: Does the member think the present level of fees in medical schools is a deterrent for people from poorer families?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, in many cases it is.

Mr. Renwick: How would the member go about solving that?

Mr. Gaunt: The member is leading me off the track—

An hon. member: Make your own speech.

Mr. Gaunt: —but may I say that we can't do it overnight, but I think we have to move toward the system of free tuition. I underline that we can't do it overnight but I think that is a desirable goal.

Mr. Renwick: I understand that, and that was the reason for my interjection as to whether or not that is the member's ultimate goal.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to deal, as I said earlier on, with the subject of expanding opportunities in medicine for Ontario students. I want to deal with it in some detail if I may.

Ontario is faced with an odd situation. There are marked imbalances in our professional schools' outputs. I suspect that this situation has developed because Ontario has had no long-term manpower planning regarding Ontario's needs in the various professions. Now we have a surplus in some professions while others, most notably medicine, are producing too few, thus denying career opportunities in medicine for Ontario students. Ontario is producing enough lawyers—I think the member for Riverdale would agree with that—enough teachers, and PhDs. In the case of the latter we are oversupplied in view of the dwindling academic opportunities in contracting employment positions.

However, in the one profession, medicine, there has been an obvious neglect in providing educational opportunities in Ontario. Medicine has been denied availability to rapidly increasing numbers of our own aspiring and qualified Ontario students. In addition to the need, it is obvious that medicine has an attendant professional satisfaction, self employability, financial security, and social prestige.

In 1970, of the 921 new MDs registered to practise in Ontario, only 37 per cent were Ontario graduates; roughly one-third of the new MDs were Ontario medical school graduates. Over 50 per cent of the new MDs in the year before last, 1970, were immigrant medical graduates. In 1969 the Ontario medical schools rejected 36 per cent of the applicants whom they considered acceptable and for whom there were no places.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Ontario had the worst record.

Mr. Gaunt: Indeed they did. Close to 200 Ontario students were denied this professional education for which they were considered qualified, and this province has need of the medical training they sought. The Wright commission report has a suggestion with respect to that. It considers that a lottery system would be something of an improvement.

Mr. Renwick: Has the member a breakdown of over 50 per cent—from which countries they came? I know it is not right on the member's point.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes. I have breakdown of that. I don't have it here but I can get it for the member.

Oddly, Ontario produces half the number of applicants for medical schools, compared to Quebec, but we reject more than Quebec. The Association of Canadian Medical Colleges in a recent study states, "Ontario seems to be accepting too few students in relation to its population."

As Harold Stafford, MP for Elgin, pointed out in his excellent brief on this subject to the Commission on Post Secondary Education in Ontario, it is apparent that Ontario is relying on foreign medical graduates to meet the increasing MD services needed in this new Medicare era. Most of these immigrant doctors are from underdeveloped countries, interestingly enough. Since 1965, immigrant doctors annually exceed the number of our graduates. It is obvious that Ontario has elected to provide increased medical manpower needs through immigration. I find this totally unacceptable, indeed morally wrong.

Grand Bend, for instance, had—I believe, a year or so ago—acquired two doctors from Ireland after building a medical centre and exploring all the possibilities in the province and in the country, of filling the positions. The dean of the University of the West Indies states that it is very clearly a moral situation and that the West Indies can no longer afford to spend over a million dollars a year to supplement Canadian health services. What a parasite this country has become, when one realizes that 86 West Indian MDs emigrated to Canada in 1969, while the West Indies is only capable of graduating 115 new MDs a year!

Mr. Renwick: A good point.

An hon. member: They came of their own free will.

Mr. Gaunt: They came of their own free will. I am going to come to that.

It is obvious, then, why the dean of that particular medical school in the West Indies would be upset. This matter has even received the attention of the UN, because in April, 1970, I believe it was—I am sorry, April, 1971—there was a resolution passed, suggesting that the western nations be required to pay for trained personnel they entice away from poor nations.

Mr. Renwick: It would be quite different if we allowed other persons without the point qualification to come into the country from the West Indies—

Mr. Gaunt: That is right. At least this would force action—

Mr. Renwick: —for immigration purposes.

Mr. Gaunt: —on the part of the government to do something about the situation. In essence then, we have depleted part of the badly needed medical personnel in developing countries. At the same time, this province has denied our own citizens the opportunity to be members of a needed and highly respected body in the province.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): It is the doctors' club.

Mr. Gaunt: Newfoundland is supposed to be a poor province, yet it has taken bigger steps to open a new medical school, to set itself on the path of self-reliance. By 1973, Newfoundland will have 50 per cent more places per million population than will be

available for medical education in good old wealthy Ontario.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): How many places are there now?

Mr. Gaunt: I don't know. I don't have that information, but I know that that fact is correct. By 1981, Newfoundland medical students will have almost doubled per million as compared to Ontario. I am not suggesting the building of another medical school—my friend, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, had outguessed me or was trying to move ahead of my train of thought; I wanted to allay his fear—but I am not going to suggest that.

I recognize the time lag between the initial planning of a medical school and the actual output of graduates is from eight to 10 years. We can't wait that long. What we need are more entrance places for our medical students right away. The Americans are recognizing the gravity of the situation. As a matter of fact, they are even worse off than we are. However, I understand plans are under way to increase the American pool of MDs by 50,000 by the year 1980.

In my view, this province should be very nearly self reliant in medical manpower. There is no reason why it can't be, although this will take some planning and some money, neither of which is out of the reach for Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: What is the extent of the shortage of doctors?

Mr. Gaunt: If we do not increase our present medical school output immediately, we shall likely face a crisis in medical manpower in the next 10 years. Just think what would happen if large numbers of foreign medical graduates stopped coming into this province, thereby placing an almost intolerable burden on our own resident doctors.

Dr. Douglas Bocking, dean of the University of Western Ontario faculty of medicine, says that the flow of doctors depends on governments. We're depending on outside sources for our medical personnel; changes in government policy, even the war in Vietnam or the cessation of that war could affect the flow of doctors to this country.

Dr. Bocking also states the problems concerning medical schools are in increasing class size, and are related in the first instance to basic medical science laboratory space and staffing, and secondly to the number of teaching beds in the community.

The dean also makes the point that the entering class size at Western should be increased from 100 to 150 by staggering classes in the basic science laboratories, on condition space and facilities are provided for the additional staff required. The people at Western foresee a greater output by continuing its present four-year curriculum and using staggered laboratory periods with a class of 150, rather than going to a three-year curriculum for a class of 100. It is estimated that approximately $15 million would be required at Western to provide the clinical teaching facilities for a medical class increased from 100 to 150 students. Also approximately $10 million would be required to provide the basic medical science facilities to increase from the existing 85 to 150 students. The estimated $25 million is still considerably less than the estimated $90 million required to develop a new medical school with an output of 64 medical students.

Dr. Bocking says that the advantage of an existing school expanding to use facilities in satellite areas, is the involvement of these areas in health education but, most important of all, is the much more rapid output of medical graduates.

I'm not saying—the minister interjected earlier on—I'm not saying that we stop doctors from coming into this country from outside. I don't think we can and I don't think it would be desirable. But I think we can create the climate where it is not nearly so attractive for them to come in. I think we can do this by changing the doctor population ratio so that it won't be as attractive to outside doctors.

Mr. Renwick: What about cutting the fee schedule? Would that deter them?

Mr. Gaunt: The OMA has suggested that we should be utilizing the concept of teaching in satellite hospitals. The flow of students could be increased in a number of ways. First, by lengthening the school year. Second, by shortening the number of years required by putting final years into a clinical setting. And third, by double shifting.

Actually when one stops to look at it, the American Medical Association has really had a tremendous influence on medical practice and medical school requirements, standards, tariffs and the whole bit in every country in the western world. Actually in some cases they've imposed tremendous costs—unnecessary costs—on the medical profession in this country and hence on the general population.

I think it's fair to say that we have too little flow in this country with respect to medical students coming into the medical schools. Perhaps the volume of training is too much in certain areas. I think we can look at that. Perhaps in certain other areas the standards are too high. I am thinking particularly of the admission standards. I think going simply on the basis of academic achievement does not really put the finger on those people who would make excellent doctors in the long run.

I feel that I have given the minister a few of my thoughts with respect to this matter. I consider it a serious problem. I hope that he will give it his earnest attention and sit down as quickly as possible with the deans of the medical schools in this province to see if some of these things cannot be achieved. I think he will find them co-operative and most helpful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the leader of this party has put forward a very reasoned amendment. I commend it to all members of the House. I think if all members sit down and reflect on the content of the motion, it will undoubtedly receive unanimous support, and for that I am truly looking forward.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. J. R. Smith (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the other hon. members who have participated in this debate in extending my congratulations on your most worthy appointment as our Speaker. May I give you my best wishes for good health and the satisfying fulfilment of your appreciation for parliamentary procedure and the traditions provided by Mr. Speaker in the order and conduct of this old and historic assembly.

Mr. Speaker, these are days when it is exciting to be a Hamiltonian. Our city is in a period of explosive growth in every sphere of activity. Really, I think as more and more people from Metropolitan Toronto—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member is whirling like a dervish!

Mr. J. R. Smith: —visit our community—I would say to the hon. member for Lakeshore —these are some of the following things they will see and discover for themselves. Commercially, our city sees rising in its central core our Century 21 complex and already several of the retail outlets are almost ready for occupancy. Other commercial towers are under construction in the central core of that very old city.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is he one of the products of the new Hamilton?

Mr. J. R. Smith: To the hon. member for Ottawa Centre, I am very glad to say that one reason I have a great deal of pride in our city is that I am not native born but rather have moved there by choice. I had the pleasure of being raised in his particular community of which I was also very proud.

Perhaps the hon. member for Ottawa Centre should come down and see and find out what some of the other cities in Ontario are really like as well. Everything doesn't centre around Metro Toronto and the big chiefs down in the capital at Ottawa.

Culturally, Hamilton also is no longer to be considered by many people in other perhaps more sophisticated communities as a lunch-bucket town. Hamilton is certainly coming to the fore in many aspects, particularly as the new theatre auditorium nears construction, a project which has been chaired by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. McNie).

Our many cultural groups will have the opportunity to fulfil many of the productions which they are capable of performing. Similarly, guest artists will be able to come to our city and indeed we will be able to have a two-way cultural flow between Toronto and Hamilton. It won't be a one-way street of Hamiltonians having to come to the O'Keefe and to the Royal Alex to enjoy the various entertainments. We look forward to the Torontonians coming to Hamilton.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): We cannot afford to go to the O'Keefe!

Mr. J. R. Smith: Our philharmonic orchestra, Mr. Speaker, has reached such prominence that next month its guest conductor will be Mr. Arthur Fiedler of the Boston Pops.

Industrially, Hamilton has been a leader in Canada. It is known as the steelmaker but here again many changes are taking place. I refer in particular to the trade complex for which the Province of Ontario is contributing well over $2 million in capital costs. This industrial trade centre will become the showcase for Hamilton products and also serve as a banquet and convention centre. It is sort of interesting, Mr. Speaker, that although a commitment was made during the 1967 campaign by the former Premier (Mr. Robarts) of this province that he would match any grants made by the federal government, the federal people never delivered—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Shame, shame.

Mr. Renwick: It was a great promise.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —on any funding for the Hamilton theatre auditorium and trade complex. But Ontario did and our new premier (Mr. Davis) went one step further and delivered a well over $2.5 million commitment for this facility.

Mr. Renwick: That is the ultimate in blaming Ottawa.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Of course, 1972 sportswise in Hamilton sees the Grey Cup being played in the Ivor Wynne Stadium. We in Hamilton are proud of our Astroturf and the fact that we were the first community in Ontario to have artificial turf. Then again, the Football Hall of Fame will be opening in November, and it too will complement the historical role the Hamiltonians have played in the sporting life of Canada.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): You had an energetic mayor.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Scientifically, we see many new developments in our community. Early last year the new provincial regional health laboratory was opened in my riding and is already serving a very useful role for the whole region. Similarly the McMaster medical school is well under way and already functioning; many of its departments functioning in the various hospitals and clinics in our city and at its temporary quarters at the McMaster medical school site.

Educationally, Mohawk College continues to be one of the real success stories in the field of community college education in this province, filling a void for industry. The fact that well over 90 per cent of its graduates last year found employment speaks well of the advisory committees of that community college which draw their resource people from industry and management. I think that their co-op system might be a model that could well be adapted for use in other private community colleges in this province.

Of course, as we enter this 29th session of this Legislature, I think politically Hamilton has a great deal to be proud of during the Seventies, because the Progressive Conservative Party last October rose in total votes from the very sad position in 1967 of third place in the Hamilton-Wentworth constituency to first place in total votes.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): That is the first and last time for 45 years. You'd better make the best of it.

Mr. J. R. Smith: I am always very humble and I feel honoured when the hon. member for Hamilton East interjects, because I respect him as one of the venerable members of this assembly. Undoubtedly he has been here many, many more years than I and has a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. Lawlor: Be careful now, you are beginning to sound like Uriah Heep.

Mr. J. R. Smith: But I would not like to foretell the future, we don't have crystal balls such as Mackenzie King. The thing for us to do with the government is to work during the next four years to be worthy of the confidence and the respect of the electors. Who is to say who is going to form the next government. It is for the electors to decide.

Mr. Gisborn: Tell us the sad part about the theatre auditorium. Tell us the sad part about the trade centre.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I think the mandate given to this government by the people of our city and county is indicative of the confidence they have in our new Premier and leader and in his government and its policies. We look forward to being able to work with him and the members of his cabinet for even better things for our city and county in the next four years.

One of the highlights of the past provincial election undoubtedly had to be the election of two fine new lady members to this assembly. Mr. Speaker, I know that the former member for Hamilton West, whom we in Hamilton, people of all political colours and walks of life, refer to as "our Ada," would be glad to see this development, but I know that the members of this House will miss the countenance, the wisdom and the vitality of that very special person, in the name of Mrs. Ada Pritchard. It was certainly most fitting that the mayor of our community tendered a testimonial dinner in her honour, attended by the Premier and federal, provincial and municipal leaders earlier this year.

And so, to our Ada we wish her well and many more years not of retirement—she is too active a person for that—but fulfilment of her life and companionship with her husband. And we wish her well in her participation in the various areas of community life for which she has a very special interest.

One of the things that the former member for Hamilton West was very concerned about and interested in was the construction in our community of senior citizens' accommodation.

That is perhaps one of the reasons why Hamilton has been most fortunate, probably ahead of many Ontario communities of its size, in obtaining at the present time well over 1,500 senior citizens' units.

Mr. Gisborn: —1,400. We have a backlog need for another 1,900!

Mr. J. R. Smith: No! Mr. Speaker, these have been constructed in many areas of the city; a few are located in my particular constituency. Last year a large complex was opened in the riding of Hamilton East, a new one late last year in Hamilton Centre, and others in Hamilton West. And I would only like to draw to the attention of the Ontario Housing Corp. the fact that this dispersing of the units throughout the entire community is a most noble and laudable move on the part of the Ontario Housing Corp.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think it should perhaps reassess the city situation. It should realize that almost one-third of the residential community of our city resides on Hamilton Mountain—the geographical area known as Hamilton Mountain—I would hope that it would take cognizance of the resolution to our mayor by the Mount Hamilton Salvation Army senior citizens that the next senior citizens' housing units be considered for that area known as Hamilton Mountain.

Now, during the February visit by the select committee around Ontario, I was interested in seeing a number of the senior citizens' accommodation facilities in other communities. I was particularly interested in a unit near the city of Sarnia where the Ontario Housing Corp. has built a complex of approximately 25 to 30 units in a two-storey building which fitted in so very well to the neighbourhood around about it.

I think that we should be very careful not to isolate senior citizens in tall, cold senior citizens' towers. Whenever possible we should try to build the smaller housing accommodation where the sites are available and proposals are reasonable, so that the senior citizens occupying the apartments have easy access to the churches, the shops and their friends in their own particular neighbourhood.

And secondly, on the matter of senior citizens, I would encourage the Ontario Housing Corp. to pursue its dialogue wtih the city so that soon the province might assume total responsibility for the maintenance and the administration of all the units in our particular city.

On the matter of public protection, I would like to bring to the attention of the minister responsible for public protection the role of the policeman in our society.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Which minister is the member talking to about that?

Mr. Renwick: The Solicitor General?

Mr. Singer: The Solicitor General? The Department of the Attorney General? The Minister of Justice?

Mr. J. R. Smith: The hon. member for Downsview is looking straight into the blue of eyes—the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko).

Mr. Singer: Which minister is the member directing it to? I think that is a fair question.

Mr. Renwick: I think that is the inappropriate minister.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Undoubtedly, the policeman in our society has an increasingly more difficult role in trying to perform his duty—and perhaps along with the teacher who also has an extremely difficult time due to changing roles in society. I think in our community there is a great deal of concern, particularly about public safety. Perhaps there is a need for those concerned to call together a provincial conference of police chiefs, law enforcement officers, magistrates and citizens to try to develop programmes to help preserve that very special aspect of the way of life in Ontario, that of public safety.

One thing we should cherish more than anything else is the fact that the streets in our communities are safe at night and that we can go out and walk at leisure, indeed leave our doors of our houses unlocked, and know that there is relative safety.

Mr. Bullbrook: We haven't confronted the social problems yet.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Undoubtedly this is a part of a total problem of society, but the law enforcement officers also require the support of the magistrates, the courts and the citizens at large.

Mr. Singer: The police are not getting support from the minister now.

Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, in an industrial city such as Hamilton there is always the matter of labour relations. During this past year there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the employees at the Stanley plant.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon): Would the hon. Minister of Labour look into the decision of the Labour Relations Board, handed down on March 2 by Mr. J. D. O'Shea in regard to the workers of Stanley Steel Co. in Hamilton, to ascertain whether this decision to deny the application of over 80 per cent of the membership for their democratic right to break away from the United Steelworkers Union of America in favour of an all-Canadian union was indeed an impartial one.

There is indeed a great area of controversy as to whether or not this group of workers did have a fair hearing before the Labour Relations Board, whether or not they did have the opportunity of bringing forward all of their witnesses and airing their case, and whether or not the solicitor for the company had the right to intercede and more or less act in the role of a prosecutor in questioning various employees of the group wishing to break away from the Steelworkers.

Mr. Gisborn: Is the member in favour of the raiding of that established organization?

Mr. J. R. Smith: The hon. member for Hamilton East, of course, is a member, I believe, of the Hamilton Steelworkers local—

Mr. Renwick: You don't believe—you know.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —and therefore must have a great deal of interest in this particular international union. Since he has raised this particular point, I would also like to ask the Minister of Labour, and in turn the committee for natural resources, that when it gets through with dealing with the issues laid before it regarding Mr. Cauley and the Workmen's Compensation Board—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —it should look into the following matter.

Regarding chapter 22 of the bylaws governing chartered local unions of the Canadian Labour Congress, revised June, 16, wherein in chapter 20, I would wonder if this in any way might violate the Ontario Human Rights Code or perhaps the spirit of the Canadian Bill of Rights, where it says under article 1:

> Every member of a local union is guilty of an offence against the constitution of the Canadian Labour Congress and the bylaws of the local union who [and point 4 says] advocates or attempts to bring about the withdrawal from the Canadian Labour Congress of any local unions, or any members or groups of members of such local unions and [in point 6] works in the interests of any organization, competing with the Canadian Labour Congress in a manner which is detrimental to the Canadian Labour Congress.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Read that to the Teachers Federation.

Mr. J. R. Smith: The Speech from the Throne mentioned that legislation will be introduced at this session—

Mr. Renwick: I don't think you will get any solace.

Mr. J. R. Smith: —to enable school boards and municipal authorities to share in the development of various facilities for both school and community use. Through such arrangements, the speech said, the use of school buildings should be considerably enhanced and the concept of the school as a community resource will come closer to being a reality.

I welcome the opportunity to talk with the members of this House about the select committee on the utilization of educational facilities. Indeed that particular name is, I would admit, quite a mouthful. But nevertheless, the word "utilization" seems to be the in word for 1972.

Written submissions have been received from all over Ontario by our committee and I would like particularly to thank the members of this select committee for their interest and their co-operation and diligence and hard work in the meetings and travelling that we have, so far, encountered. The submissions that we have, so far, received have expressed quite a wide range of concerns and interests. So far, however, we have managed to avoid the embarrassment of another committee which, having advertised for briefs, received a whole box of white shorts.

Now, what is the committee all about, what has it been doing and what is it going to do? Perhaps the word "education" is a good place to begin. For most people this immediately brings to mind schools: What happens in schools, what should be going on at school, and even, how can schools be avoided? Our terms of reference, however, instruct us to look not only at schools, but at the community colleges and universities. We are concerned to discover how the physical resources of all these institutions can be put to better use. How can more use by the community be achieved and should there be programmes for their year-round use?

Once the answers to these questions have been found, we must decide what will be the best ways of achieving this better use. The question of money, as usual, becomes a central issue for us to examine. We know we cannot just say "Give us some more for this group. Give some more to that group." There is certainly a point at which the distribution of provincial funds cannot be looked upon as a panacea.

So, we must also be looking for other sources to support the multitude of uses that will be demanded of all these facilities. And this, perhaps, is the crux of the matter.

Education does play an important part in the lives of all of us. Its value may well grow as our leisure increases. Educational facilities do represent a major expenditure and one that is borne by everyone in this province.

Ever since the Second World War, but especially in the past 15 years, an immense effort has taken place to build up the capital resources for education. Schools are a very central part of our neighbourhoods and all of our lives. University campuses claim large parcels of land in our cities. The community colleges have added a whole new set of images to urban life.

All of these educational facilities are highly visible. And since they represent, in all their forms, such a substantial investment, it is only proper that we begin to concern ourselves with the question of how they can be better used.

Our approach to these questions has been, first of all, to advertise our existence in newspapers across Ontario. In this public notice we asked everyone to send their ideas on these subjects to our committee. As I mentioned earlier we have already received a substantial number of submissions covering a very wide selection of issues.

We also decided to visit various centres in Ontario. We wanted to see for ourselves what is happening in different areas. While most of the members are somewhat aware of what happens in their own riding, we need to find some comparisons with other centres in Ontario.

We have managed to visit schools in Oshawa, Toronto, Hamilton and St. Catharines, in a number of the smaller communities and rural hamlets of southwestern Ontario, and in the Thunder Bay and Kenora districts. This has involved travel by almost every motor vehicle, including a Lands and Forests plane, a Go mini-bus and even the taxi at Sioux Narrows, owned and driven by the local Indian chief. During the forthcoming school break a portion of the committee will visit Ottawa and hear submissions at this time from eastern Ontario while, in turn, another meeting is scheduled on the Thursday for Don Mills in Metropolitan Toronto.

On all of these visits the committee has spent considerable time meeting with members of various educational institutions. We are concerned not only to consult with the educators, administrators and other professional groups, but also we want to gather the feelings and opinions of the community at large. We want to know how the general public feels about these issues. We want to find out what the public thinks about the role of educational facilities in its community, how it thinks its facilities and resources should be used. For this reason, we have held these public meetings in the various centres we have visited.

Many groups and individuals have come before the committee to present formal briefs and informal ones. Sometimes they are quite impromptu. Indeed, one or two of the finest submissions have been made by secondary students or university students who happen to be sitting in on the meeting and, at the conclusion of the formal presentations, felt moved to make a presentation of their own.

We have found these remarks and comments and submissions extremely informative, although they are sometimes a little tedious. The meetings sometimes last four to five hours and are quite often quite unpredictable. We are never quite sure who will attend. In one city, one group availed itself of the opportunity to meet with us, and that was perhaps our only disappointment.

All of these submissions from the public meeting and those that have been sent to us directly will form the basis for our work as a committee. They point up problems, suggest possible solutions and present a very large selection of excellent ideas. In fact, the range of possibilities for the utilization of educational facilities is so great that I begin to think there is so much to be done, particularly in schools, that there is hardly time for education. Fortunately, though, the educators do keep reminding us of the principal purpose for school. The four or five members of our committee who are teachers keep reminding us so that that particular aspect is pretty hard to forget.

We have found that the subjects of recreation, of daycare services, libraries, are the most prevalent public concerns at this time,

particularly as these services relate to the use of schools. For this reason, we have just begun a programme of research on these issues for the committee. On the basis of this research programme, the committee intends to submit, I hope, Mr. Speaker, if all goes well, a preliminary report to the Legislature by the end of June.

In looking at these and other issues in terms of achieving the most effective use of educational facilities, there is perhaps a more important point to make. We are not willing to dictate to the public and to educators exactly what uses should or must be made of our educational capital resources. Rather, the committee is concerned to make recommendations to this Legislature that will help to create the opportunity for more use, better use and, more importantly, a wider use. It is on this note, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say that I again thank the members of this committee and that we look forward to presenting our preliminary report this forthcoming June.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, like others before me, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on your position and the fairness with which you have handled this House, and ask you to convey to the Speaker my congratulations and best wishes to both of you for being most kind in the one or two social gaffes that I have committed in this House. I appreciate that very much.

I would like also to particularly thank the government House leader for the overflowing government benches that he has managed to round up for my first major contribution to this House and, particularly, the front benches. I am most flattered and almost overwhelmed by the attendance.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The new Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr) is there.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): You get the quality there.

Mr. Foulds: Yes. You always get quality with the Minister of Colleges and Universities.

I would like to start off, Mr. Speaker, by saying that unlike some members on this side of the House, I was delighted by the Speech from the Throne. It was a speech that I had looked forward to as a new member with a great deal of eager anticipation. Having been denied the privilege of a full-fledged Speech from the Throne in the brief December sitting I was, as you can understand, looking forward to this special occasion.

You can imagine my expectations. The level of debate in December had led me to believe that things were, well, if not great, at least afoot in this province of opportunity. Here I was, a novice from northwestern Ontario in the megalopolis of Toronto, overwhelmed by the importance of the Legislature, owed by the personalities governing this province, inspired by the rhetoric, the wit, the debate, the repartee of this chamber. Yes, truly, the Speech from the Throne was to be an occasion.

And what an occasion it was! I was delighted that the government did not disappoint me. Every one of my expectations was fulfilled. There is very little to criticize in the Speech from the Throne; there is very little in the Speech from the Throne.

The Speech from the Throne seems to have been drafted, to paraphrase Bob Dylan, in the back roads and the junkyards of someone's mind. Yes, Mr. Speaker, with the shuffling of portfolios, government ministries, departments and so on, I thought that after learning a few of the ropes in December I was going to have to start all over again. But that document presented to this Legislature on February 29 reassured me, Mr. Speaker. After all, a speech delivered on that most improbable of days, February 29, was bound to have certain distinctive characteristics. So it was reassuring to me to learn that the targets have remained the same, only the names have been changed to protect the guilty.

I was delighted with the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, because as a member of the opposition, along with the other 38 opposition members on this side of the Legislature, I represent 56 per cent of the voters of this province and it's somthing both we and the government forget at our peril. And so I was reassured that the government has decided to help us in representing these people. I think that the speakers on this side of the House have been altogether too modest, altogether too intimidated by the events of Oct. 21.

Let me just digress for a minute, Mr. Speaker. As you know, as all members of this House know, the members of this House have considerable light reading. Light reading: government documents, reports, speeches from the Throne, government press releases, even

Hansard, Mr. Speaker. We have to read these and digest them. Well, occasionally, I like to stretch my mind on the journey back home. I like to read something a little bit more substantial, a little more intellectually stimulating. And in one of these books, called "A Coffin for Demitrios" by Eric Ambler – which I recommend to you–there is this quotation:

> Political prestige is the reward not of the shrewdest diagnostician, but of the man with the best bedside manner. It is a decoration conferred on mediocrity by the populace.

That is one of the things that government members who chortle about the results of Oct. 21 should keep in mind. They should seriously keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, whether or not it is the best "bedside manner" that this province needs in the next four years. It was taking into account things like that which made me look forward to the Speech from the Throne, and made me be reassured–

Mr. P. D. Lawlor: The government knows all about mediocrity. It is okay.

Mr. Foulds: –by the government's pronouncements on that improbable day of Feb. 29. The Speech from the Throne, aside from displaying an excellent bedside manner, seems to have achieved new heights–or depths–of stylistic wonders; Davis-ese–a new government language–or perhaps we should call it Westcottian or Hoy-ish. Certainly, it is larded with McKeoughisms, phrases "of sound and fury, told by an idiot, signifying nothing."

It is amazing that the "big blue machine" of the Conservative Party which displayed such imaginative creativity in selling that party before the events of Oct. 21, exhausted, it seems, its creativity on Oct. 21.

Mr. Lawlor: It was a tremendous effort. I mean, we cannot expect them to keep it up.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, they are tired. They are just exhausted. Right. Because ever since receiving that mandate, this government has presented to this Legislature, through the hands of its public relations flacks and hacks, a series of cliches, vague generalities or the "Darcy-Davis" grab bag of picayune handouts.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Or regulations from the Minister of Colleges and Universities regarding a great bill that was passed last July without regulations.

Mr. Foulds: The member means his ex-department?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Just a little litter.

Mr. Martel: Not now–the minister is out. Yes, he is clear now.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many of the members of this House have seen that fine Canadian film "Mon Oncle Antoine"? I recommend it. As I listened to the banalities in the Speech from the Throne a scene from that movie flashed through my mind.

In that film the fat, sleek, well-meaning but complacent manager of the town's mine, drives through the town on Christmas eve in a horse-drawn sleigh throwing trinkets to the children in the houses by the side of the road. Every time I view the government front benches I'm reminded of the same paternalistic smugness.

Mr. Lawlor: Members know what happened to him. He got a snowball in the ear!

Mr. Foulds: This feeling was reinforced by that unfortunate Speech from the Throne. There is another image that is etched on my memory, Mr. Speaker, and that is of this building itself. I wonder if it is at all symbolic that the life, the vitality and the surge of traffic that comes up University Ave. is directed around this building and goes on its way ignoring us. We should constantly remind ourselves that by and large what we are doing here may be important, but in most people's minds it is not significant.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: This is terrible cynicism for a young member. What does the member for Hamilton East think?

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He is just warming up!

Mr. Foulds: That is a humbling reflection for a new member of the club to make, Mr. Speaker. I make it with some reluctance but I make it with all sincerity.

I would like to turn from these rather unpleasant thoughts to a pleasant topic, if only briefly–my riding, Port Arthur. Port Arthur riding consists of half the new city of Thunder Bay, which includes about 28,000 of the voters in the riding; the other 6,000 are in a rural area that stretches from east to west about 30 miles in each direction. Taking the downtown section of my riding, Port Arthur is 1,000 miles away from Queen's Park. One of the problems that we constantly face, however, is that Queen's Park is 10,000 miles away from Thunder Bay.

Mr. Martel: Like the rest of northern Ontario.

Mr. Foulds: I regret to say that in the last term, my riding was, to say the least, underrepresented in this House. I'm afraid that what happened is still unclear to most of us but it would appear that the former member for Port Arthur (Mr. Knight) was masterminded by Liberal Party strategists through the Ontario Legislature on his way to a disc jockey's job at CHUM.

No wonder the Liberal representation in this House has diminished by 25 per cent. We at least, Mr. Speaker, held relatively firm. As I say, enough of unpleasant things; let's talk pleasantly.

I would like to pay a genuine tribute to two former members of this House who represented Port Arthur voters in the past very, very capably indeed. Those two members were the hon. George Wardrope who was possibly one of the best Ministers of Reform Institutions that the Conservatives had the good fortune of having. The other one was Mr. Fred O. Robinson of my own party, or more precisely of its predecessor, the CCF.

Port Arthur has been fortunate in having representatives of such capability. I can only hope that my own contribution will come close to theirs perhaps in magnitude if not in style.

I must say that my electorate did say a resounding no to the making of the Premier, 1971 Ontario style. When they heard "Bill Davis is doing things for people," they knew what kind of things—insignificant things—so they said no. I want to make it clear that I feel and they feel that they and I are part of the government in the best sense of that term; and that all the government departments are and should be as open to me and to them as they are to any member of this House and to any elector in this province. It is the principle that I've been working on in the past few months and I will continue to work on it.

I must say that the government officials locally in my own riding have been more than co-operative. Down here in Toronto the few forays I've made into various government departments have been very welcome and pleasant. There are, mind you, one or two minor matters that have not yet been resolved but I'm sure they can be in the very near future. I want to make it very clear that I feel very strongly that government projects in my riding should not be sacrificed simply because my voters upheld the democratic process by daring to elect an opposition member. I feel very strongly that these projects should not be sacrificed, but should be judged on merit.

Like all northerners, Mr. Speaker, the people of Port Arthur are fiercely independent, sometimes ornery, but always a lovable type of people. I can think of no greater pleasure than presenting that independent, gutsy, ornery viewpoint in this, the Ontario Legislature.

An hon. member: Let's not have too many of them, though eh?

Mr. Foulds: Let the member keep up his end of the province, and we will keep up ours!

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to indulge in some idealistic reflections. How do I see the job of the MPP?

In an editorial of August 4, 1970, the Toronto Globe and Mail made the following statement and I am quoting:

> A member of Parliament, if he is a good one, does more than just vote in the House. He pushes the particular causes of his particular area and he serves as a kind of ombudsman for voters who have personal difficulties with government.

As usual the Globe takes a rather cautious editorial view. While I agree with that statement, I feel that it is only the starting point for a good definition of a good elected representative.

I see the true politician—and I am not ashamed of that word—as being an innovator, an administrator, a leader, a teacher and a servant for his constituents. He must serve his constituents wisely, not just well. He must endeavour to keep them informed of the issues. He must maintain direct contact with them because they are his only source of strength. They are, after all, his only justification for existence.

There are a number of specific areas in the Speech from the Throne with which I would like to deal. The Throne Speech indicates a tokenism to the northwest which I find unsettling. While we can approve of the government's intention to continue last year's programme to encourage mining exploration and its intention to construct two roads northwest from Pickle Crow and Red Lake, we can genuinely ask the government to be much more specific about its recommendations that the Northern Development Corp. board of directors be expanded.

We should demand that all these newly appointed members come from the north and that the people of the region have a genuine say in these appointments. The fact that the north is passed over in four sentences does not surprise me, but what is disturbing is that there seems to be no commitment on the government's part to plan development of secondary industry to provide jobs in northwestern Ontario.

In this regard there are two very disturbing points in the Speech from the Throne which I feel those of us in the north need to be very careful about. On page 4, in one sentence, the government says that it is "convinced of the need for both federal and provincial action in order to sustain and develop an internationally competitive secondary manufacturing sector, a matter of critical importance to Ontario."

On the surface that seems like a reasonable enough statement. However, that is the kind of generalized statement that can also be the basis for deciding against government incentives to develop secondary industry in a region such as the northwest. The excuse the government can always use for failing to develop justified secondary industrial development is that with their numerous feasibility studies, they find that such industry is not "internationally competitive." This excuse must not be accepted.

The second statement which I find puzzling was that in which the government said it would take action to implement the Toronto-centred region plan and the Design for Development in northwestern Ontario. On the surface again this looks like not a bad idea. However, the government still does not seem to realize that the implementation of the Toronto-centred region plan, as it is now envisaged, proposes that Toronto region would become the processing centre for raw materials produced in northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: I think they wished they had never said that.

Mr. Foulds: We in the north had always assumed that the processing of those raw materials that we produce would eventually take place in our own region, so I most strongly object to the statement in the Toronto-centred plan that the metropolitan area, or the "golden horseshoe" area, be the processing area for all of Ontario.

I still have not received an adequate explanation, Mr. Speaker, of the statement that occurs in the Toronto-centred-region plan:

> Because of the location within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence megalopolis the Toronto-centred region can probably increase its economic role in processing resources which currently originate in northern Ontario, and move to major markets in the Chicago-Detroit-Cleveland industrial area.

I have attended two of the so-called information meetings that the Department of Trade and Development held in northwestern Ontario to explain the plan. They could not explain the contradictions, nor could they explain why this lovely map on page 5 of the Toronto-centred region plan, which has what they call "development corridors" to places like Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Montreal, Ottawa, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie and so on, does not have a development corridor to northwestern Ontario and Thunder Bay.

When I asked the planners in Thunder Bay why it was not in, they said they simply forget to draw it in. Some thinking—some planning.

Mr. Stokes: I wonder what the hon. member for Fort William thinks about that. I wonder if he supports the government's position on that. No, he shakes his head; he doesn't agree with it.

Mr. Foulds: As well as the generalities of the Throne Speech and the Design for Development: Northwestern Ontario Region, we need concerete government proposals for developing secondary industry in northwestern Ontario. We need a commitment from this government that it will bridge the gap between the resources industries and the service industries of the region by long-range planning for the development of manufacturing and processing.

Mr. Martel: Any planning would help.

Mr. Foulds: Surely our technology has advanced to the stage when this is possible without sacrificing the way of life that most of us in the north love so much.

The other day, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin pointed out most ably to this House the price disparities that exist between northern Ontario and Toronto, or southern Ontario generally. In view of those statements and the statements made many times in this House by representatives of this party, it is absolutely essential to develop a healthy and viable secondary industry in northwestern Ontario—

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foulds: —not only to provide much needed jobs but to increase the average wage level for the area. The government itself admits in its Design for Development:

Northwestern Ontario Region that the incomes of northwestern Ontario are substantially lower than the average for the province.

On page 32, the study reports that for the year 1966—the last year the study had figures for—we in northwestern Ontario (1) earned $240 a year less on our personal incomes than the average for the province, (2) the taxpayers of our area earned $256 less than the average taxpayer in the rest of the province, (3) the per capita income for the area was $147 less than for the province as a whole; and finally (4) the average family or household in northwestern Ontario earned $238 less than the average for the province.

So not only are we in the northwest paying more for goods than the average for the province, as the member for Algoma-Manitoulin pointed out the other day, but on the average we also earn less.

Mr. Martel: How does the minister reconcile that?

An hon. member: Lower his salary!

Mr. Foulds: The present government likes to bill the Province of Ontario as the province of opportunity. The trouble is that it is not a province of equal opportunity for all of its citizens. We are being penalized because we live in the north and in northwestern Ontario. In spite of its public relations programme, the Conservative government has let an accident of geography discriminate against more than a quarter of a million of its citizens in northwestern Ontario alone. Is it any wonder that there are northern Ontario separatist grumblings from time to time?

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It is neglect by this government—years of neglect.

Mr. Foulds: Yes. Twenty-seven years of neglect of the north. That is right.

Now, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explore an area of northern development that isn't often explored in this Legislature or in any other. I have been disturbed for some time that the governments in this country—be they federal or provincial—have demonstrated relatively little interest in developing cultural and artistic activities in the north. I am concerned not only for Canada to own and control its own economy and land, but that we also own our own soul, our own art, culture, mass media, ethos.

It is in this area that I am concerned, for example, that in the report of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism, the cultural aspect always is relegated to the status of subsidiary interest. The book publishing industry seems to be the only area of cultural nationalism that has attracted the attention of that committee to any degree.

Might I suggest to that committee, to this Legislature, yes, and even to that government on those benches over there—that the cultural life of this country is vital to its identity and to the identity of this province. Might I suggest also that the cultural identity is not to be found merely in the megalopolis of Toronto, but in the activities of community groups throughout this province.

We rightly spend a good deal of money on the health grants, but surely good health and a good life are closely interrelated. What is the use of having a healthy man if he has got nothing to be healthy for—if that man cannot make use of his good physical health to develop his cultural and therefore his national sensibilities?

I take a good deal of pride, Mr. Speaker, that in the Ontario theatre study report, "The Awkward Stage," published by the Province of Ontario Council for the Arts, the following passage appeared:

> . . . community involvement in theatre occurs on a much broader scale in the Lakehead than it does in any of the other four cities. We will argue further on that theatre exists as a viable or meaningful element of life only in one of the five cities sampled, namely the Lakehead.

This report, Mr. Speaker, covers five of the most widely representative cities in Ontario—Toronto, Ottawa, Kingston, London and the Lakehead. I would suggest the results of that study show that the culture vultures of the Toronto-centred region do not have the secret to cultural development in this province. And perhaps that explains the healthy grassroots culture in those far-flung areas of the province.

In this regard, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased with the sentence on page 15 from the Speech from the Throne, and I am quoting directly:

> The government believes greater recognition must be given to the fact that many of our cultural organizations are resources to be enjoyed by the whole province and means will be provided to make them more accessible to people throughout Ontario.

I would like to suggest that all major organizations such as, for example—and I do not want to single it out, it is just an example—

the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, receiving provincial subsidies, should be required, as a condition of their receiving of a subsidy, to travel throughout the province. We in the north are just a little bit tired of subsidizing the tickets of the people in the Toronto-centred region.

I am aware that a very fine job is being done by a company such as the Theatre Hour Company, operating under the auspices of the Department of Education and the St. Lawrence Centre, with regard to high schools in this province. But the demand is such and the need is such that not only could other companies, or an expanded company, be used in the school system, but companies with presentations for adult audiences would and could be very welcome.

Also, it is important to realize that not all our cultural resources exist in the "golden horseshoe." Many community groups throughout this province and some, including those in the area that I know best—in my own city of Thunder Bay, for example—could well use assistance to provide the smaller centres of their own regions with services. In my case we would go out into northwestern Ontario to communities such as Schreiber, Dryden, Red Lake, and so on.

The cultural amenities of this province must be developed on a regional basis. It must not be artificially imposed by the misguided ethos of a region, such as this one here in Toronto, in which growth for its own sake is seen unfortunately as a good thing.

Mr. Martel: Old hog town.

Mr. Foulds: But there is another aspect to the question, Mr. Speaker. I would like the government to expand programmes of travelling art shows and museum exhibits. Ontario Place, the Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario must be given the required funds and flexibility to serve all the regions of this province. Their names remain a mockery until the residents of a town, such as Kakabeka Falls in my riding, or any other small northern Ontario town, can take part in the facilities and resources of these institutions with as much ease as the residents of this region. Toronto, after all, is not Ontario.

Feeling as I do so strongly about this area of our life, Mr. Speaker, I was disappointed when the Speech from the Throne merely indicated, "The various forms of provincial government support to individuals and cultural organizations will be reviewed and integrated." How long is it going to take?

Mr. Martel: It has taken 29 years so far.

Mr. Foulds: We in the north desire some action. We have had enough of reviews, feasibility studies, and so on. I would hope that the government would take some pretty fast action in this regard.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): That is the fourth time.

Mr. Foulds: So you see, Mr. Speaker, I am anxious that the people of my region have access to equality of opportunity in the cultural field as well as in the economic field.

I would like to turn now to accessibility of a very different sort—a very practical sort—mere physical accessibility. One in seven Canadians is physically handicapped and one in seven Canadians is, therefore, deprived of the use of many public facilities, because the architectural barriers make access to many buildings and facilities impossible or hazardous. More and more of those one in seven Canadians who are physically disabled are able and desire to get a good education to take employment accordingly and take advantage of their full citizenship opportunities. The achievements in medical rehabilitation in recent years have been neutralized too often by structural hazards and barriers in buildings which restrict the mobility of those who do not have the full use of their limbs or physical strength.

I want to read to you, Mr. Speaker, a statement that was given to this House by the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Simonett) on Oct. 14, 1969.

Mr. Deans: That will be profound.

Mr. Foulds: He said:

> It is the intention of this government to introduce legislation which will ensure that facilities for the handicapped are provided in all public buildings. . . . I am sure that my colleague, the hon. Minister of Trade and Development, will also ensure that these standards are met wherever possible in our public housing developments.
>
> By public buildings, I do not merely mean those buildings constructed by my own department. All public buildings, whether constructed entirely with provincial funds, subsidized by provincial funds, or whether constructed by some other public or municipal authority will be included.
>
> It is also anticipated that the new legislation will require that provision for facilities for handicapped persons be provided in buildings to which the public is invited but which may be privately owned. In this category, I have in mind such buildings as theatres, museums, arenas, and sports stadiums.

Mr. Deans: No wonder he is no longer with us.

Mr. Martel: He said pollution would be eliminated by 1970 too.

An hon. member: He was the same guy who promised to abolish pollution by 1970, too.

Mr. Foulds: The federal government has established and recommended building standards for the handicapped since 1965. These standards have been incorporated into all new federal public works projects across Canada. In Canada, however, because of the distribution of responsibilities between governments, the legislation cannot be enacted at the federal level, but must be enacted at the provincial and municipal level. The federal government has researched and recommended the standards through the National Research Council. But it is up to the province and the municipalities to integrate them.

In Ontario it continues to be a private matter between the architect and his client whether or not the recommended standards are included in the design for a new building. Many architects now voluntarily include these standards, as at the design stage any extra cost is minimal—not more than one per cent of the total cost—and it is considered to be a sound investment.

But this private arrangement is not good enough. There must be legislation at the provincial and municipal levels, so that the mandatory biulding codes and bylaws demand that all these public buildings promised in 1969 be designed or modified to be acceptable to all citizens.

Mr. Deans: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foulds: Legislation is needed at the provincial level, not only to make the standards for buildings for the handicapped a mandatory part of the building code for new buildings throughout the province, but also for adaptation of old buildings—modifications of the older buildings.

Surely it is not unreasonable to ask that there be legislation to ensure that all of the seating space, for example, in auditoriums and theatres, not be taken up with fixed seats, that there be space near fire exits for a few wheelchairs, and, also, that handicapped persons may be able to reserve seats near a fire exit, if they so request. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, one of the few theatres in Ontario which does this is the Stratford Festival Theatre.

It must be very frustrating to a lawyer if he cannot climb a long flight of stairs to a courthouse; a librarian, if he cannot get into a library; a lab technician if he cannot get into his laboratory; or a high school student or a teacher if he cannot get into the high school. It must be very frustrating for adults in the community who see evening classes advertised in the newspaper, which they cannot attend—or concerts, or lectures—on account of some physical disability.

What has been done, Mr. Speaker, by this government, besides having built in this building the two ramps that we see leading to the members' offices? Where is the legislation which was promised 2½ years ago?

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): —just accidental for the handicapped.

Mr. Foulds: Yes, just accidentally for the physically handicapped.

An hon. member: And for mail carts.

Mr. Foulds: Now, Mr. Speaker, in another vein, I would like to turn to one aspect of the Speech from the Throne with which I was genuinely delighted. On page 8 of the speech, the government hinted that—and just last Thursday the Premier (Mr. Davis) announced in more detail—the Summer 72 programme. Several of these programmes have initials and form truly imaginative catch phrases—SWEEP, CRISP, RSVP, SNAP—and so on.

I can only wish, Mr. Speaker, that the government had seen fit to add programmes and I would like to suggest a few. One of these programmes I think we could call "The Co-Operative Reading and Conscientious Knowledge League of Egalitarians," and a programme called "Positive Occupations for People."

If the government had had the imagination and the sense to add these programmes, we could have had, not only SNAP but CRACKLE and POP. And the overall thrust of the government's programming could have been clearly seen for the puffed up Rice Krispies that they were.

Some hon. members: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Foulds: Acceptable and welcome though these programmes are, these are not programmes that should be launched with government flares of publicity. They should be implemented in a way that this government likes to think of itself as implementing programmes—in a no-nonsense, business-like way; as a matter of course. And what I want to ask this government is this: Where are the

programmes for the elderly—not mere subsistence programmes, but programmes to encourage them to use their leisure time fruitfully?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): This is an instant expert?

Mr. Foulds: Why can't they add to their incomes and their learning experience in programmes similar to those designed for youth? They may even be an advantage to the chairman of the management board. How many programmes does this government provide for those who are retired?

Mr. Deans: The chairman of the management board is getting close to retirement.

Mr. Foulds: And I mean community programmes, Mr. Speaker; programmes where these elderly citizens can contribute their knowledge and experience and receive payment just as does youth. Just as a start—as a token of the government's good intentions, this government should make available, at no cost to our senior citizens, every night school course, every municipal parks and recreation course, every community college or university extension course, every arts and crafts course offered by a public or private institution in this province that these citizens would otherwise be eligible for.

If necessary, this government should be prepared to pay their fees, their transportation costs and their expenses. Many people are disturbed by the way we artificially prolong adolescence in our society. I am disturbed and concerned that we take so little action to prolong the vitality of the life of our senior citizens in a positive cultural and recreational way.

I would like to remind this assembly that many of the great achievements in our society have come from so-called elderly people; Bertrand Russell, George Bernard Shaw and Daniel Defoe made many of their best contributions to mankind after their 60th birthdays. I dare say that there are even a few members of this House who have reached their 60th birthdays and still feel that they have some worthwhile contributions to make and many learning experiences awaiting them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to feel that way myself.

Mr. Foulds: We should apply our energies to providing for senior citizens as generously as we do for our youth.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have passed that barrier.

Mr. Foulds: The minister has broken the sound barrier, has he?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have broken the barrier and I am still here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have lots of company, too, by the way.

Mr. Foulds: I would like to conclude my remarks with a few observations on education. I think all of us in this House regret the loss of the former speaker on education for this party, Mr. Walter Pitman of Peterborough.

Certainly we on this side of the House—with the possible exception of the current member for Peterborough who, though on the government side, ironically finds himself on the opposition side of the House—will miss him sorely. Those of us who have been asked to try to fill this role recognize fully the impossibility of that task. We will certainly do our utmost not to let slide his high standard.

I was pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that the government Speech from the Throne indicated on page 10:

> Legislation will be introduced that will enable school boards and municipal authorities to share in the development of various facilities for both school and community use. Through such arrangements the use of school buildings should be considerably enhanced and the concept of the school as a community resource will come closer to being a reality.

I was very pleased with that statement, Mr. Speaker, but I was very surprised. After all I thought I had been appointed to a committee to examine this very question. I took the trouble to look up Hansard and on Dec. 17, page 412, you yourself, sir:

> Hon. Mr. Davis moves that a select committee of this House be appointed to inquire into the utilization of educational facilities. The committee would be guided by the following terms of reference.

I would like to read the first term of reference:

> The committee should inquire into the potentialities and possibilities for the increased use of educational facilities throughout Ontario at all levels including post-secondary facilities.

I go down the page and I do find my name among those appointed to the committee. Until I heard the member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith) give his interim

report to this House a few minutes ago I had no idea that our committee had made an interim report.

Presumably if the select committee is to bring in findings that are of a truly worthwhile and independent nature it should not have its course of action pre-determined by the government. If the government has prejudged the case and decided what recommendations our committee should come up with we might as well dissolve that select committee right now and at least save the taxpayers of this province the expenses of that committee.

It just may be that the current ceilings on educational spending preclude the wider community use of schools. Certainly it would appear that increased use of the physical plants, the school buildings, will lead us to have a better return on the capital expenses involved in those buildings.

I would like to file this minority report at this time seeing that the chairman has already filed the government minority report of the committee in his speech. I suspect that from what we are able to see so far, the wider use of school facilities is certainly going to entail more expense to the taxpayer, at least in operational costs. The equipment, for example, will wear out more quickly with increased use. Extra custodial and maintenance costs will be involved and if the buildings are to be adapted so the community truly can make full use of them, it may and will involve additional capital costs.

So while I support very strongly the increased use of school facilities, we should not fool ourselves into thinking we are doing it from the economic motive of saving money. We should be doing it because it will increase the vitality of our school life and our community life and that it will, hopefully, be breaking down the artificial institutional barriers between the school and the community.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foulds: This leads me to my next point, Mr. Speaker. I would like to put on record some initial reservations about the current ceilings on educational spending.

There is no doubt that the government was politically wise in imposing the ceilings at the time that it did. There is no doubt that the public has been feeling uneasy for some time about the rising cost of educational spending which the present Premier got us into in the 1960s. But I think that it is the government's job, not simply to reflect public thinking, but also to lead it.

The artificial imposition of ceilings on educational spending, in spite of all the weighted formula adjustments that are made, does not attack the essential problem. What happens with a formula based on numbers of students, is that those courses of services which have recently been developed and are just now beginning to prove their worth are the ones that will get cut back first. The more entrenched courses with large enrolment are the ones that will remain.

Special services will suffer. The courses and services that suffer are essential courses —courses that develop the whole human being and courses and services that serve all human beings. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, of just two examples. Of courses such as remedial reading on the one hand, and, say, theatre arts on the other. I use there only as two examples.

Mr. Stokes: Library facilities for another.

Mr. Foulds: Right. Psychologists service, diagnostic service, all that range of things.

But in their ways these two differing courses illustrate what we consider are essential. One, remedial reading, is the kind of course that is essential if we are to give equality of opportunity to those children who, through no fault of their own, cannot cope with basic skills that are necessary for the learning process.

Yet these courses, by their very nature, need to have small numbers of students if they are to achieve their purpose. But, because they require small enrolments they are considered in crass economic terms "not economically viable."

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I want to get very personal and relate a personal incident. When I was teaching last year in a grade 10, four-year programme, there was a boy in my class who had a speech impediment. Because he had been taught to read the way he sounded his words, he wrote all his b's as p's and things like that—d's as b's. And that boy was not, to use the term, a stupid boy. He was a very bright boy and there was a human being there struggling to get out with creative ideas and he could not do it.

When I reported this to the guidance people—this is at grade 10 level, and we had a very good guidance department in our school, Mr. Speaker—the guidance people said to me: "It's too late. We can't tackle the problem now. We don't have the resources and when it should have been done, earlier

in the school system, we didn't have the resources either."

That boy is going to go through life with a handicap because this government will not spend money on education where it should be spent.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foulds: Similarly, on the other hand, courses such as theatre arts or, if you like, any of those courses which we call creative courses—music, art and so on—are essential to develop those individuals who perhaps do not have traditional academic ability in the normal sense, yet have a tremendous amount of talent and potential for creative development that could be beneficial, not only to them as individuals, but also collectively to our society as a whole.

Our society and our educational system must recognize that individuals need to develop their whole personality, that they are not mere receptacles into which knowledge and information are to be poured, that they are living, creative beings. The major fault with the present educational spending ceilings is that they do not fundamentally realign spending, they merely curtail. They slice off the top of the educational budgets, but they do not get at the vertical fat within those budgets. Where we need to put more of our educational budget is at the elementary and the pre-elementary level.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Foulds: I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that for every dollar we are presumably saving at the elementary level through our educational cutbacks, it costs us twice as much at the secondary level and three times as much as the post-secondary level to remedy the problems we created by our so-called savings at the elementary and preschool levels.

What we need is a fundamental realignment of educational spending so that we can get value for our money. I suggest that we would not only get more return on our investment in economic terms by spending more at the elementary and preschool levels and relatively less at the secondary and post-secondary levels, but that we would be serving the cause of social and economic justice as well by doing so.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we in this party have a fundamental difference with that temporary government party across the way. We feel that equality of opportunity in education is a top priority—and it begins very early in the child's life. Equality of opportunity in education for the socially and economically handicapped of this province is a right.

We do not feel that those people who through an accident of birth are disadvantaged—be the handicap, emotional, mental, physical, social or economic—should be second-class citizens. We feel it is our responsibility, the government's responsibility and society's responsibility to ensure their fullest possible development as human beings. We do not consider this a frill; we consider it an essential.

Rather than impose artificial limits on spending that result in the elimination of programmes which the disadvantaged of our society need, we would redesign, realign and redirect our spending from the bricks and mortars from edifices and put the money where it belongs—on the children, not on the bureaucracy.

We would also very much rather cut back on some of the corporate welfare programmes, such as the tax rebates on machinery that this government seemed so fond of.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to support the amendment put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party. I thank you.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, may I first take a moment to congratulate the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) on his address. It was a most significant one and I think speaks well for himself, his party and exemplifies to a great extent the talent that has come in the election of October 1971 on all sides of the House. I myself have been most impressed with them.

I don't know really, though, whether we consider the present administration as temporary; 29 years is an awful long time, frankly—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): There's got to be an end sometime.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): There is still hope.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): In terms of civilization.

Mr. Bullbrook: Nauseatingly so!

May I say to you, sir, that I join with the other—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In those terms, the member and I are gone too.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm getting help already from the deputy leader of my party; just what I need.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Being over there really doesn't mean very much.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am so pleased he is here with me today.

Mr. Lewis: He made it by a bare 6,000.

Mr. Bullbrook: I say to you that I join with the other 115 of us in congratulating you on your ascension to the throne. It was a worthy move on the part of the Premier (Mr. Davis) of Ontario—one of the few worthy moves I've seen in the juxtaposition of power that has taken place. Because day to day, I must say, my admiration for his knowledge and sagacity almost descends proportionately with the performance of some of his cabinet ministers. I'll get into this a little deeper afterward.

It is indeed unfortunate that this is almost an exercise in futility, this Throne Speech. For us who have had the opportunity of being here before it should be a short speech, and I can assure you that I'll make it such. But one would think that it would not be categorized as condescension to see a shift of less than one cabinet minister or two cabinet ministers per hour into this chamber to listen to what the other members have to say.

One would like to suppose, albeit improperly, that this isn't just an exercise in frustration. I'll get into that a little later also because I believe frankly, Mr. Speaker, through you, to—I don't know what the appellation is, titular or otherwise—the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton); I say to him, a man whom I've admired in this House for five years now, that it would make new members feel a lot more productive in their efforts if they saw sitting across from them and listening to us some of the senior members of the government of Her Majesty in the Province of Ontario.

Now sir, I want to say I apologize to you, if I might, for that unfortunate incident that took place the other day when I used the word "dissemblance" to the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. White). Of course, it was a most appropriate word. It was not offensive. It was what I call semi-offensive; and that's the way I like to operate at all times in this House, in a semi-offensive fashion.

I want to say to you I had significant response from my constituents in connection with the use of the word. My local newspaper said there was no such word at all. It was an improper use, they said, of the verb "dissemble." Of course that was immediately wrong and I must give them credit that they retracted that statement—I am glad the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) is here, really—they retracted that statement in an editorial. It went on to say that in the context it was used absolutely with propriety.

They said not only that; that the inquisition we attempted as to the loss to the public purse in connection with the operation of Ontario Place and our demands, or at least our desires to find out what the entrepreneurs were making were completely appropriate. As can be seen today, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to get that answer at all.

We are going to get, as I called it again, befogging, and pettifogging as the leader of the New Democratic Party characterized it—but we are not going to get any answers.

All we want, in pure and simple terms, is to find out if the public purse is being taken for $3 million. We want to find out what the entrepreneurs are making.

I figure it out now that, on a reasonable return of about eight per cent they are making about $1.2 million worth of profit. That's what they are making while the public loses $3 million in the operation of—what is the phrase we call it? I am trying to think what it was called previously.

An hon. member: A showplace.

Mr. Bullbrook: A showplace! I suppose that would be it.

In any event this constituent wrote to me on the use of the word "dissemblance." I want to record it. She asked me to pass it on to the appropriate cabinet minister. She says:

> You cannot be accused of dissemblance
> In English, we must keep it pure
> Even though to disguise or dissemble
> is common enough I am sure.
> But one can be accused of resemblance
> It is correct for example to say
> That a horse's neck you resemble in
> every possible way.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Was that addressed to the member?

Mr. Bullbrook: No, she asked me to pass that on.

Mr. Lewis: I think the member had better editorialize the document.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, I have. For the sake of appropriate decorum and the iambic pentameter, I have juxtaposed the horse a bit. I had to do that.

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, we are obviously blessed with new talent, gracious talent, handsome talent, beautiful talent—at least the last on one side of the House. I want to take a few moments to pay tribute to those people who are no longer here and who were with us in the 28th Parliament.

I associate myself entirely with what the member for Port Arthur said about the former member for Peterborough. I want to expand that to say, in connection with the New Democratic Party, they suffered a loss—and we all suffered a loss—in the loss to this House of the member for Windsor West: A man of grace, charm, talent and ability and one whom we all grew to admire and respect, and for whom we all had a significant affection—at least on this side of the House we did.

I want to say that we here in this caucus feel the loss greatly—and the whole House must feel the loss greatly—of the former member for Sudbury.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: He was not—and I disassociate myself entirely from the remarks made yesterday by the member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa)—he was not just an entertainer. Let us hope it is never said that there was just sent to us from Sudbury an entertainer, because someday they might say they just sent us a joke from Sudbury. Let us hope that never is said, because Mr. Sopha was very entertaining, but underneath the veneer of entertainment there was a great deal of sagacity, a great deal of wisdom. He made a great, significant contribution to this House.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: He is one that will be missed, and thoroughly missed, by this party and by the House itself.

I want to say, if I might mention some additional names, we will also miss Mr. Stanley Farquhar, our former whip; again a gentle person, gracious himself and admired by all. I was pleased to hear that his successor in office felt that way about him and that his people in his riding, as we felt, feel the same.

James Trotter, the former member for Parkdale, is a person whom we all admired also.

I could go on. Frankly there are people in the government side whom I met. They were not as vigorous in the debates of this House. Because of the context of their positions, they were not always able to be. But I look back with fondness and recollection to my meetings with Allie Johnston and my meetings with Erskine Johnston, two men whom not too many of us got to know too well, but who were essentially fine and kind people, and stood their own constituents in good grace.

I want to relate for just a couple of moments—and I will be brief, sir, I assure you—to several situations in Sarnia.

First of all, I want to record at this time, again, a plea for the people whom I represent in connection with the need for a controlled-access facility outside Sarnia to London connecting with Highway 401. In April, 1968, the then minister, hon. George Gomme, rose in this House and said it was a priority position, the construction of Highway 402 eastward from Sarnia.

We are still waiting for that priority to bear fruit. I exhort the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), and I exhort the Treasury Board to put this facility into its proper perspective. The people of Sarnia, frankly, are with some justification becoming almost fed up.

In August, 1969, the then minister came before us in Sarnia and was kind enough to invite me to a press conference at which he advised that within the fiscal year the first contract would be let at the easterly or the most westerly region of the proposed facility. Nothing has been let as yet, although I must say, in fairness to the department, it has run into a difficulty in drainage in the township of Sarnia.

It is not my purpose, as a matter of course, to read into the records of Hansard correspondence that I receive, but I want to record a letter that I received on March 5, 1972, from Wyoming, Ontario.

> Dear Mr. Bullbrook:
>
> I am thankful that there are men like you who know the need for Highway 402.
>
> Perhaps you should display the list of people who have lost their lives. On Highway 402, on the section 25 miles east of Sarnia, there should never have been a three-lane highway. The men who delay doing anything about this death trap shall continue to be held responsible for the deaths of these victims.

I want to interject for a moment that I do not associate myself with those remarks, because I do not believe, frankly, that the administrators of that department, nor the policymakers, are responsible for those deaths.

I continue:

> You will understand why we feel so strongly when I tell you our son, William J. Watson, was killed the last of May, 1970, at the Durant Hatchery. He was a young man in his 28th year, a promising young chemist at Dow Chemical and a gifted musician. The United Church in Forest lost its director of music. He was to have played for the anniversary service the next day.

She goes on to make some other comments about representations she made elsewhere, but I will not read those into the record.

I want to say to you that in speaking to this matter some four years ago, I pointed out to the government at that time that 13 people had lost their lives in the previous calendar year on that highway from Sarnia to London.

We must have it. I believe the government to be sincere in its purpose in intending to give us that facility, but we need it and need it badly.

One other comment I want to record—it is kind of parochial in nature—is that the State of Michigan is now undertaking significant financial aid to owners of lakeshore property in connection with the erosion problems. We have attempted to get that type of aid to private and public ownership but we have not been able to do so. I exhort the government to consider this.

I now want to close my comments relating to my riding by telling members something that happened in October of 1971. In the early part of October of 1971, Polymer Corp.—a Crown corporation owned by the people of Canada, the people of the Dominion of Canada—held a press conference. I refused to attend that press conference. On that day, that management struck a new low blow for management in labour relations in the Province of Ontario. And I will not bring in a private member's bill to die on the desk about this matter. But let me tell you, gentlemen and madam, what happened.

That day the management said: "We are going to reduce our work force by 250 people. Of 1,400 of you who work for us and who have families, 250 of you will no longer work for us." But do you know what they also did, sir? They would not tell them who the 250 would be.

Now I ask you to consider the trauma of that situation. Can you imagine 1,400 people going to their homes—1,400 less a dozen of the hierarchy who would make the decision and do the cutting. Fourteen hundred people went to their homes. Several of them went to the hospital with heart attacks; several of them had other experiences, physical and mental, as a result of that type of abuse of the management function. And nothing was done.

The reason I bring this up is because it transfers, of course, to the purpose of this debate, not necessarily to talk about your riding alone, but to talk about what His Honour said to us in the Throne Speech. And I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that the word "labour" and the Department of Labour is not even mentioned in that Throne Speech.

What an insolent abuse to this House, in a matter of such contemporary need and concern, that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon)—one of the finest gentlemen we have ever met, and for whom we have collectively bled over the last several days because of his own Gallic charm and because of the grace and thoughtfulness that he has given to us all—should permit a Throne Speech to be published without any comment as to what the policy is and what the intention of this government is in connection with the field of labour.

I will digress for a moment to say to you that I interjected today, Mr. Speaker, to say to the Minister of Labour that it is not his executive assistant at all who should be pilloried, but responsible government is responsible government whether we like it or not, and when a mistake is made somebody has to pay for that mistake.

You see, the essence of the error that was made is not in his department at all; the essence of the error lies with the leader of the government—but nay the leader of the Progressive Conservative party—because somewhere along the line General Motors has developed a liaison with that government whereby it can have the effrontery to utilize the government's public relations staff—or if the minister's executive assistant is correct, its lawyers—to be in direct communication with the Workmen's Compensation Board and the government of Ontario.

You see, the minister's executive assistant in his naivete—he himself in his naivete—did nothing so reprehensible; the error was that he would ever conceive that it would be appropriate to distribute that memorandum. The only reason there was such a distribution is because of the aura and development of that party. We know where the funds come from. And it is that type of difficulty they exemplify week in and week out as a party that shakes the public confidence in them.

Nothing is said about labour at all. The offensiveness of this document, most respectfully to His Honour, because he is not the author of it, of course, he is only the person called upon by the requirement of his office to read it—but the offensiveness of this document, as I see it, is on page 14 where it says.

> A select committee of the Legislature will be asked to consider proposals with regard to public safety and convenience in relation to motorized snow vehicles and all-terrain vehicles.

Now that is what they have given us to do. Five committees and commissions are considered in this document and we outside the government itself, we private members as we are called, are endowed with sufficient talent and ability only to be able to assess public safety and convenience in relation to motorized vehicles and all-terrain vehicles.

What about labour? What about the collective bargaining process? Is it still a feasible process? What about the strike weapon? Is it a viable weapon? Is Meany right? Is Dennis McDermott right? Let us look at it. Give us an opportunity as private members of the Legislature to look into these things. I exhort the Minister of Labour to carry through to the Premier and cabinet colleagues the absolute thirst that we are going to have here if the government is going to continue to utilize only business people, bureaucrats and academics.

We show no sense of lack of humility in saying that we feel we are here for a purpose, and we don't feel we can really fulfil that purpose if we see his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), coming in and tabling a report on the reorganization of his department in concurrence with recommendations made by others when we don't have the opportunity to debate them.

Surely that must be regarded—perhaps I exaggerate; I trust not—but surely that must be regarded by us, and with justification, as an affront. Surely we don't ask and demand too much to say to the government of this province that we want to have the opportunity of analysing these things.

If they are brought in as faits accomplis, why are we here? Why don't we go home and they can send us a telegram as to what they have done? Are we back to the stage of operation by divine right or executive decree? Why don't we all pack up our bags and go home if this is what they are going to do with the government of Ontario?

The same thing applied yesterday. We went to the private bills committee, a committee we all wish to be on because again it is a committee that shows some regard for a tripartisan if not a non-partisan thrust. It is an enjoyable committee, and it is a committee where the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) would come to us and he would say: "This is our policy"; and we would be able to dialogue with him about that policy. He's not coming to us any more. The parliamentary assistant comes.

Perhaps again I overemphasize this, but I regard that as an affront. I think that is one of the functions of a minister—one of his responsibilities. It is not just administration. He represents Her Majesty; he comes to the Commons and committees of the Commons and says this is what his government's attitude is; and we, as individual members, are able to respond to that, either positively or negatively.

Now we don't have that right any more. A parliamentary assistant comes. I don't demean that individual at all; again he is a person we all admire and like. But we are entitled to have the minister come before us, and we are entitled to ask these questions.

That is one field.

Labour, transportation—not a word. No alternative to that courageous decision of Dalton Camp—nothing in there at all about it. Could we not help in that? Could we not look into it? No. I suppose again we are not sufficiently talented and knowledgeable to look into it.

There is an on-going committee involving the province and Metropolitan Toronto, but there is no Ontario policy in connection with transportation, concurrent with or otherwise related to the national transportation policy.

Can't we help in formulating that? Why not? I think we can. I think we have a significant input to put there.

Ecology—why can't we help in that? If Bennett is so courageous that he can do something about banning the bottle, surely to goodness somewhere here we'll have more than just private members' courage. Surely we can help in that field. And we can go on and on to show that what you've done to us is, in effect, tacitly say to you: "Abdicate your position. We don't want you here anymore."

Housing—the platitudes in that document.

I just read this morning, Mr. Speaker, the submission on proposed legislation of the Ontario government by the Ontario legislative committee of the International Railway Brotherhoods. Listen to this for a moment; and then I ask you, fellow members, to go

back and read what they said about housing in that document. There are the recommendations:

(1) We recommend legislation to require financial institutions and pension funds to channel a certain proportion of their funds into housing.

Nothing new in that. It's been asked for many, many times. But why don't we give it some consideration.

(2) We recommend a much greater implementation of the principle of municipal assembly of land for housing, financed, where necessary, by federal subsidy. This together with the tax on land sales could tend to hold prices down.

Again, nothing new, but nothing in that document about it.

(3) We recommend the establishment of a uniform building code for the entire industry and country. We decry the recent efforts by some builders and builders associations for the abolishment of all building codes. We feel that this would only lead to the production of extremely shoddy homes and this to be strongly resisted.

(4) We recommend that for individuals, mortgage interest payments on houses be deductible for income tax purposes.

(5) We recommend the removal of the federal and provincial sales tax on building materials.

(6) We recommend the continued emphasis on low rental housing projects, but we urge regulations limiting the number of units in such projects and a provision made for park and recreational land in each such area.

(7) We recommend research into methods of home construction and support the idea of housing co-operatives and urge their recognition of the National Housing Act.

I take time to put those things into the records, to say to you frankly that in those seven small recommendations we, as members of the Legislature, are given more meaningful grist for our thoughtful mill than that whole Throne Speech gave us. It was just full of the purple platitudes of almost Dalton Camp—I'm not sure whether it was he or not.

But this is what we ask for: In the field of justice—let us help!

You've got your bureaucracy on offtrack betting. Let me give you a short history on offtrack betting, because I want to give, especially the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), if I could, one phrase that I think exemplifies the government and the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence).

Harken back to February of 1967, the very first case that was successful, if you recall from Welland, on offtrack betting. Then a series of more successful cases. Then in February of 1969, the amendment to the federal legislation. And then they got around that. And then the continual dialogue and 37 questions—37 questions put to the minister by the hon. member for Lakeshore, the hon. member for Downsview, the then hon. member for Sudbury, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and others interested in the problem over a period of three years. But with never a positive response. Never a positive response, but always the same hemming and hawing going back and forth.

And then this great Provincial Secretary, this most over-rated of any cabinet minister in this government, this is what he said in speaking to the lawyers on November 10, 1971—the problem arose in February of 1967—he said: "Consistent with our conclusion that quick action was necessary the Prime Minister of Ontario, Mr. Davis, announced on July 7, 1971, the formation of an interdepartmental task force."

Over four years later, and they say "consistent with our conclusion that quick action was necessary."

That is exactly the way he responded to that particular social problem, and it seems to be the way that this government wants to respond to every problem of a ticklish nature.

It is easy enough to say that the problems of secondary picketting will go away—they won't go away. It is easy enough to say that the question of the evaluation of compulsory arbitration and the benefits in the public and private sector will go away—but they won't go away.

We have to look at them. And we as members of the Legislature should be the ones, Mr. Speaker, who are entitled to look at them. And if there is anything that has come through to me in the short time that we have reconvened, its the fact that the government, even more than its predecessor, seems to be running in a trend of bureaucracy.

And I worry, and I want to record in Hansard without reservation, my deep concern as to whether, really, this institution is an anachronism.

I trust it won't be. But you must realize that we on this side of the House—as members of the government do, and we realize this

also—have a great and supreme responsibility to all the people of Ontario, and so when we get up day in and day out and ask these questions, it is because that is our responsibility. The responsibility of the government is to establish policy in the context of the debate and the needs, social, economic and political, of the people of Ontario. But we are not having that opportunity and I worry very much about it.

I exhort members; and I exhort especially people who listen attentively today—such as the Minister of Labour, a man who I think is concerned because he has experienced the role of the backbencher before—that he would bring to the attention of the Prime Minister and his colleagues that the be all and end all isn't in the reports of the Committee on Government Productivity.

The cornerstone of good government isn't efficiency; it really isn't. That is unfortunate to say, but it isn't. The saving of money can never be the criterion upon which we build good government. It is meeting the needs of the people, collectively and individually; and the only way we are going to meet those needs is if we have an opportunity to participate in assessing those needs and in responding to them.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to add my congratulations and best wishes to the many you have already received on your election to the post of Speaker of the House. I have every confidence, sir, that in this most difficult role you will serve with distinction and fairness to all and you will have my fullest co-operation at all times. You have already earned my respect, sir.

I also congratulate the government on the restructuring programme that has been put into force in recent months. This streamlining is most welcome indeed. It is designed to meet the new and increasing needs of our people with better, more efficient service.

One of the most important innovations is the establishment of the new policy ministries designated to deal with policy matters in various areas. These vital fields, Mr. Speaker, have in my opinion been assigned to excellent and able men—the hon. Robert Welch, the hon. A. B. R. Lawrence, the hon. Allan Lawrence, the hon. Darcy McKeough, and the hon. Charles MacNaughton.

I also want to take a moment to salute the members for York East, Ottawa South, Hamilton Mountain, Ontario South and Sault Ste. Marie who have been appointed parliamentary assistants.

Also, I want to mention the last Ontario election when the people of this province gave our government a decisive mandate. I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the team so ably led by our Premier.

Humber riding, which has always been a Tory riding, was in the hands of the official opposition for a very short time and now it is back where it belongs. The disgruntled voices of the departed opposition can still be heard through the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Shulman) who, from the very first session of this legislative assembly, has unceasingly attacked, charged, sneered, pouted over the victory and generally wasted a lot of time of the members of this House. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for High Park is not in his seat so that he could hear the remarks I am about to make.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He generally only comes in when he speaks, that is why.

Mr. Leluk: That is right.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is that in the member's text—that he is not in his seat? Has he already written it in his text?

Mr. Leluk: No, I did not write it in my text.

Mr. Lewis: I just wondered at his clairvoyance.

Mr. Leluk: I am offended by the allegations of the member for High Park who has claimed improper, unfair, dishonest and corrupt practices in the riding of Humber among others. I am talking of election practices.

The charges were made with his usual lack of accuracy, substance, or even detail. He has, in my view, offered an indignity to the residents of Humber through his unwarranted allegations. In his speech in the Throne debate in this House, the hon. member for High Park specifically mentioned one, and I repeat, one polling station located in the Ivan Franco Home at 767 Royal York Road.

He stated that on the morning of election day the 86 eligible voters who resided in this home were told that someone would mark their ballots for them, that only four people objected and one of the residents insisted on voting himself. The member for High Park says that he has received letters from relatives of the residents complaining that the residents were being mistreated and are being mistreated.

What utter nonsense! On the day of the election, my wife and I visited this polling station amongst several others and spoke to the DRO, Mrs. Mary Cairns of 839 Royal York Road, and the poll clerk, Mrs. Anne Pipa of 15 Woodford Park Road, who happens to be a Liberal. Mrs. Mary Cairns tells me now that the charges of the hon. member for High Park are ridiculous.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Poor old George Ben couldn't get into the place.

Mr. Leluk: That's right. She personally handed out ballots to those people who voted that day. She stated that there were no irregularities whatsoever; that these people voted on their own and that they were not accompanied by anyone to the polling booth.

Mr. Lewis: Now that is an exoneration.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That certainly clears it all up.

Mr. Leluk: It sure does. Mrs. Pipa, the poll clerk, checked off the list those people who voted. There was no pre-marking of ballots as has been alleged by the hon. member for High Park. Therefore, he has deliberately misled this House in making these charges.

An hon. member: Stand up and make a speech.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member please be seated?

Mr. Lewis: It is unprecedented that a new member should so violate the rules.

Mr. Speaker: I think he knows quite well that the use of the words he just used is not permitted in this House. He has accused another hon. member of deliberately misleading the House. I would ask him to withdraw the comment.

Mr. Lewis: Use "inadvertently."

Mr. Leluk: I will leave out the word "deliberately," but he has mislead the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: I think that puts you in an impossible situation.

Mr. Leluk: Let's have a speech from you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Leluk: There were no irregularities. On top of this he has offered an indignity to the directress of this home, Mrs. Pasternak, by saying that she has mistreated the residents and is mistreating the residents of this home.

Mr. Lewis: Boy, are you inviting a reply and are you going to get it!

Mr. Leluk: He says so, safely hiding behind the privilege of this House.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Does the member mean there were never any corrupt practices in Humber?

Mr. Leluk: If this is what the hon. member for High Park is referring to when he talks of "improper, unfair, dishonest and corrupt" election practices, he should resign now and not wait. Furthermore, he implies because I took 85 of the 86 ballots cast, Mr. Cummings took 1, and Mr. Ben took none, that there was something shady at this particular polling station.

Mr. Lawlor: Sounds a bit curious.

Mr. Leluk: Obviously, he does not yet realize how the election went across the riding, across Metro or indeed across the province.

Mr. Young: When did they get their cheques?

Mr. Leluk: I find it little wonder that George Ben received no votes. Early on the second Sunday prior to the election, he went to this home with two police officers, the leader of his party, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon), and interrupted holy mass. They tried to force their way in to canvass these elderly citizens.

Mr. Lewis: What, during mass?

Mr. Leluk: During mass.

Mr. Lawlor: Not fair to Ben.

Mr. Deans: The Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Leluk: The NDP candidate, Mr. Cummings, also made a public issue of the fact that he was not able to canvass the residents of this home by going to the press and making a big to-do about it.

Mr. Lewis: But he went there on a Tuesday afternoon—

Mr. Lawlor: What did you do? Sprinkle some holy water around?

Mr. Leluk: I wasn't permitted to canvass either. My literature was left in the office and that was the end of it.

Mr. Young: When did they get their $50 cheques?

Mr. Leluk: So the allegations are unfounded. Can it be that the hon. member for High Park is still smarting, because he himself wasn't admitted into the other Ivan Franco home in his own riding?

Mr. Lawlor: Why wasn't he?

Mr. Leluk: In any case, he was supposed to file a report of his allegations—a report I have yet to see. Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the member who is well known for his abuses of the privileges of this House has made these accusations for publicity purposes.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury): Why hasn't it been brought before the committee?

Mr. Leluk: I further suggest that he is not—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for High Park has never sought publicity.

Mr. Leluk: I suggest, sir, that the member who is well-known for these abuses—

Mr. Lewis: That is a palpable slander, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Now he has got competition.

Mr. Lewis: What is it about the west end of Toronto, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. W. Hodgson (North York): He is not the friend of the NDP leader. He should not protect him.

Mr. Leluk: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he is not prepared at this time, or at any other time for that matter, to make any accusations concerning election practices in the riding of Humber outside this House where he knows full well that he would be liable to a lawsuit.

Mr. Lewis: The only reason that he won't go before the cameras is that he won't cross a picket line.

An hon. member: Right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He goes when the strike is off.

An hon. member: The leader of the New Democratic Party does.

Mr. Leluk: If he's not prepared to do so then he owes the public an apology—a public apology to the people in my riding—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): He should go to mass.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Leluk: —to the people of Ontario and to the members of this House.

Mr. Lewis: You wait for the orders of the day tomorrow morning, my friend—just be here!

Mr. Leluk: Speaking of foul air, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every member of this Legislature has been faced with one type of pollution problem or another in his own riding. In Humber we have what I consider to be a rather serious one. Much of it results from the Metropolitan Toronto Humber sewage treatment plant—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Leluk: —located on the Queensway where the Humber River empties into Lake Ontario.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That is what the Tories have been responsible for creating in the last 28 years.

Mr. Leluk: The foul air that is emitted from this sewage treatment facility, Mr. Speaker, is often beyond description.

Mr. Martel: It is all cleaned up in Sudbury.

Mr. Leluk: Our citizens have been subjected to this type of pollution for a long time and now it is time for something to be done about it.

Briefly, the plant is of the activated sludge type, providing a secondary treatment—approximately 90 per cent removal of organics —of the sanitary sewage discharged to it. This plant, I am told, presently treats an average daily sewage flow of approximately 60 million gallons. It has a capacity of 62.5 million gallons daily.

I am also told that there is a plant expansion contemplated for the near future which would bring the normal capacity to 75 million, or perhaps even 90 million gallons per day.

Mr. Speaker, the smell from this sewage treatment plant fouls the air so badly that at times people actually become ill from the fumes. The problem is particularly critical on hot or humid days.

For example, the air management branch of the Department of the Environment received 36 companies last July and 26 complaints last October. Basically then there were two separate critical periods last year during which the odours were extreme—July and October.

In investigating this matter I have discovered that indeed there is an explanation for all of this, although it is not totally acceptable. Since only about 90 per cent of the solids or organics are removed, the remainder of the sludge must be taken elsewhere to complete the treatment. It has to be hauled away in trucks. One explanation is that there are not enough "honey" trucks, as some like to refer to them, to haul this sludge away to disposal sites—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Leluk: —and there are equipment breakdowns.

Consequently, the biological solids level at the plant eventually increases to a point where the plant's air supply facilities are overtaxed and odours result. And that is putting it mildly, Mr. Speaker.

One of the occurrences of heavy odours was a result of overhauling the sludge filters. I am informed that certain corrective measures have been proposed, subject to a council ratification of existing budget proposals, which would permit the purchase of four more of these "honey" trucks to look after, not only the Humber treatment plant but the Highland Creek one as well.

Mr. Martel: And the honey.

Mr. Leluk: So if the city council approves the money, the municipality will buy more trucks and they will cart the stuff off to where it is not going to bother us.

This is no answer. First of all, although the odour is more extreme at one time than at another, it is always present.

If an ill wind blows over my riding this odour covers practically all of it.

I suggest that the only answer is proper treatment of the sewage right at the plant. We should not be building sewage treatment facilities that do not fully treat sewage. I ask that the construction of treatment facilities of the type we have in Humber riding not be permitted. Furthermore, that corrective measures be undertaken at those treatment plants where such conditions presently exist.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): What sanctions does the member think should be imposed?

Mr. Leluk: Talk to me after. I also intend to pursue this matter with Municipal Affairs.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Well, it has been 30 years with Gypsum.

Mr. Leluk: I am currently investigating reports of the dumping of raw sewage from the treatment plant into the Humber River at two sites, particularly at times when heavy rainfalls would naturally increase the volume of sewage. The problem has been made known to the former Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) and now to the new minister (Mr. Auld).

Metro officials have been made aware of the complaints from residents of Humber. I intend to meet with officials to discuss causes of the odour as well as the alleged dumping of sewage into the river.

There are a great many fine people in my riding but there is one group that warrants special mention. It is a group of young people who have embarked on a programme to clean up the Humber River. The programme called CUTH, initiated by the members of the Young Progressive Conservative Association, is designed to clean the river bed and its banks of debris.

The hon. members will recall Hurricane Hazel which devastated our area some years ago.

An hon. member: Too bad the government would not help them a little bit.

Mr. Leluk: To this date nothing has been done to clean up the mess. Now something is going to be done by our youth. Starting sometime in May, they will be spending some eight weeks cleaning it up from Dundas St. W. on the north to the lake on the south. I am confident that the Minister of the Environment, like his predecessor, will give these young people his support and the assistance of his department for technical advice and certain equipment.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Leluk: An engineering firm in the riding has already volunteered assistance. Other citizens, in the true Humber spirit, will also help. We also have a pollution problem from the incinerator which is located at the foot of Grand Ave. in Mimico. It is one of those antiquated incinerators which will be closed by Metro sometime in 1973.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, by shoving the incinerator into my riding.

Mr. Leluk: I am asking Metro to close this old incinerator sooner, if at all possible.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, we know the hon. member for Humber is up to his neck in a dirty river.

Mr. Martel: And they load it in trucks and send it to northern Ontario.

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. memebr for Humber is going to get a sludge incinerator in his riding next year. He doesn't know it yet, but he is.

Mr. Leluk: I am very aware of the fact that we in Ontario have taken particular care to provide for those of our citizens who are less fortunate and those who have retired on fixed incomes.

Mr. Deans: We will talk about that later.

Mr. Leluk: I realize that we have undertaken programmes in an effort to relieve the financial burden on our senior citizens. However, I am concerned that we should provide even greater assistance.

The burden of education falls on old people as well as young and has forced numerous people in my riding to sell their homes after they have lived there for years and brought up and educated their own children. I strongly feel that the education tax for such people should be totally removed and I would urge the government to give this recommendation every consideration.

Mr. Martel: This rump group over here is going to give the Chairman of the Management Board a hard time.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): They will give the member a hard time.

An hon. member: Please don't refer to it as rump.

Mr. Leluk: I am pleased to say—

Mr. Lewis: Every one of them is rump. They address all their comments to the Chairman of the Management Board personally. They know a fellow rump when they see one.

Mr. Leluk: I am pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that our government has recognized many of the needs of our elderly. We now have a new senior citizens home in my riding in Royal York, which will be officially opened this month.

There is one more point, sir. This involves not so much the tremendously significant help to our senior citizens but rather an extension of this government's obvious and effective concern for the quality of life in this province. The modest proposal I am about to make is consistent with that policy and would also serve as a clear and unmistakable declaration of how this government regards those persons who have worked for 30, 40 and often 50 years as productive citizens.

I am speaking of assistance in the area of recreation that would convey our high regard and respect. Simply put, Mr. Speaker, I propose to my learned colleagues that any person in possession of a birth certificate or any other form of identification proving he is a resident of Ontario and is 65 years of age or older be given unlimited access to Ontario Place and its theatre, the Ontario Science Centre and its theatre, the Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario without payment of any fee.

It is my respectful submission that the loss in revenue would be negligible. Furthermore there would be no administrative costs at all.

The simple presentation of a document which almost any citizen would have in his possession should suffice. It may be a little thing, Mr. Speaker, but is a logical outgrowth of our concern for the quality of life and would convey so much to those who have built this best of all provinces.

I would now like to discuss a problem of grave concern and a problem which does not take a back seat to the pollution of the environment. That problem is pollution of the mind by drug abuse. In my opinion this major social problem has not received sufficient attention from any level of government even though Ontario is miles ahead of the federal government in this respect.

Not only as a father but as a health professional with 13 years in the field of drugs and drug abuse, I am consistently dismayed, Mr. Speaker, by the casual attitude and lack of concern of the Addiction Research Foundation of this province.

Despite its well-known expertise in certain forms of research, this agency as I see it has its weaknesses. Its recent absurdly premature release of initial impressions of a research project on marijuana was, in the words of the executive director of the foundation, "at the request of the federal Royal Commission of inquiry, the LeDain commission." It is as if the foundation is utterly blameless, but upon closer examination one finds that the Ontario foundation, on its own initiative, approached the commission verbally and in a manipulative manner deliber-

ately structured a situation which would call for the release of this report.

It is a mockery of scientific method for this agency to insult the intelligence of this House, of the medical fraternity and of the people of Ontario to suggest that this 90-day study reflects the ability of marijuana users to function in, and now I quote, "nearly normal social and economic conditions".

What a fabrication this is. The subjects referred to were all over 21, were all males, all had successfully passed a psychiatric evaluation and, more important, Mr. Speaker, their functioning was in anything but a near-normal situation.

These admitted marijuana smokers were locked in an institution. They did not need to pay rent, nor find a job, nor find a room, and when they were taken to Centre Island they had more staff supervision than a grade 5 classroom. This they call "near-normal" functioning.

What the study proved is that if you take the sort of person who will voluntarily submit to censorship mail and removal from the real world and satisfy yourself that he is apparently healthy first, then for 90 days he can weave belts in a rent-free cloister. The study proved that potheads can function very well in an isolated setting.

I am shocked, Mr. Speaker, to learn that two of these marijuana users were employed at the end of that phase of the experiment as scientific observers of other marijuana-using subjects.

Mr. Lewis: Another progressive voice comes into the Legislature.

Mr. Martel: Charlie's getting uncomfortable.

Mr. Leluk: It is my intention to ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) for details of this wanton and reckless disregard for the most fundamental tenets of scientific inquiry and this inexcusable lack of concern for the effects of their words on our impressionable young people.

I am reassured and grateful that the hon. Minister of Health is now inquiring into the circumstances surrounding the recent dismissal of staff psychiatrist Dr. Andrew Malcom. He is literally a world-renowned figure in the field of drug abuse.

What makes Dr. Malcom different from the other administrators of the foundation? Apart from his well-known expertise, he also differs in that he had courage to show publicly the errors, the omissions, the outdated information and thoughtlessness of the federal government's treatment report on drug abuse.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member could find a convenient spot to break his remarks for the time being.

Mr. Leluk: I move that the House be adjourned, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I may say it is not necessary for a motion to adjourn.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 16, 1972

French language secondary education commission report, statement by Mr. Wells 445

Supreme court appeal re title of Lake Erie beaches, statement by Mr. Bales 446

Telephone service conversion at Queen's Park, statement by Mr. Snow 446

Pollution control order at Canadian Gypsum plant in Weston, statement by Mr. Auld 447

Inquiry re unauthorized distribution of General Motors' press release via WCB, statement by Mr. Guindon 448

Shelter grant withdrawal and substitution of equivalent municipal tax credits, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans 449

French-language education programmes, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roy 450

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum plant in Weston, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Singer 451

Ontario air route application, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Stokes 453

Payments to former WCB vice-chairman, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis 454

Information on savings in health insurance costs, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis..... 455

Operation of Ontario Place re revenues, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon 455

Lunch hours at LCBO store, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 457

Protection for cleaned building at Queen's Park, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Scrivener 457

Absence of London judge from duty, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Singer 457

Compensation Board pensions to widows, disabled, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Deans, Mr. Lewis 458

Employment situation for casual workers, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 459

Tabling report—French-language secondary education committee, Mr. Wells 460

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Clement..... 460

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Henderson 460

Nursing Homes Act, 1972, bill respecting, Mr. Potter, first reading 460

Simcoe Day, bill respecting, Mr. Smith, first reading 461

City of Kitchener, bill respecting, Mr. Breithaupt, first reading 461

City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. Bennett, first reading 461

Personal reporting agencies, bill to regulate, Mr. Deacon, first reading 461

City of Sault Ste. Marie, bill respecting, Mr. Rhodes, first reading 461

City of Sarnia, bill respecting, Mr. Bullbrook, first reading 461

City of London, bill respecting, Mr. Walker, first reading 461

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Wardle, first reading 461

Peterborough Racing Association Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Turner, first reading 461

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. J. R. Smith, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Leluk 461

Recess, 6 o'clock 491



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 14

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 16, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(*continued*)

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I would like to carry on with my speech, if I may.

Is it the position of the Addiction Research Foundation that the recent dismissal of Dr. Andrew Malcolm—that his criticism, I should have said, of the recent LeDain commission report—had no connection with his dismissal?

I intend, Mr. Speaker, to find out also whether his firm stand against the legalization of marijuana is connected with his dismissal. Is this the penalty that he must pay for criticizing a document which he and many other experts feel to be medically unsound and unacceptable—a report which he labelled as misleading and potentially dangerous? A major defect is the report's failure to consider adequately the hallucinogenic drugs, including cannabis, mescaline and STP-type drugs. The report dealt with all of these hallucinogens in two pages.

I am concerned about the casual approach of many agencies, governmental and private, involved in the field of drug abuse. The LeDain commission, after spending two years holding inquiries across Canada, has come up with nothing in its reports that was not already known. One dangerous recommendation in this final report is that heroin be made available to heroin addicts. I fail to understand why we cannot learn from history and pay heed to programmes which have been total failures. If this recommendation ever becomes a reality, you can be assured that Ontario will become a mecca for drug pushers and heroin users.

I would now like to read a telegram which I received at Queen's Park on March 9 at 2:10 p.m. This telegram came to my office from Ottawa and was signed by nine distinguished Canadian doctors of various specialties including psychiatry. The telegram reads:

WE STRONGLY PROTEST AGAINST THE DISCHARGE YESTERDAY OF DR. ANDREW MALCOLM FROM THE ONTARIO ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING HIS PUBLIC PRESENTATION OF THE HIGHLY-DETAILED, MEDICALLY-ACCURATE CRITICISM OF THE LEDAIN COMMISSION FINAL REPORT ON DRUG ABUSE TREATMENT. DR. MALCOLM'S BRILLIANT WORK IN THE FIELD OF DRUG ABUSE REPRESENTED BY HIS RECENT MAJOR CONTRIBUTION ENTITLED "THE PURSUIT OF INTOXICATION" HAS WON FOR HIM AND CANADIAN MEDICINE INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION. HIS PRESENTATION OF THE DANGERS TO YOUTH OF ILLUSORY DRUGS, INCLUDING MARIJUANA, BASED UPON HIS OWN AND WORLD-WIDE RESEARCH IS IN STRIKING CONTRAST, IN OUR OPINION, TO THE MEDICALLY UNACCEPTABLE, CASUAL AND FACT-HIDING APPROACH TAKEN BY THE DIRECTOR OF THE ONTARIO ADDICTION RESEARCH FOUNDATION AND THE LEDAIN COMMISSION TO DATE.

CANADA OWES DR. MALCOLM A DEBT OF GRATITUDE NOT DISMISSAL FOR HIS EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE WITH THE FOUNDATION AND HIS OTHER YEARS OF CAPABLE AND UNCEASING WORK TO ESTABLISH THE REALITIES OF THE DRUG PROBLEM ON A PROPER MEDICAL BASIS WITH FULL CONSIDERATION OF THE SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS.

ABOVE ALL, EXPERTS IN THE FIELD OF MEDICINE MUST BE ABSOLUTELY FREE TO MAKE PUBLIC THEIR FINDINGS AND JUDGEMENTS SO THAT TRUE ADVANCES MAY BE ACHIEVED. ANY ATTEMPT TO SILENCE BRILLIANT MEN IN THIS FIELD IS UNWARRANTED CENSORSHIP. DR. MALCOLM'S FULL STATEMENT, WHICH WE HAVE STUDIED, MUST BE MADE KNOWN PUBLICLY TO THE PEOPLE OF CANADA.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) today in writing for an inquiry into the total operation of the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation because of numerous complaints I have received over the past several years and in light of the recent dismissal, the unwarranted dismissal, of Dr. Andrew Malcolm.

In my former capacity as executive director of the Council on Drug Abuse for some 2½ years, I received many complaints from Ontario residents about the lack of concern shown by the Addiction Research Foundation. There were people who could not get

answers to their questions, who were unable to get a speaker to come up to their groups, who waited weeks on end to receive literature about drugs.

There were also complaints about staff members using drugs. There have also been complaints of the waste of public funds, particularly in the funding of the street programmes like Digger House, for example, which is now defunct.

I find it very difficult for this agency to justify firing a man of Dr. Malcolm's calibre because of what they claim to be a tightening up of their budget. It is my understanding that Dr. Malcolm's salary was in the neighbourhood of $25,000 per annum and that this agency's budget last year was $13 million. I believe the firing of Dr. Malcolm had absolutely nothing to do with budget whatsoever.

May I now offer an example of the casual approach to this problem. When "12 Madison" which was funded by the foundation, was approached for help by a father whose son had been on the drug MDA, he was told this was all part of the natural process of growing up and that MDA was really not as dangerous a drug as LSD. The boy died from MDA several months later.

Therefore, based on this and other evidence which has been presented to me by various sources, I feel it is important for the safety and welfare of Ontario residents that the Minister of Health ask for the most detailed inquiry into the operation of this foundation.

I also feel that the permissive attitude and the casual approach to the drug abuse problem, which exists with many of the staff of the foundation, is unacceptable to the taxpayers of this province and to the many parents who unfortunately today have encountered drug abuse problems with their children.

I also feel that they have made many attempts publicly to justify the spending of a large percentage of their budget—65 per cent, I believe—on alcoholic research after all these years of study. Alcoholism is still one of the leading problems of drug abuse, but we have now moved into an era of chemical drug abuse and we have many other drugs today to worry about.

Another reason for re-examining the function of the Addiction Research Foundation is that it has attempted to do all and be all in the drug abuse field. It has become involved in not only research but education, case studies, treatment and public information.

Based on public statements made by members of its staff, the foundation has a sacred monopoly in the area of drug abuse. I for one do not agree. I recall the words of the Premier (Mr. Davis), who stated publicly that there are areas where the private sector may be able to do a better job than the government and should be encouraged to do so.

We must give every consideration to encouraging some of the private agencies involved in the field, through government grants and possibly in other ways, to play a more active role and possibly participate hand in hand with government agencies to do the job. History has shown that governments can work with private sector groups effectively.

Although there is no one pat solution to the overall problem, Mr. Speaker, I encourage this government to pursue the possibility of instituting drug programmes in all our schools throughout the province to better inform our young people of the hazards of drug abuse.

I urge tighter controls, particularly in the use of some of these hazardous chemicals, including the various solvents, which have also been a problem. I strongly recommend that this government consider passing legislation making it mandatory for producers of solvents, particularly airplane glue, to add some irritant to their product that would make it difficult for people to abuse these solvents.

I would also urge this government to take a clear and firm stand against the legalization of marijuana and hashish in the light of present knowledge. In Geneva, Switzerland, a United Nations drug control group warned recently against any relaxation of any controls on marijuana and hashish.

I was very pleased when the Premier announced a select committee to study the extension of the use of school facilities in this province. I am somewhat discouraged by the lack of recreational facilities of all types for the young people of my riding to enjoy.

There are many high schools today that have swimming pools, gymnasiums and track fields, but unfortunately these facilities are not being put to full use. There are many areas in Toronto where there is very little, if any, parkland, and the youngsters are not permitted to use the playing fields for football, soccer, or what have you, because the grounds are surrounded by 12-foot barriers.

I know of high schools where groups of parents wanted to hold meetings in areas of social concern and were refused the use of even one classroom.

Therefore, I am hopeful, because of the appointment of the select committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. J. R. Smith), that we will eventually see these facilities put to better use.

Young people need an outlet for their energies and their talents, and I feel very strongly that if they have somewhere to go —whether to swim or to play basketball, or dance—there would be fewer youngsters getting into trouble.

I was delighted by the Premier's announcement of the 1972 summer employment programme for students. This government has taken the initiative to create more jobs through its winter works programme and now through the announced special summer employment programme for students.

I am very proud that Ontario gives youth the opportunity to achieve, in sharp contrast to the Liberal government's policy of handouts and ludicrous projects. The best example of such a handout is the recent grant of $217,000 to Rochdale, that drug-soaked cesspool.

Unfortunately, the economic condition of our country has been anything but encouraging. It has, in fact, gone from bad to worse during the past three years, despite, or rather because of, the efforts of the present Liberal government in Ottawa. This mismanagement has had a devastating effect on my own riding of Humber, where many people are out of work. But we are not alone; it has hurt our province and our country.

Yet I sat here, Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago and listened while the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) criticized the provincial government for dragging its feet on matters of economy and unemployment. I hardly think this was a just criticism of a government that has maintained the greatest economic stability and the lowest unemployment rate of any province in our country, despite the bungling programmes of our federal government.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the government of Ontario will not only continue to provide for our people in the future, as it has in the past, but also that it will do so better than ever before.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, new as I am to the House and knowing very little about legislative procedures or performances of past Speakers, I feel that it would be almost presumptuous of me to make any comment upon your judgment or ability, or more so your fairness.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Well lambaste him for a change.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Yes, give him a going over.

An hon. member: Sock it to him!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bounsall: As you are well aware, my predecessor from Windsor West was a gentleman by the name of Mr. Hugh Peacock, which has been mentioned here in the session today. As you probably also know, he had a natural interest in and ability with House rules. He's been a longtime friend of our family and often commented upon the legislative doings and actions during the past four years. One of the things which he mentioned several times to us was the judgement, the fairness and the humour which the Deputy Speaker of the last Parliament (Mr. Reuter), had, and how he hoped that, in this session, you indeed would be the Speaker because of those attributes. I feel that I should pass this on and I only hope that you're not so good as to spoil me for any successive Speaker who might come along.

I was quite interested to hear in the Throne Speech that this government,

> Will continue to make constructive proposals to the federal government, in order to improve intergovernmental co-operation in such specific areas of concern as fiscal and monetary policy, and in areas relating to competition and foreign trade, including the vital consideration of the auto pact between Canada and the United States.

I'm going to speak tonight on the auto pact agreement between the United States and Canada, and what is obviously the Prime Minister's (Mr. Davis) intention and the intention of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough), to press the viewpoint of Ontario home to the federal government in this issue, which strikes so directly at the heart of the Ontario economy.

There are many communities—not just my own in Windsor—which would be adversely affected by any downward revision in the auto trade agreement, and indeed

will be adversely affected if there is not an improvement in the existing auto trade agreement. The pact became a necessity because of the deplorably depressed state of the Canadian auto industry in the late Fifties. The Bladen commission was established to investigate the entire situation. The members considered all points of view and reported in the early Sixties.

At that time Canada was running an enormous balance of payments deficit with the US on automotive products. Wages were lower than in the US industry and prices were higher. In addition, due to the short production runs necessitated by the small Canadian market, the Canadian auto industry was highly protected with tariffs and highly inefficient in productivity. There appeared at that time to be two main alternatives. 1. Rationalize the industry behind tariff walls and produce a small number of models for the Canadian market; or, 2. Rationalize the industry on a continental scale with guarantees of minimum production levels in Canada.

The second alternative was chosen, and the auto pact became operative in January, 1965.

It seemed at the time that the plan would benefit Canadian workers and consumers in both increased jobs and rate of pay for the worker, or at least the same number of jobs as the auto industry, although expanding to meet market demands, became more automated. For the Canadian consumer the hope was for lowering of prices. The hope, of course, was that the price differential would disappear completely as a result of the greater efficiency of production and the rationalization of the industry as long model runs were assembled in one plant location servicing a wide geographic area irrespective of the international boundary.

It was clear that it would benefit in a monetary way, to a large extent, the automobile manufacturers themselves. In fact, the US government agreed to the scheme almost on the grounds that, "what is good for General Motors is good for the US"—and, indeed, it has been a golden harvest for the US auto makers. By rationalizing production as they have done right across North America they have definitely maximized their profits.

What was the agreement that went into effect Jan. 1, 1965, and what were the safeguards written into the auto pact about which we have all heard so much lately?

They were, in terms of safeguards:

1. The ratio of finished assembled automobile units in Canada to sales in Canada be not less than the 1964 ratio of 0.92 to one, or 92 per cent.

2. That the Canadian added value be not less than the 1964 figure of 60 per cent of sales. Let me explain that. Canadian added value means that production in dollar amounts from all sources, including parts, depreciation on capital equipment and buildings, as well as the labour involved in assembling the vehicle, be no less than 60 per cent of sales.

Another way of saying it is that the Canadian content in terms of parts and labour be no less than 60 per cent of sales. In effect, this put a base production figure of $774 million for Canadian labour and parts.

In return for these safeguards, tariffs were abolished by both countries on new cars and parts imported by the auto manufacturing companies. In addition, and completely separate from the pact, letters of intent, or letters of understanding, passed between the four automobile companies and the Canadian government in which these manufacturers promised to increase production facilities in Canada by $268 million by 1968. This they achieved.

The objective that is included in the Canada-US auto pact, and stated clearly and categorically, is:

> That the trade barriers are to be liberalized to enable the industries in both countries to participate on a fair and equitable basis in the expanding market of both countries.

What effect has the pact had? And what has happened since 1965? The important thing to note is that it has been a success for all concerned.

First, the car manufacturers have certainly rationalized production in North America and maximized their profits. They, above all others, do not wish to see the pact discarded or cancelled, which can be done of course on one year's notice by either country.

Second, it has been a success in terms of providing jobs for the Canadian worker. Since 1965—and here I'll use the 1969 figures because 1970 was a special year as a result of the long General Motors strike and the figures for 1971 are not as yet complete—since 1965 employment increased in the auto field in Canada by 13 per cent, in spite of the automation that took place ever relentlessly reducing jobs.

In 1965, in dollar terms, Canadians con-

sumed 7.5 per cent of the North American market for North American cars, but produced only four per cent. In 1969 we consumed about the same percentage, 7.5 per cent, and produced 5.5 per cent. There is evidence that in 1970, in dollar terms, consumption of North American cars by Canadians equalled production of North American cars in Canada.

So it would appear that, mainly due to the building of two modern assembly plants, one at Ste. Thérèse, Que., and one at Talbotville, Ont., we have achieved the main objective of the pact—"a fair and equitable share of the market accruing in Canada" — in that the dollar value of production over the past two years, equalled the dollar value of the sales in Canada.

This was at least partly fortuitous in that, for example, the Ford Motor Co. decided to assemble in Canada at the Talbotville location all of the Pintos for the entire North American market and a large portion of the Mavericks.

The United States and Canada have been in an economic slump in the last two years, and it is not surprising that the lower-priced smaller cars have sold better in this economic climate than have the larger ones. However, all indications are that the economic climate is improving and if the small cars are continued to be assembled in Canada, I would suspect that their share of sales in the market would decrease during this time of better economic conditions, with the larger cars in greater demand.

As well, another type of vehicle has been included in the auto pact tariff arrangement —the snowmobile. These vehicles were not around before 1965, and Canada currently still enjoys a rather large balance of trade in snowmobiles with the United States, which helps to even out the balance of trade figures between the United States and Canada in the auto vehicle industry.

Wage parity for workers was negotiated, that is point three. It has been a success for US workers as well. Although the United States hasn't experienced the same percentage increase in jobs as experienced by the Canadian labour market, it is the type of job created in the United States as a result of the pact that is noteworthy.

All of the design, all of the research and development, all of the top management positions and most of the purchasing—all of the purchasing except a small amount done by General Motors in Oshawa—have been moved to the United States, including, along with these positions, the vast majority of the skilled technical and managerial positions requiring persons of advanced education or training, not to mention the secretarial services that they require.

Indeed, it is clear that since 1965 the jobs created in Canada, by and large, all have been in the albeit labour-intensive assembly area. This means that Canadian workers are just one step removed from being hewers of wood and drawers of water. We have now become screwers and drivers at a time in the societies of both of our countries when a much higher percentage of our population is receiving advanced education or training qualifying them for better jobs than their parents had. We ourselves find within the automotive industry that these opportunities no longer exist in Canada.

I do have figures for the first 11 months of 1971. It would appear there was over $1 billion to Canada's export credit in the area of finished, assembled automobiles. It is also clear that there is over $1 billion export credit to the US in auto parts. There's a small difference in our favour, no doubt mainly due to the snowmobile vehicle situation. This position can change overnight, of course, as consumers purchase in 1972, as predicted, the larger cars which are assembled in the United States. This should put forever to rest the myth that the Canadian auto industry is capable of standing on its own two feet without any safeguards, which the Liberal government in Ottawa is now implying.

The Liberal government in Ottawa is right in one respect, however, when they say that the present safeguards in the pact are so far exceeded now as to be useless. However, if new safeguards are not negotiated so that in dollar amounts the Canadian production from all sources, including the labour of assembling, parts and managerial skills, equals the dollar value of sales of North American vehicles, the 1965 floor figure will, in point of fact, become a ceiling figure, with no incentive for the US auto makers to expand in Canada to meet the need of the ever expanding vehicle market.

Expansion in both plant and equipment needed to meet the 1974 consumer demand will occur in the United States. Canada will no longer produce anything like, as time goes on, the value in vehicles equal to the sales in the Canadian market. Even if the present safeguards are retained, production levels could be allowed to fall back to the 1964 level, which would be disastrous for employment prospects in this country, and

particularly in this province where 80 per cent of the auto-vehicle manufacturing occurs. Even without the displacement due to automation, it would be safe to say that 35 per cent of the Canadian workers now employed would be jobless if we returned to this 1964 level.

In this situation, what must Ontario be proposing to the federal government in terms of the auto pact, with a view to retaining employment prospects in Canada?

(1) Retaining the present safeguards is not nearly good enough for Canada to achieve a fair and equitable share of the North American auto industry. The safeguards must be updated so that our production in dollar value in Canada equals the sales in Canada in dollar values.

(2) As the auto industry expands in North America—and there is no reason to assume that it will not—the expansion of facilities must take place in the auto parts industry which, although less labour intensive, provides a more skilled employment for workers, such as tool and die workers and those involved in the design of machinery to produce those tools and parts.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): That's what I tried to tell the government last year.

Mr. Bounsall: An example of this situation is the Ford Motor Company's Pinto which, although assembled in Talbotville, Ontario, for the entire North American market, does not have one Canadian-made part in it. The ball bearings come from Japan; the motors come from Germany or vice versa, and so on and so on.

In addition, I can provide the House with figures of how out of balance the Canadian auto industry has become in terms of having vast assembly capacity and little else. Again, my concern that we have become a nation of "screwers of nuts and twisters of bolts"—only.

In the year 1970 the ratio of passenger car assembling in Canada to sales of North American passengers cars in Canada was 1.9 to 1. In other words, in 1970 the production of assembled cars in Canada was 90 per cent greater than the sales of North American cars in Canada. Going one step further, the ratio of passenger car assembly production in Canada to the sale of all passenger cars in Canada, including the imports, was 1.47 to 1.

It is clear that our assembly capacity far exceeds our consumption capacity. In terms of all vehicles, not just passenger cars—here we include trucks, snowmobiles and everything—the ratio of assembled vehicles to North American vehicles sold was even greater—1.92 to 1. And the ratio to the sale of all vehicles, including imports, was 1.54 to 1.

For the first 11 months of 1970 these figures continue to hold. In terms of all vehicles assembled, the ratio of assembling to sales of North American vehicles was 1.87 to 1, and the ratio to all vehicles sold, including imports, was 1.47 to 1.

We therefore need no further expansion in this country for the foreseeable future in the assembly plant area.

Our third demand of Ontario to the federal Liberal government should be the transfer to Canada of a portion of the design, research and development work. Canada's share of the North American vehicle market is about eight per cent. Research, development and design should occur in Canada equal to the Canadian share of the market.

Doubts may be expressed as to the feasibility of such a request, but in reply a case would have to be made that it is necessary for all the research and development work to be done under one roof. Valid arguments, I am sure, cannot be presented.

Even if it is necessary for the designers of, for example the Buick and Pontiac models for three years hence to be in contact periodically with each other—let's say about once a month—one of these divisions could be placed in Canada in close proximity to Detroit. For example in Windsor, where constant contact by telephone would involve no or little expense and travel time for meetings would involve, at most, 30 minutes.

Another approach would have all the R and D work on one or two compacts done in Canada, and hopefully these compacts could be totally assembled here as well as all the parts for them produced in Canada. I choose compacts for my example since the Canadian market, with its lower average income, is more receptive to compacts than is the American market.

And the fourth point that we should stress is that the factory retail price must be equalized. There is no conceivable reason why differences in factory retail prices should continue to exist.

The leader of our party, the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) in his reply to the Throne Speech, detailed some of these price differences. He also proposed that the Ontario government, quite independent of the federal government and the negotiations that are taking place or likely

to take place, could call the manufacturers before a committee to indicate why those price differentials are justified and pass legislation accordingly. It was interesting to note that the hon. Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Winkler), indicated, both by his reaction and verbally, that it was a good idea. We look forward to the minister's announcement of this commission.

Upon inspection of the price differences, it is clear that on small cars the difference arises from factory retail prices and one-half from the higher Canadian taxes, those being excise and sales tax. On the larger model, as much as 75 per cent of the difference comes from the higher factory retail price, and only 25 per cent comes from taxes. There is utterly no reason why a higher factory retail price should exist.

The Pinto, wholly assembled in Canada for the entire North American market, has a higher factory retail price in Ontario than in the US. Ridiculous!

One of the arguments used by the companies for retaining this difference was the additional money needed to be spent in order to produce French-language brochures for use in Quebec and preparation of French-language radio and television advertisements. It has been estimated that the total cost of effecting these translations is about $30,000 per year per company. If they pay more than that, they are getting taken. There are only four companies in the field, a total of $120,000 therefore.

For the first 11 months of 1971, there were 870,000 motor vehicles sold in Canada; the figure for 12 months will be around 940,000. The additional cost of the French-language translation, therefore, works out to be about 13 cents per vehicle. Even if my figures for cost of translation are out by a factor of 10, we are talking about a $1.30 per vehicle.

An hon. member: Companies cannot add when it comes to raw material.

Mr. Bounsall: This is a far cry from the $130 to $400 factory retail price differences which now exist.

An hon. member: That is called gouging!

Mr. Bounsall: It appears that one of the major US demands is that there be tariff-free transfer of vehicles between individuals, not just between the manufacturing companies as is now the case.

I would suggest that if the factory retail prices were equalized and the difference in price therefore lay only in the Canadian excise and sales tax, this might be a feasible proposal to accept. However, the factory retail prices must be identical before we should even contemplate that.

This is one suggestion that the Conservative government of Ontario may well not want to press upon the federal Liberal government as, if I recall correctly, the largest single group of Conservative candidates by occupation during the last provincial election were recruited from car salesmen, obviously with an eye on the success of Real Caouette in Quebec. However, the differences in price, once the factory price was equalized, would not be sufficient to cause many, if any, Canadians to do their buying of new cars in the United States.

In addition, if this occurred—the duty-free transfer by individuals of new cars across the international boundary—it might then be even feasible to contemplate the second demand of the United States, the proposal that used cars traverse the border tariff free.

However, I would propose one important thing take place before this could be contemplated. That would be a requirement that a log-book be provided by each state in the United States and by each province in Canada and that it be required to be retained with the automobile. This log-book would contain, and indicate, all of the names and addresses and occupations of the owners of that car, with appropriate penalties for falsifying information or misuse of such log-books.

Such a requirement for log-books prevails in England today and has been in use for some time. In that way a resident of Ontario could decide, upon inspecting the log-book of a used car, whether he wished to buy one whose previous owner resided in Alabama, California, Manitoba or Ontario. He also would know the occupations of the previous owners and so judge the type of use to which that vehicle might have been put.

Even if this does not come about as a means of aiding the sale of used cars in Ontario, I would offer this as a suggestion to the Department of Transportation and Communications as a thing that we could well have in any event in the Province of Ontario.

In concluding my remarks about the auto pact, I would like to make one final point. The New Democratic Party opposes most strongly any further continentalization or rationalization of any segment of the North American industry. With the auto industry

entirely owned in the United States by US companies, we had little to lose in 1965 in terms of economic nationalism in having this industry rationalized. I would hate to see this occur in any other industry that has even the smallest segment of Canadian ownership in it.

I would urge that the Prime Minister or the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, when pressing these points upon the federal government, to indicate what a strong bargaining position the government of Canada is in with our vast amount of natural resources. We should never be in the position of going cap in hand to Washington for concessions. As long as we retain control of our natural resources, it is Washington that must come cap in hand to Ottawa for any purchases.

This does not mean—and I repeat—this does not mean that I or the New Democratic Party are saying that we are willing to bargain away our natural resources in return for a proper auto pact agreement.

In fact, I would go so far as to propose—and I would hope Ontario would press this view home to them—that on any energy sales by Canada to another foreign country, that as a condition of sale we place a clause similar to that which appears in the Canada-US auto pact agreement; that is it could be cancelled by either country upon giving notice of a certain specified time.

In the energy resources field, due to the fact that the buyer or recipient may well be dependent upon that resource, the time period should necessarily be longer than the one year contained in the Canada-US auto pact, but I can see no justification for making it longer than three years.

In addition, I see nothing amiss or improper with Ontario's Minister of Trade and Development or the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, going himself on behalf of Ontario to the automakers and saying: "Give us a letter of intent saying that expansion will take place in Canada so that production here is equal to 100 per cent of our sales." How about it?

We in Ontario have a lot to lose in employment opportunities. They, the manufacturers, have a lot to lose if the pact is cancelled and rationalization and increased profits are lost.

Mr. Speaker, in another area the government, in making its so-called constructive proposals to the federal government in the area of policy, may well point out that Ontario should be making constructive proposals in the area of cross-boundary air pollution—a very serious problem in the Windsor area—and the non-functioning of the International Joint Commission on air pollution.

You know, one of the reasons we in the Windsor area heard it was never feasible or that people were rather leary of trying to make the International Joint Commission work, was that although we in Windsor got all that pollution from Detroit, just up the river it was always believed that Sarnia polluted Port Huron; therefore if we got tough about the Windsor-Detroit area they would get tough about the Port Huron-Sarnia area.

Well about a year ago the International Joint Commission published its study of where the pollution was coming from and, lo and behold, it was true that 95 per cent of the pollution in the Windsor-Detroit area came from Detroit. When it came to Sarnia and Fort Huron—because of the prevailing wind by and large blowing in the direction of Port Huron—much to everybody's surprise they found that only 55 per cent of the pollution in the Sarnia area came from the city of Sarnia; 45 per cent of it came from Port Huron. So there is no reason why, from the Canadian side, the International Joint Commission cannot press the demand that the cross-boundary air pollution controls be enforced in both the Windsor-Detroit area and the Sarnia-Port Huron area.

A 1967 health study report—and I must admit to the House that I cannot find that clipping so I cannot indicate whether it was an Ontario health report or whether it was a local health report—found that living in the west side of Windsor and breathing the polluted air coming from Detroit was equivalent to smoking 46 cigarettes a day—and I represent the riding of Windsor West and live right in the middle of it.

Other health studies have reported that smoking two packs of cigarettes a day—which is only 40 cigarettes a day—for a 20-year period knocks six years off your life expectancy.

So due to the Detroit air pollution, people living in the west side of Windsor for 20 years will have in excess of six years knocked off their life expectancy. And what moral right have we, I wonder, to have children in the west side of Windsor and have them grow up—and most of them stay at home until close to the age of 20—knowing that we are knocking six years off their life expectancy?

I wish to turn my remarks at the moment,

Mr. Speaker—being as I am the labour critic of our caucus here in this House—to the plight of nurses and hospital workers in this province, particularly in relation to their salaries. The need, as I see, is for province-wide bargaining and contracts for all nurses and hospital workers in Ontario. In referring to hospital workers I am including, other than registered nurses, all the RNAs, orderlies, nursing aides; as well as the kitchen, laundry, housekeeping, attendant nurses, maintenance men and janitors.

These employees are shackled by the chains of compulsory arbitration, with all of its injustices in the form of delays, third parties who often do not have a clue as to the needs of hospital workers, and of hospital employers and administrators who take full advantage of these situations. What do those hospital workers who happen to be organized face? No matter how they justify their proposed wages and fringe benefits, they end up with an award based on what other hospitals are paying their employees. With all hospitals obtaining overall grants wholly from OHSC financing – soon to be financed wholly out of OHIP—therefore, with the hospitals receiving a predictable amount, the administrators have little leeway to negotiate wages with the workers. In fact, the amounts assigned really have a built-in wage guideline.

This from a government in Ontario which, in the Labour Relations Act, tells us that both union and employers should negotiate in good faith. The hospital administrators are not allowed to negotiate in good faith due to the wage guidelines given to them when they receive their budgets.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bounsall: The average take-home pay of hospital workers in Ontario, leaving the registered nurses out of it for the moment, is $80 for a 40-hour week.

Mr. Deans: Starvation week.

Mr. Foulds: Shame!

Mr. Bounsall: Almost welfare level!

And when you compare hospital workers' salaries with school employees' salaries – employees who really are paid no more directly or less directly than hospital workers from government moneys –

Mr. Foulds: Right on!

Mr. Bounsall: – you get an interesting comparison. Comparing the janitors' wages one finds that the janitors' pay in the school system is roughly 50 per cent more. They have most of their fringe benefits, in most situations, wholly-paid for them. In the hospital situation you're lucky if you have any one of them paid as high as 50 per cent and you're required to buy your own uniforms as well. There's no premium paid hospital workers for Saturdays, Sundays or holidays, and in most cases no premium paid for night shifts.

A Toronto newspaper some time ago put the plight of hospital workers into perspective when they pointed out that the Toronto zoo pays more to people to look after monkeys than the Ontario government allows hospitals to pay their hospital workers to look after people.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Shame, shame!

Mr. Foulds: Where's their sense of priorities?

Mr. Bounsall: Registered nurses –

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That's a matter for the social development policy minister.

Hon. R. Welch (Provincial Secretary for Social Development): Sounds like it! The zoo is not in our policy field.

An hon. member: The zoo is over there.

Hon. Mr. Welch: People are our first concern.

Mr. Foulds: Start concerning!

Mr. Cassidy: Let us see some proof.

Hon. Mr. Welch: See how well things are going on in the school system, yet that's not what the member was saying about those people.

Mr. Foulds: The minister heard my speech this afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Absolutely!

Mr. Bounsall: Let me comment on the registered nurses for the moment—

Hon. Mr. Welch: I can hardly wait.

Mr. Bounsall: The right arms of the medical doctors in this province receive a pittance in comparison with these medical doctors.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): How many people has the minister talked to in the last week?

Hon. Mr. Welch: People are very happy—

Mr. Singer: Yes!

An hon. member: How about the monkeys?

Mr. Bounsall: An RN in the Toronto area receives $590 to $610 to start, going to a maximum of $705 to $715 a month—almost $8,500 maximum, compared to an estimated average figure of $30,000 net for Ontario medical doctors. Both are paid or both are soon to be paid from one combined medical scheme, OHIP. I cannot help wondering why hospital workers and nurses continue to perform such a conscientious job in our hospitals, as we abuse them and shamefully exploit them.

Mr. Deans: The government should be ashamed.

Mr. Bounsall: Before I leave the health field I would like to report on some contacts I've had with the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) and letters from him over the past few months. Living in a border town we have some unusual situations arise due to the contemplation of the combination of the Ontario hospital plan and the Ontario medical plan into the one combined plan. There are some 4,500 commuters living in Windsor—Canadians mainly, who work in Detroit. These workers are compulsorily covered in Detroit through their place of employment for at least Blue Cross hospital coverage, and in most cases Blue Shield. Now Blue Shield coverage for medical coverage is not nearly as good as OHSIP was and OHIP will be. So these workers were quite happy and quite content to be compulsorily covered through their company for hospital and Blue Shield if they were, but to pay their OHSIP back in Ontario. They never used the Blue Shield portion of their coverage. Now the government has combined the plans into one they must still pay through their place of employment for hospital coverage in the United States, but must also pay for hospital coverage back in Ontario in order to continue their OHSIP.

I asked the Minister of Health, for this particular group of people—any commuters living in Ontario, but working in the United States, or if the same problem arose in another province—that a specific exemption be made for them and that they be allowed to retain the medical portion of the combined OHIP coverage only and at half the price. The answer, Mr. Speaker, was what you would expect having combined the plan into one in order to achieve a premium saving for a family from over $27 a month down to $22 a month, there was no way the minister of the Department of Health was going to separate the plans now.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Bureaucracy triumphs once again!

Mr. Bounsall: Currently what I am doing in the Windsor area—and I must admit that the manager of the Ontario Health Services Commission branch in Windsor has been most helpful in this—is engage in persuading the companies for whom these Ontario residents work to, instead of insuring their employees through Blue Cross and Blue Shield in the States, to buy for them the OHIP coverage in Ontario. This is progressing with some degree of success.

However, the bill combining our health plans into one needs some comment in one specific area. There was a premium saving which had to be passed on to the workers, that if there was a premium saving it must be passed on to the employees under the plan. Since Jan. 1 all old age pensioners now receiving free hospital and medical coverage, if they were covered in a negotiated contract with the company paying all or part —it didn't matter which—of that benefit, were to receive that benefit directly until the contract was renegotiated. This is fine, except that the only provision which the legislation makes for causing the companies to pay this to their employees, which the Act requires them to do, is to cause them to go to arbitration.

Mr. Speaker, there are many companies around this province now that are holding up payments to the old age pensioners and will soon hold up payments of the savings that have accrued to their employees because of arbitration. Although there are a few precedent-setting cases of this same thing occurring in previous combinations, they still must go through that lengthy arbitration process and many of those old age pensioners are going to die before those savings are passed on to them.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in that bill it should be stated that if the companies have not paid, or started to pay, those savings to their employees, be they old age pensioners or not, after a short period of time—let us say a three-month period—that this government of Ontario should take to court those companies which are dragging their feet rather than institute length arbitration proceedings.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A good point.

Mr. Bounsall: I seem to be sort of sidetracked on the Department of Health at the moment, but just last night the Minister of Health appeared on the Star forum discussing dentistry and dental care delivery. The reports on the meeting were rather interesting to me, since although nothing was said in the Throne Speech, the good doctor and Minister of Health spoke rather respectfully, certainly not disdainfully, of denturists in Ontario. He indirectly seemed to be blessing their illegal existence in terms of selling dental plates. He said, and I quote: "Denturists make teeth for $80 and sell them for $180. I don't think that should happen."

This statement was in the context that dentists should make no profit from selling false teeth. In the whole context and tone of the article we have our Health Minister seeming to acknowledge the existence of denturists selling false teeth in Ontario. I wonder if he plans to legitimize the denturists and end—as other provinces in Canada have done—this ridiculous dentist-denturist controversy that we have here in Ontario?

Mr. Gisborn: Ontario always trails behind good legislation.

Mr. Bounsall: Just last month—

Mr. Gisborn: Always behind good legislation. Labour legislation is always 10 years behind.

Mr. Bounsall: Just last month, as a result of the legislation prohibiting denturists selling false teeth to our Ontario residents, the dentists in Windsor, made their first raid on one of the denturist's operations in Windsor.

Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine a group wanting to end a certain practice being more heavy-handed in their way of going about it. It's one thing to take the law into your own hands because the police will not, of their own accord, go in and prosecute denturists. It's one thing to take it into your own hands and go in—with police watching—and take pictures of the operation so you can show in court that they are producing and selling illegal plates. But it's another thing to go through the harassment that they go through, which is to confiscate each and every impression, each and every dental plate that's there being made or in the process of repair.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): They have taken them right out of people's mouths!

Mr. Bounsall: Probably, probably! I was not aware of that but I take the member's word for it.

Mr. Reid: Look at Fred there.

Mr. Bounsall: I think we should end this situation. I hope that the Minister of Health will end this confrontation.

Mr. Foulds: I wouldn't take the member for Rainy River's word for anything.

Mr. Bounsall: There is another thing in the health field which sort of interests me. I guess it was the night before last there was an article in the Toronto Star by a doctor in which the doctor says: "Sex is not only here to stay, it can help you stay here longer."

Mr. Reid: Hear, hear! That is the first good thing I have heard the member say.

Mr. Foulds: That was the member for Rainy River. Get that down in Hansard. It is the first thing he has been awake for in the whole evening.

Mr. Bounsall: This noted research doctor, Dr. Eugene Scheimann of Chicago—he is obviously a misogynist—said:

> During the next year millions of men will suffer from painful and often fatal heart attacks. Ironically, many of these attacks could be prevented by one very simple, very cheap and very pleasant treatment: more sex.

I wonder whether the Minister of Health—I am sure he has noted this—has considered including this sort of treatment in the paramedical services provided to the hospitals?

Mr. Reid: Is that covered under Medicare?

Mr. Foulds: The Provincial Secretary for Social Development is thinking about it.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I thought maybe it would get the member somehow.

Mr. Bounsall: I am very glad to see that the Secretary for Social Development is in favour of such a project.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now just a minute, let's set the record clear on that.

Mr. Bounsall: It just occurs to me, considering the low wages that we pay to all our hospital workers, to ask how much these paramedical people would be worth, operating in our hospital and our nursing home situations and so on? There might be a few people of the Legislature here who would be quite interested in the rate of pay, to do it as a particular sideline to their legislative duties.

Mr. Foulds: He is interested in the therapy.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think I missed something here.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): He sure did. Try to keep up.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Doesn't the article refer to it as being fairly inexpensive?

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Mr. Bounsall: Well, it depends on how much you are going to pay the people that you bring in to provide the service.

Mr. Foulds: We could get volunteers from the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think we had better end it about here, boys.

Mr. Bounsall: One other thing that I would like to touch upon, Mr. Speaker, is that I happen to be the elected member in a riding in which the Conservative candidate published as his election expenses $50 and contra, and his election receipts $50 and contra.

Mr. Stokes: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. Welch: He meant et cetera.

Mr. Bounsall: The leader of our party mentioned this in his reply to the Throne Speech. His immediate reaction was that contra meant contraband. The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr), speculating with me what contra meant, said contra was a short form for $25,000. The only thing wrong with the hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside's assumption was that he thought a little too low; it probably was a short form for more like $45,000.

What bothers me about it is that this particular candidate ran a very lavish campaign in this election. We have seen nothing like it in the Windsor area. The amount of television advertising boggled the imagination of the supporters of our party in terms of toting up the cost. The newspaper advertising was perhaps not much more than the previous candidate for the Conservatives had done in 1967.

And you had a great big new or used—used I guess—breadwagon touring the riding handing out doughnuts and cookies throughout the whole of the campaign with a very gaudily painted: "A better slice for Windsor residents"—and so on. Such a blatantly expensive campaign in terms of what we are used to in the Windsor area, that on at least three public platforms during the course of that campaign—usually in the context of schools—that candidate was asked how much his election budget was.

And that candidate, and I can particularly remember his reply to the students of Forrester Collegiate, was that: "Once the election is over we all have to file a financial statement and it will all become clear then." So there's his answer: $50 and contra.

Mr. Stokes: And contributions.

Mr. Bounsall: The Election Act also says that the returning officer shall publish the abstract of what the returning officer is provided with. A detailed statement of all moneys exceeding $50 or its equivalent must be reported to the returning officer and he publishes the abstract. The Act also says in clause three of point 161:

> The returning officer shall preserve all statements and vouchers and shall, during the six months next after they have been delivered to him, permit any voter to inspect them on the payment of a fee of 25 cents.

And while we were very intrigued in our riding by what contra meant, we were not about to get involved with paying 25 cents just to find out what that figure meant. One of the advantages in this case of living in a university community with a very active political science department, is that you're surveyed almost to death by students in all political science courses.

For example, I think last weekend I gave three separate interviews to people involved in class projects, all on different aspects of political life, my campaign, and so on. And one of them chose to make his assignment election expenses in the area, and he chose our riding. And having only that which was in the Star, went down and paid his 25 cents—

Mr. Foulds: Last of the big time spenders.

Mr. Bounsall: —to be told by the returning officer that the Conservative candidate or his official agent—and/or his official agent—refused to provide any more detailed statement than: $50 and contra receipts; $50 and contra expenses.

How much more of a laugh can one of your candidates make of the Election Act that was passed in this House? When the hon. member for Scarborough West mentioned it, one of this candidate's Conservative colleagues and a member of this House, was sufficiently upset that that allegation was made about one of the elected members in this House, that you'll

recall he asked a question—and I quote from Hansard:

> The member for Scarborough West made certain allegations about a candidate who filed an election report of $50 and contra. I have waited very patiently for the hon. member to name that person. I am asking for it now, because it casts a slur upon everybody in this House.

Now that is one of your candidates and he refuses to provide anything else beyond that summary. And it is a bit unfortunate because although of rather, I would say limited intelligence, that candidate was rather a nice guy. He conducted the campaign in a very gentlemanly fashion. But this person, due to what he has done in his filing of election returns, has made certain that he has destroyed his credibility forever in terms of ever being a candidate for any office in the Windsor area.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go on too much longer. As the labour critic there are whole areas of general policy that interest me in the labour field—the 40-hour week, the tremendous numbers of plant closures and shutdowns and the various effects emanating from them.

Perhaps there is just one item, plant closures, which I might mention. Eaton Automotive moved out of Windsor some 20 years ago and settled in London. It is a wholly owned company of the US company, Eaton Yale and Towne Inc. A short time ago—this would be about eight to 10 months ago—Eaton Automotive closed down its London operation and moved its plant wholly to Ohio. Rumour has it from two or three different sources now, Mr. Speaker—rumours that have reached my ears—that this company is planning to set up again in the city of St. Catharines. I just wonder when this company, Eaton Automotive, having gone from Windsor to London 20 years ago, having gone from London to Ohio less than a year ago, as it sets up in St. Catharines will we be seeing it receive a forgivable loan for so doing. I will be watching with interest.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bounsall: St. Catharines is the rumour.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It is just a rumour.

Mr. Bounsall: I have heard it from three different sources. I would be interested to see what happens.

Mr. Gisborn: Sure they'll get one. They will just come and ask for it. They will get it. The less the company needs it, the easier it gets it.

Mr. Bounsall: I am glad to see that the minister would like to accept plants which have a long history of displacing their employees with no regard for their security or the security of the community, which is what he gets if he accepts that particular company there.

One other company that interests me, Mr. Speaker, is Duplate which up to 16 months ago had one of its two Canadian plants in Oakville. They closed down the Oakville plant and moved some of those displaced workers to the Windsor plant, the only other plant of Duplate.

No, pardon me, they had three plants. One was in Hawkesbury, one in Windsor, one in Oakville. They took the Oakville plant, closed it down and moved half of the employees that they could absorb to Hawkesbury, the other half to Windsor. That was 16 months ago.

I understand that notice has been received by all of the Duplate employees in the Windsor area that they are moving all the Windsor operations to Hawkesbury, consolidating them all in the one plant. Here you have a company moving some of its employees in a close-out situation in Oakville to Windsor, and within 16 months moving them out of Windsor. I'll have more to say in much more detail about plant closures and shutdowns later on this session.

With respect to some riding matters in the Windsor area, there are a couple that I would like to bring forward. One is the situation of the very great need of more Ontario Housing Corp. units to be provided in Windsor. At the moment on file—and this report is a month ago, through these winter months they increase—there are 908 family applications on the list for Windsor Housing Authority units. This you can assume would encompass somewhere around 4,000 people.

This is a small number compared to the number in the Windsor area applying for and asking for senior citizen accommodation. There are close to 3,000 applications in Windsor for senior citizen accommodation. If one looks at the DBS statistics, one finds that in the senior citizen range, 65 years and over, Windsor has the highest proportion of any city in Canada. It might have something to do with the fact that it is the warmest city in Canada, certainly in Eastern Canada.

The fact that there are that many applications on file for senior citizen housing, particularly in Windsor, cries out for at least five or six units accommodating at least 300

or 400 people to be built as soon as possible in the Windsor area.

There are several other areas of particular interest to people in the Windsor area that I could dwell on, one being the Peche Island situation. This involves an island in the Detroit River that the provincial government bought during the campaign to keep for development of some sort. They were careful to say at the time that they were not going to make any promises as to how soon that island would be developed.

It is an island that is probably not big enough to contain a provincial park, but I would urge this Ontario government to make plans for the use of the island—if not as a campsite, as a park for various groups in the province, such as Girl Guides, Boy Scouts—and to provide hydro, which is all that needs to be provided on the island at the moment and transportation facilities for the short distance from the mainland to the island. If they would provide simply that I would suspect the city of Windsor might be more than willing to take the further development of the island under its jurisdiction.

One point of interest: If any of you have ever driven along Highway 401 to Windsor, when you get about 25 miles from Windsor, midway between exits 6 and 7, you will hit this stretch, which continues all the way into Windsor; after about two or three minutes you will find yourself stopping your car, pulling over to the side of the road and checking to see how many flat tires you have.

The last 25 miles of Highway 401, in both lanes, coming in and out of Windsor, is a piece of highway that rumour has it was built as an experimental piece of highway—experimental in terms of the construction of materials used—to test a certain particular cheaper solution to highway construction. To anyone in the community who has driven on it for the past at least seven or eight years it obviously has been a patent failure. and I just wonder when the Department of Transportation and Communications is going to resurface and repair completely that stretch of highway.

Windsor is the city that is the largest point of entry for vehicle traffic into Canada. US people, coming to Canada for their vacations, get the impression as they cross into Windsor and proceed along our 401, that it is the worst piece of superhighway they have been on, or they are stopping every five miles to ascertain if they have flat tires. It's not a very good introduction to visitors and vacationists coming from the United States into Canada and certainly is not the best way to say "goodbye" to them after they have had an enjoyable holiday here.

I will just end my remarks, Mr. Speaker, with some brief comments about the draft report on secondary education. I will not say very much about it at this point because I am very confident that the final report will be substantially different from this draft report.

An hon. member: One would hope so!

Mr. Bounsall: It is quite clear to me that the drafters of this report, in terms of saying to the universities that they must be publicly accountable, have certainly mixed up accountability by the universities to the public with accountability to the government.

Mr. Gisborn: And the establishment.

Mr. Bounsall: It is quite clear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the three controlling groups they have recommended—the University of Ontario, the community colleges and the universities in Ontario— in fact will dictate and control, and make uniform, all educational endeavours in this province to the detriment of us all.

I just wonder about the remarks of Doug Wright, a friend and former colleague of mine on the faculty of the University of Waterloo, in the Wright report, where he says CUA already has all the control of the universities in Ontario that is being laid out in this report on secondary education, how the Premier of our province feels in terms of being in charge of secondary education in this province when the Province of Ontario, as announced by his right arm in the Colleges and Universities post, has effectively, and always had, through the committee on university affairs, the complete control of all universities in our province.

It would be interesting to know whether the Premier shares that feeling with the present executive assistant to the Provincial Secretary for—is it Resources Development? —Social Development. I look forward to the revised report on secondary education which, if it is not much different from this first report, will most certainly get a rough passage—if it does pass this House, Mr. Speaker, when the attempt is made for passage during the summer months, when both the students and the faculty of the universities are engaged mainly in other interests.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker,

I would like to join the long list of speakers here in the last week who have congratulated you on your election as Speaker of this hon. assembly.

You will have to excuse me, I am still not as familiar with the House as other members and I still have sort of a funny feeling when I address the Speaker and he is not here. But in any event, I hope the Deputy Speaker will convey my remarks to him.

I have had occasion in my short experience in this Assembly to observe the Speaker. I am convinced that he will take an impartial and objective approach in his decision-making in this Assembly. I consider his role somewhat onerous and difficult in a situation where the government is represented in such large numbers – although you would not know it this evening. I am satisfied –

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): A very good point.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Just move the adjournment of the House and watch what happens.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): There are nine of them.

Mr. Roy: I want to finish talking.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Yes. That is right.

Mr. Roy: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that you will give each and every member of this House a chance to represent his electorate to the fullest.

Je voudrais vous féliciter, M. l'Orateur, de votre nomination en tant que président de cette Législature. Je suis convaincu, d'après mon expérience encore assez limitée, que vous allez jouer un rôle impartial et objectif vis-à-vis de tous les membres de cette Législature. Vous réalisez, sans doute, que votre rôle devient plus difficile quand il existe une situation telle que dans cette Assemblée, lorsque le gouvernement est representé par une si forte majorité.

Si je peux me le permettre, M. le Président ou M. l'Orateur, je voudrais aussi féliciter le Lieutenant-Gouverneur qui, à l'occasion du discours du Trône, a profité de faire une allucation en français et ainsi mettre en pratique le droit qui existe dans cette Assemblée de parler dans les deux langues officielles.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to make a suggestion, I note that in the legislative assembly standing orders, standing order 13 permits the speaker to address himself to this assembly in both French and English. I think it might be of some consideration, if the system that allows certain members who have difficulty hearing the speaker to have a hearing aid if this facility could possibly be used to give simultaneous translation when one is addressing this assembly in the second official language Perhaps the hon. member who is speaking could advise the Speaker of the assembly prior to making his speech and we could provide over this system simultaneous translation. Then all members could enjoy the pearls of wisdom enunciated by the member who is using the second official language.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That assumes they will listen in French or English.

Mr. Roy: The member should just listen in French or in English.

May I take this opportunity as well, Mr. Speaker, to express my deep gratitude and respect to my leader for the way he has conducted himself, not only during the last provincial election but during his full tenure as leader of this party. I am convinced, and obviously the applause convinces me even more, that regardless of party affiliation all are in agreement that the hon. member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon), has earned the respect of this House and of the citizens of this province for his objective and level-headed approach to politics as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister of Correctional Services mustn't break his arm there!

Mr. Roy: The fact that he will remain as the member for Brant and will continue to make his usual valuable contribution to this House will be the only compensation we shall have for his loss as Leader of the Opposition.

I would not want to renege, Mr. Speaker, on my opportunity to thank as well the voters of Ottawa East for their overwhelming support during the last provincial election. I feel indeed privileged to have an opportunity to represent this great riding. It was often said that the citizens of Ottawa East were sometimes forgotten in this Legislature.

One can hardly blame the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), who, during the years 1967 to 1971, made the comment that he thought the hon. member for Ottawa East was just a figment of his imagination. As well I would like to congratulate the media, both French and English, who emphasized this fact to the electorate and to the members in the regional municipality of Ottawa Carle-

ton. I would like to assure the voters of Ottawa East that they shall now have a voice in this Legislature.

The riding of Ottawa East has a great tradition. I might point out that it is typically a reflection of what a national capital should be, where both linguistic groups live in mutual respect and tolerance for their respective languages, cultures and traditions. I am not suggesting by any means, Mr. Speaker, that there is not friction at times but giant strides have been made to ensure the cultural and linguistic survival of the minority. I suggest that such a riding is living proof that Rene Levesque is wrong when he calls French-Canadians outside the Province of Quebec "dead ducks."

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that I do represent all citizens of Ottawa East when I say that I am prepared to stand and be counted and say that federalism is still a valid option and that it is still the option by which both linguistic groups can flourish.

May I now make a few comments on the Throne Speech. After the election, Mr. Speaker, I attempted to advise the electorate that one would make every effort as a member of the opposition to be objective about government policy and government programmes. I always felt that a proper role of an opposition member would be to applaud and congratulate the government when he felt that such programmes or policy were in fact in the best interest of the citizens of this province.

Criticism should not only be negative, Mr. Speaker, but when necessary it must be positive as well. Unfortunately, in this case I have got problems. It is very difficult to be positive about this speech. Undoubtedly the government mentions many topics and programmes in this speech and in fact I would hazard a guess that there are very few topics which are not mentioned. It would be just as though the government sent out the experts and said, "Cover every conceivable situation that might affect the residents of this province." And the experts having advised the government, it seems to be satisfied simply to have mentioned them.

In order to be positive about the speech, Mr. Speaker, one must presume that the government will deal with these topics, but one is left without any ideas as to how or when.

A major part of the speech deals with federal-provincial co-operation in the areas of economy, employment, environment, etc. One can only applaud the government for encouraging such federal-provincial relations. And I support, Mr. Speaker, the provincial initiative in hosting a tri-level conference this year in Ontario, in which the federal, provincial and municipal governments will be represented.

The Throne Speech goes on to say that this government will continue to make constructive proposals. I underline the word constructive, because I felt that obviously this has to be a new approach.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Roy: For I suggest that the government, in the past year, has hardly been constructive, but rather negative, continually and persistently criticizing the federal government to a point where it smacks of partisan politics.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Singer: Except for the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) giving out maple leaf pins in China.

Mr. Roy: I would like to see this government take more initiative and stand up and take a position on such programmes as constitutional amendments and equalization payments. It should take a clear position, and not just vacillate, in areas such as that where the government of British Columbia, under the leadership of Mr. Bennett, has challenged the constitutionality of equalization payments.

This government, Mr. Speaker, should make it clear that it supports such a programme and that such a programme is important to the unity of this country, such as the railway was in the early part of this century, and such as bilingualism was in the 1960s and still is today.

Is it not important to this country that we do not have pockets of poverty, or have sister provinces where the standard of living does not compare at all with that of such provinces as Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta? How else can the federal authorities assure a proper standard of living to all citizens of this country and remove the great disparity that exists at the present time?

I would like to see this government take more initiative in the area of constitutional reform, because of the special relationship that it has with the Province of Quebec. It should contact the Province of Quebec and try to negotiate and alleviate the differences that this province has with the

federal government, so that we might, once and for all, repatriate our constitution.

There is mention, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs recognizes the need for stronger and more independent local governments, and in preparing future urban and regional plans, this government will be able to avoid a fragmental approach and piecemeal planning by achieving a closer partnership with municipal authorities. This is what is in the speech. Great words on paper. But this has hardly been the practice in the past, I suggest.

If future government policy is anything like the past, I predict that we shall have many problems indeed. This government's attitude towards regional government and especially that of the designated Minister of Finance and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough) has been to dictate to municipal authorities rather than to co-operate with them, and to impose on them the will of the senior government.

One could hardly call the past establishment of regional government in this province an overwhelming success. For example, in the judicial district of Ottawa-Carleton, all municipalities are unhappy about regional government in its present form. A month or so ago, Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Ottawa said in his 1972 inaugural address and I quote:

> I call therefore on the Minister of Municipal Affairs in the government of the Province of Ontario to give consideration to an early review and to study our present system of local government in this region at this time. This study should earnestly consider the amalgamation of all parts of regional government into a single political executive unit capable of providing the best management of the affairs of local government in the entire region.

I might point out that he made the statement with the full approval of his board of control and most of the members of city council. The response from the minister was a quick, categorical and emphatic "No." The minister suggested that he had a 10-year plan in effect and that no further consideration would be given until the government's 10-year programme had elapsed.

This decision, Mr. Speaker, was made without consultation with any of the government members in the Ottawa region and in fact without even consulting one of the members of the board of control, the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). One could hardly call that co-operation. What sort of attitude is this on the part of the senior government to dismiss categorically suggestions made by individuals who have to live and work with regional goverment in the Ottawa area?

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the appointment of the member for Ottawa South as parliamentary assistant might have some influence on this present government and its attitude toward regional government in the district of Ottawa-Carleton.

I would like to question as well what position this senior government will take in areas where, as we have noticed in the past while on regional government, council has to quit proceedings and everybody goes home because they don't have sufficient quorum. What is the position of the senior government in such an area?

Mr. Ruston: That is like it is here.

Mr. Roy: There are problems with the quorum here as well!

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): We are keeping it up. The opposition is keeping it up.

Mr. Roy: Right. A further area of concern, Mr. Speaker, is that of the government implementations of major recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity. The first week of this present sessions bears out the fears of the opposition members that by establishing the so-called policy or superministers the government is attempting to enlarge the gap between the executive arm and the legislative arm of the government.

As a new member one cannot help but be amazed at the offhanded childish approach of some so-called superministers who seem to bounce off questions under the pretext that it is not policy, or that it is not within their department, and so on.

I appreciate that it will take some time for the government reorganization to function properly. I would only hope that the present attitude of the government and of its policy ministers in avoiding their responsibilities to this House will not be indicative of future government action.

I trust as well, Mr. Speaker, that when the government establishes the commission appointed to review the functions and processes of this Legislature that it will see fit to appoint members of this Legislature to the commission. How else can the members put forth their views?

One has to be concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the role that this government expects

of individual members. Today, we had our first meeting of the committee on regulations and 12 members of this House attended this so-called committee. I am told that it was eight. In any event under the Regulations Act, here is what this committee is supposed to do, Mr. Speaker. I read here from section 12, subsection 3, of the Regulations Act which states:

> The standing committee on regulations shall examine the regulations with particular reference to the scope and method of exercise of delegated legislative power but without reference to the merits of the policies or objectives to be affected by the regulations or enabling statutes, and shall deal with such other matters as are referred to it from time to time by the assembly.

Mr. Speaker, we were sitting there and we were told by the legislative counsel that we were only to consider such regulations fitted within the four corners of the Act, not the merits or anything else.

In fact, in section 12, subsection 3, I see contradictions here as well. We should study the scope and method of exercise, and yet without reference to the merits of the policy or objectives. It would be somewhat difficult to look at the scope and exercise of delegated legislative power without looking at the merits of this. First of all there is a contradiction there.

We were told by counsel as well that these regulations were presently in force and as we were sitting there we, 12 members of this Legislature, had to consider whether the regulations fitted within the four corners of this Act. How idiotic can we get? We are sitting there just going through the motions actually. The regulations are already in force and what are we expected to do to find out whether the regulations are within the four corners of the Act—read the whole Revised Statutes of Ontario for 1970 which cover about six volumes of this size?

Mr. Speaker, if this is the role that is expected of members of this assembly, it was the unanimous opinion of the members on this committee that obviously we're going to waste our time as we're just going through the motions. If we are going to sit on committees like this we may as well not sit at all.

I suggest that possibly this should be brought to the attention of the Premier (Mr. Davis) or whoever is in authority now to find out if this is what we are expected to do, go through the motions? I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I for one will not attend this committee.

I cannot sit down either, Mr. Speaker, without first making some comment about the government policy in introducing legislation to prohibit the holding of more than one elected public office by any individual. Of course, the biggest sinners against this are the government members.

I have to wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the government is serious in its approach when I consider the fashion in which the Premier has dealt with the member for Ottawa South. Here we have an individual who undoubtedly was aware of government policy and yet has held two elective offices for the past six months. He is a member of the board of control, city of Ottawa; a member of Parliament for the riding of Ottawa South. True, he intends to resign sometime in April yet I find it strange that the Premier would give him additional responsibilities in this House when he still holds elected office on the municipal council.

If the government is serious, why does it give the member for Ottawa South additional responsibilities? Does the Premier intend to pay him additional remuneration as parliamentary assistant while he is still being remunerated at the municipal level to the tune of something like $24,000 a year? Mr. Speaker, how can one possibly take the government seriously on its policy when in fact and practice one of its own members is the first to breach it—with government approval apparently, because the Premier has given him additional responsibility and remuneration.

Let's look as well—and this has been mentioned by the member for Ottawa Centre—at the number of government members who are appointed to so-called commissions. These commissions apparently are supposed to be autonomous. Some have generous salaries. Is this not a conflict of interest?

I look as well at some of the appointments. We can just expect what sort of appointments we're going to get. We have Ward Cornell appointed to this plush job in London and I understand that now Ward Cornell is a public servant. Yet watching the hockey game last night I see Ward Cornell is still making advertisements for your friendly finance company, Avco.

Mr. Ruston: They charge 25 per cent interest, too.

Mr. Roy: Where is the government when one of its own servants is announcing on

public television? One can only have apprehension as well when one notices that further appointments are in line, for instance, in the area of secretariats to be appointed for the provincial secretaries.

Mr. Lewis: Think what he will do for the BBC!

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The journalist from High Park! How about that?

Mr. Roy: Pardon me?

Mr. Lewis: The journalist from High Park is not the agent general for Ontario in the United Kingdom.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: But he sure is worth a lot more money!

Mr. Lewis: He is not getting more money than the Premier.

Mr. Singer: Nor is he the head of the Water Resources Commission and getting more money than the Premier!

Mr. Roy: I would not say that.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) make more money than the Premier?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Ottawa East has the floor.

Mr. Singer: That is a secret, and he would rather not reveal it.

Mr. Lewis: That is most extraordinary.

Mr. Roy: One can only view with apprehension –

Hon. Mr. Winkler: One gets paid for what one is worth around here.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs was talking when he should have been listening.

Mr. Roy: What else is new?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I am always listening, particularly when the member for Downsview is talking.

Mr. Lewis: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Could I ask the member for Ottawa East, when Mr. Cornell was on the hockey game last night, could the hon. member tell me whether Mr. Cornell was on the programme live, or was he, in the practice of the industry, on an old tape?

Mr. Roy: What difference does that make?

Mr. Ruston: You've got to be crazy, man!

Mr. Drea: A lot of difference.

Mr. Ruston: Sit down, you old blabbermouth. What a stupid question.

Mr. Singer: It is not a point of order, either!

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Picky, picky! Ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East has the floor.

Mr. Drea: I asked for a point of clarification. Was it live or was it on a tape made months ago?

Mr. Renwick: Alive or dead, it doesn't matter. He's a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That may be so. I would not disagree on that one.

Mr. Roy: In any event, Mr. Speaker –

An hon. member: To the member for Scarborough Centre: Mr. Cornell is better on tape than he is alive.

Mr. Drea: He probably is. So am I.

Mr. Roy: – one can only anticipate and have a certain amount of apprehension of what's coming next as far as government appointments are concerned. I notice one of the recommendations of the government productivity committee is that a small secretariat be established for each policy field to provide the policy minister with an analytical administrative support. These appointments should be for specific renewable two-to-five-year terms. The search for suitable candidates should not be restricted to the public service and I am sure the government will follow this dictum.

I note with a certain amount of interest as well, Mr. Speaker, that as concerns criticism of the member for Ottawa South, the first one to do so of course was the member for Ottawa Centre. And, rightly so, the member for Ottawa Centre mentioned that the member for Ottawa South was milking the public at both levels. I find this interesting, because although the hon. member for Ottawa Centre is not on the government side he too holds two offices–as Member of

Parliament for Ottawa Centre and as alderman on Ottawa city council.

An hon. member: Aha! Aha!

An hon. member: How much does he make?

Mr. Foulds: He made that clear in his speech the other day.

Mr. Roy: Just hang on, you will get your turn.

Mr. Foulds: I had my chance. Wasn't the member listening this afternoon?

Mr. Roy: No, I didn't bother.

An hon. member: Thank goodness!

Mr. Roy: As alderman and as representative on a regional government, the member for Ottawa Centre is paid an amount something in the neighborhood of $9,000 a year.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Never that much!

An hon. member: Oho! Oho!

Mr. Roy: Now the hon. member states that he will not resign –

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: He is the one who was criticizing it, too, wasn't he?

Mr. Roy: The member for Ottawa Centre does state that he will not resign because he feels that his replacement should be elected, and not named. And I suppose there is some value, some merit, to his point of view, although it is well to consider that there is an election coming up in the fall at the municipal level and a by-election will cost something in the neighbourhood of $10,000.

Mr. Foulds: What price democracy?

Mr. Roy: Yes, what price democracy. Another point, and I think of more importance; is that city council in Ottawa—apparently with the approval of the member of Ottawa Centre—will ask the provincial government to allow that one alderman represent a ward; cut it down from two to one alderman. And apparently the member for Ottawa Centre is in favour of this, so why should he worry? There is another alderman in his ward anyway, so why should he have any concern about resigning?

Mr. Reid: He has got a 9,000 concern—

Mr. Roy: Now, there is an old saying in law, that when one seeks equity one must seek it with clean hands; or possibly I should mention a newer one which says, those in glass houses should not throw stones.

Mr. Renwick: It is an old saying in the courts too.

Mr. Roy: Monsieur le President, je ne voudrais pas manquer l'occasion de faire certains commentaires sur la—

Mr. Reid: Now he is getting dirty!

Mr. Roy: —politique du gouvernement telle qu'élaborée dans le discours du Trône, qui dit que ce gouvernement veut encourager et accentuer les services bilingues au niveau municipal et dans nos cours de justice. Comme francophone, Monsieur le President, je peux tout simplement dire "enfin!" J'encourage le gouvernement de s'efforcer à établir ces services au niveau municipal dans les régions qui le méritent, le plus tôt possible. Il y a trop longtemps que les francophones de certaines régions son obligés de fonctionner exclusivement en anglais. Je dois dire que j'ai eu l'occasion dans la région d'Ottawa d'encourager certains gouvernements municipaux à établir une politique bilingue. Malheureusement, durant cette periode il n'y avait aucune initiative du gouvernement provincial. Je voudrais voir la Province avoir plus d'enthousiasme vers le bilinguisme et donner en encouragement, soit par législation soit par subvention spéciale, afin de permettre à ces municipalités de donner un service dans les deux langues officielles. La même remarque s'applique pour nos cours de justice. J'applaudis aussi. Monsieur le Président, la décision du gouvernement de créer un poste supérieur dans le Ministère de l'Education et que ce poste soit rempli par un Franco-Ontarien.

Finalement en ce qui concerne le rapport "Symons" et je crois que la majorité des francophones de cette province sont d'accord avec ses recommandations. J'espère que les recommandations de ce rapport vont être maintenant acceptées par le gouvernement.

An hon. member: Oh, balls.

Mr. Roy: This is the reason I would like simultaneous translation—to educate a few of these members.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Les citoyens de cette—

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, can we have a little bit of order? I would like to listen to the member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, might the Speaker ask certain members of the party from which he was chosen to accord the member the respect that is due when speaking the other official language in this House?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I did not hear any undue interference.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: I think we should also show more respect for our hon. members.

Mr. Singer: These are remarks I hope the interjectionist caught.

Mr. Lewis: No, it is not the interjection, it is the comments that were made.

Mr. Roy: En ce qui concerne, M. le Président, la nomination d'un Franco-Ontarien à un poste supérieur, je voudrais voir se créer une position qui engage le processus de discussion. Je crains après ma question d'aujourd'hui au Ministre de l'Education que celui-ci va seulement avoir le rôle de conseiller n'aura pas de decisions à prendre.

Les citoyens de cette province, M. le Président, attendaient avec impatience le rapport "Symons". On l'accepte maintenant avec enthousiasme et j'aimerais voir le gouvernement légiférer que ses recommandation soient acceptées.

Chose intéressante, aussi, j'ai trouvé que M. Symons avait vraiment compris le problème et il a accepté d'étudier ce problème d'une façon globale et de faire non seulement des recommandations pour les francophones de la province mais aussi pour les anglophones. Je crois que ceci est important parce que souvent vous avez enseigné le français dans les écoles comme si il s'agissait de grec ou de latin.

J'encouragerais le gouvernement à étudier aussi les recommandations du rapport Wright, car il y a beaucoup de ses recommandations qui ont reçu l'appui des Franco-Ontariens.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the government's policy in the area of education since 1968, and I would encourage the government to give serious consideration to the recommentions of the Symons report, I think it important that this man be given due credit. I think he has understood the aspirations of the Franco-Ontarians and the gentleman has decided to accept a global approach to the full problem.

This gentleman, Mr. Symons, has been criticized in this House, and I give him full marks now that he has taken a courageous and logical approach to this problem.

I am concerned though, and I raised this in the House today, that the appointment of a Franco-Ontarian to a senior position will be outside the decision-making process of government. A report was tabled, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday which indicated that the chairman of the standing committee on French-language schools would be outside of this process. And yet I notice that the Symons report, if I might just read it, states on page 36 that:

"Le sous-ministre-adjoint des écoles de langue française would be in a position of responsibility with an opportunity to exercise real and meaningful leadership."

The minister hedged on that question, and I would hope that this would not be a token appointment, but that this gentleman could really participate in the decision-making process within government.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roy: I think it is important as well that all members of this House give credit to one of the recommendations in the report, the final recommendation—recommendation 76, Mr. Speaker. It reads:

> The commission recommends that a special department task force be created to determine how the needs of an English-speaking community in the field of bilingual education can be best met.

I think the president of this commission really put his finger on the problem when he stated—and if I might just read briefly at page 61:

> It is one of the absurdities of our country's history, including the history of education of this province, that with few exceptions English-speaking students until recent years have been denied the opportunity of studying French with French-speaking teachers.
>
> With the exercise of a little imagination this opportunity might have been developed so very naturally in Canada to the mutual advantage of English-speaking students and the French-speaking community.
>
> Instead, a pattern was set whereby most English-speaking school children were taught lifeless, desiccated French by English-speaking teachers, for most of whom it was a foreign or dead language rather than a modern living tongue.
>
> For a generation the teaching of French

> was handled as a subject akin to Euclid or Greek rather than as a contemporary language that might provide a means of communication between peoples who share a common country. It was a wretched and depressing experience imposed upon countless thousands of Ontario school children, and it is remarkable that any sympathetic feeling for French-speaking Canada has survived the experience.

I think this gentleman has understood the problem and I encourage the government to give serious consideration to these recommendations.

The member for Scarborough Centre mentioned last week that he would not like to see a Moncton in his province. I found that to be interesting, because it was only two years ago in the city of Ottawa, a city where the French minority comprised 32 per cent of the population—I am talking about Ottawa, the national capital; I am not talking about Vancouver or Moncton or other cities in this country—where it was impossible for French-speaking citizens of that city to get French services or to get one word of French out of city hall.

You talk about Moncton. You want another example? The French-Canadian organization representing the half a million French in this province receives $13,000 from the Quebec government and from the Ontario government it receives $2,500. We were told –

Mr. Drea: Mr. Speaker, there must be something the matter with the members for Scarborough. This is the second time that I have stood up; the hon. member for Scarborough West also stood up. I am having a great deal of difficulty listening to this speaker; I want to listen to him. I really wish that if people want to carry on a conversation and make derogatory remarks, they have plenty of space elsewhere in the building.

Mr. Gisborn: It is your members.

Mr. Cassidy: It is your members down there.

Mr. Drea: I don't need to be heckled; you know the point I am making.

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member for Ottawa East continue please?

Mr. Roy: We were told, Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of '67 that services in our courts would be bilingual. We are still waiting.

As one who has been practicing in a criminal court both for the Crown and the defence, let me explain to you some of the ridiculous situations that we run into. We have situations in the criminal courts where the accused is French-speaking; the judge, the Crown attorney, defence counsel, all witnesses and police officers give their evidence in French; yet it is taken down on the record in English, just for the sake of one part of the Judicature Act which states that all proceedings in our courts should be in English only.

This goes on in an area like Prescott and Russell, where 90 per cent of the population is French-speaking or many of the people cannot speak English. So I endorse the government's policy in this area.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I detect an air of cynicism—and I suppose this was mentioned today by the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook)—on the government side. It does not seem to be too concerned about any comments to the Speech from the Throne. In fact, during the speeches by my leader and the leader of the NDP it was obvious the ministers were not interested. But of course they have an excuse. They were kept elsewhere by their ministries. But as I look over to the other side and see the sparse attendance of government members, I have to wonder what emphasis the government is putting on the role of this House.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The member should look at his own benches first.

Mr. Roy: Yes, consider proportion-wise how many are missing.

Mr. Foulds: We could have defeated the government an hour ago, it had nine members in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Compare proportion-wise.

Initiative, enthusiasm and leadership are words—

Mr. Singer: Fifteen out of 78 in attendance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Ottawa East has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Even the Water Resources Commission should be able to do that calculation.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): There are 13 empty Liberal seats.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, initiative, enthusiasm—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Wellington-Dufferin should go home and count his money.

An hon. member: Get your speech on activated sludge ready.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: There is enough of it over there.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, initiative and enthusiasm and leadership are words that sound great at election time but are hardly put into practice during the government's mandate. Hopefully, some day this will catch up to the government. They will not be able to pull the somersault that was done on the Spadina Expressway forever. You know, the government's attitude on this project reminds me of an arsonist who sets fire to a building, calls the fire department and takes credit for having saved the building.

Mr. Yakabuski: Smooth manoeuvring.

Mr. Roy: Who approved of, and acquiesced in spending $150 million for a hole in the ground in the first place? Admittedly they pulled it off brilliantly, but would it not be reasonable now for the public of this province to expect, after the Spadina decision, a concrete government policy in the field of public transportation? Yet there is nothing specific about it in the Throne Speech. The public of this province will not tolerate forever a government that during the election said it would give priority to people over cars, whose main platform was Spadina—you know this was the crux of the decision that made the Premier—yet it did not spell out any alternative to remedy the problems caused by the decision. This, Mr. Speaker, is arrogance of the worst kind. And one day they shall have to account for it. Thank you.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, may I add my congratulations to you, not because it is customary to do so but because I have a warm and sincere appreciation of your excellent judgement and the impartial and even-handed way in which you discharge your duties. I may also—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Hear, hear.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How is it that Mr. Speaker Reuter is always in for the beginning of every speech and then he leaves?

Mr. Taylor: That is the good timing of the Tories.

Mr. Speaker: I work hard at it.

Mr. Taylor: I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to my predecessor, Norris Whitney. I think most of you have known him for a long time. He certainly served my riding well during his 20 years as the Conservative member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: Seeing the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) tonight kind of reminds me of him.

An hon. member: Great fella, great fella.

Mr. Taylor: I guess that is unanimous.

Mr. Lewis: All of us, the Tories with lambs.

Mr. Taylor: He was a great fellow, a big man with a big heart and he had a lot of lambs, I say to my friend from Scarborough West. He did indeed, and on occasion I think he brought that fact to the members' attention.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yes; did he put them on the voters' list?

Mr. Taylor: No, but he certainly was very concerned about the wolf situation in our riding and I may say that—

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): He was a sheep farmer—he raised sheep.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, yes, but I have learned that they were not wolves at all, that they were coyotes. I think that they were crossbred intentionally and otherwise by the Department of Lands and Forests.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: Anyway that was the subject-matter of another address. I did not mean to draw that particular point to your attention; I just want to say that Norris Whiney was a tremendous person. He had a tremendous perspective on the problems of our riding; he had an uncanny understanding of the people and their problems. I think you will agree that you never saw him in anger; he was humble, kind, proud, and may I say that the people, certainly of our riding, appreciated very much the service that he gave to our community and to this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear. Get my "hear, hear" on the record. I want Norris to read it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: When I think of my riding, some of you may, and some of you may not

know that it is Prince Edward-Lennox, a truly beautiful land. I invite you all to join with me some time in touring this beautiful land. It is not only a beautiful riding but there are many beautiful people. Wherever you go you will see wonderful scenery. That dramatic view from the high shore road is certainly in the Prince Edward part of the riding. You have beautiful areas in Napanee and South Fredericksburgh and—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Any sand dunes left?

Mr. Taylor: —we are very conscious of that, and also of our environment.

Oh, we have plenty of sand dunes. I will just maybe touch upon that in a few moments. But, I must say that we have certainly undergone a great change.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: Some of you may or may not realize the production that we have in the way of agricultural products. There is no place in Ontario that grows better apples than Prince Edward county.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: There is no place at all. You can check all the authorities that you like but you will find that there is no better place than Prince Edward county for apples.

An hon. member: You will never get a unanimous vote on that.

Mr. Taylor: You don't like those apples? All right.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Is the member an apple polisher?

Mr. Taylor: Unfortunately our canneries have been closing and our cheese factories have been closing—

Mr. Gisborn: That is the Tory government's fault.

Mr. Taylor: —and our farms are either closing or getting bigger. Many are staying the same size—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That is progress.

Mr. Taylor: —but, there are problems in the farming industry. Sometimes, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, about the policies—and I am not here, of course, to knock the federal government, or the great government that we have experienced in Ontario during the past many years, but—

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Go ahead and knock them.

Mr. Taylor: —I often wonder whether our philosophy of making everything so big is a great one. I just question that. I have found that—

Mr. MacDonald: Particularly the government majority.

Mr. Taylor: I can understand the member's concern for that. I do not share that concern with him.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the people's concern.

Mr. Taylor: Apparently it was not.

Mr. MacDonald: In retrospect, I think they were unhappy.

Mr. Taylor: Now you are trying to look into the future.

An hon. member: About 42 per cent of the vote.

Mr. Lewis: If you took a poll today you would find yourself in third place.

Mr. Taylor: That is the member's submission.

Mr. J. McNie (Hamilton West): I will share the cost of the poll with you.

An hon. member: Especially if you took a poll in this House.

Mr. Taylor: In any event, Mr. Speaker, I do question the larger units of farming, because we seem to get with these bigger units of production just bigger problems. If you look at the problem of the hog producers, for example, you will see that there are problems there, because of the bigness and specialization and marketing problems. When you look at the incentive to get people into the egg and poultry business, we have of course, these producers of eggs and chickens and we have big problems there.

An hon. member: Picking on the roosters.

Mr. Taylor: And I might say, certainly in our riding, we look forward to the early report that will solve some of the problems that our egg producers suffer. I believe that my party is very conscious of those problems and I just hope, and sometimes pray, but I am assured that there will be an early solution in that regard.

Mr. Cassidy: Tell the farmers to go to the pork barrel like Ward Cornell.

Mr. Taylor: No, that's not a good recommendation either, because we've had a lot of—

Mr. Foulds: It is exhausted, eh?

Mr. Taylor: —recommendations and so-called experts that have come in to advise us. I find that the more specialization we get, the more the people know about less and less, as the saying goes, until they know a lot about nothing. And I'm concerned about that.

I'm concerned about the family farm and what's happening to the family farm. By that, I'm talking about the little man. Just the salt of the earth in our riding certainly, and I believe in Ontario and probably in this whole land of ours.

It's the little fellow who is sort of caught in this rapid change. And I think that we must look after him. We must be considerate of him so that he does not get pushed off the farm and into the urban areas and become a greater problem in that area. He has his dignity about himself. He has his roots and he has his self-respect and I believe we have to look after that.

An hon. member: Come on over to this side.

Mr. Taylor: If the hon. member subscribes to my view then maybe he should be changing from his party to ours.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds a little paternalistic.

Mr. Taylor: I certainly believe in the worth of the individual and individual effort. And I think we should award something to the individual.

Mr. Gisborn: It's $115 a month for the single person under your system.

Mr. Taylor: That's reward. Maybe we should reward the individual. There seems to be a tendency to look upon the whole system as something that should be homogenized, so that we have an institutionalization of equality—homogenized society where we all work for the big company store. And I don't think that we should develop that kind of a system.

I think that maybe we should give a little more consideration to the work norm, because certainly there is lots of room in my riding for people to work. And we're looking, you might say, for more inducement, for more opportunity for people to work, because we're a strong believer in accomplishment and doing things with our hands and being proud of those accomplishments.

We have, I might say, spent millions of dollars educating our young people and, unhappily, our young people seem to be the biggest export that we have to offer. We must do something to keep our young people within the riding to develop the riding more. Not to preserve it as a rose garden for the rest of Ontario.

We're not interested in turning the riding of Prince Edward-Lennox into an Ontario Disneyland for everyone to come in and see. What we want is to have a proper mix of recreation and industry and commerce and residential development. And this is something that the people must be shown. We're looking for great things from this government.

Mr. Gilbertson: And you'll get it.

Mr. Taylor: I'm confident that we will get it and that's why the people of my riding have sent me here.

Mr. Gisborn: Norris said that 20 years ago.

Mr. Taylor: You can see that we certainly have achieved some things. Those of you who have visited there I think will agree to that. But I do think that we need some more communication with the departments and ministries of government, certainly in the direction of overall planning—not that we want the experts from Toronto to come and plan our communities for us but we want to know what is in the minds of these experts for our particular riding.

In other words, we want some guidance. We don't want bureaucratic control for the very simple reason that we are not in favour of regional government Toronto-style. We don't expect to wake up one day and find ourselves a region of government with an administrator from Queen's Park or anyplace else. What we are looking for is more communication.

In that regard, I might just comment on the remarks about the Sandbanks, because they are a part of our heritage in our riding. While they are an important part of our riding, they have probably engendered more concern by those people outside the riding than those people within it. Our concern in the riding is job opportunities so that we can keep our people there. While industry and tourism must come in they do not have to be mutually exclusive.

When the Pits and Quarries Act was made to apply to Hallowell township, there was a lack of communication in that the county of

Prince Edward was unaware that this regulation was coming into effect. Of course it did not affect only the operations of the cement company, but also the operations of the county of Prince Edward, the township, and a number of smaller operators who just wonder what this means to them. So we must have communication with the government in areas like that. But I am assured and I am convinced that there will be no loss of jobs in Prince Edward county because of the application of that statute. What I am talking about is communication of this type of thing before it is made to apply in the riding.

There are things that we are looking for from this government. The Bay Bridge that connects Belleville to Prince Edward county is something reminiscent of prehistoric times. I suppose it is a replica of something that might have been found on a cave drawing; it was certainly made for another era. We must connect the city of Belleville with Prince Edward county so that we can open up this whole area to the people of this province and of this dominion and introduce them to the county and its wonderful attributes. So, we will look forward to the province's assisting with the development of a high bridge—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Another one?

Mr. Taylor: —another bridge, so that we can cover our area from the west as well as from the east.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It used to be roads; now it is bridges.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just spent about $10 million on the Whitney bridge.

Mr. Taylor: We look forward to that. We need more roads. That is my next point. Thanks for bringing that up. Yes, we want another road. This is in Lennox.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): I will give you back some of ours.

Mr. Taylor: Fine, we will take whatever you have; we don't throw away anything. We don't waste anything. What we would like and what we need is a development road in that area of Bath, so that we can direct the traffic off Highway 33, which follows that beautiful scenic lake route. As I have mentioned, the whole riding is a veritable jewel in Ontario—

Mr. Gisborn: It only goes into part of it.

Mr. Taylor: But we must have this road to get the traffic off that scenic route and to provide for development in depth.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is where you are going to put that power plant.

Mr. Taylor: That's right, and that has been the problem, because some of the members don't realize just what we have to offer. They think of Lennox as a generating station and they think of Prince Edward county as Prince Edward Island. I am trying to educate them to realize just what we have and where we're going.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Thanks for clearing that up. Very nice of the member to explain that to us.

Mr. Taylor: As a matter of fact, the tourist operators tell me that last summer an American came to the tourist bureau and, with a sigh of relief, said: "Well, where's a good place to stay in Prince Edward Island?" They hated to tell him he was not there, but in any event he was convinced he had arrived. Well, he had arrived in another sense.

I think that what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, and what I am encouraging this government to do, is to develop this other route so we can have industrial growth around the generating station and around the new cement plant that is going in.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You'll be able to use that for three or four years.

Mr. Singer: That's pretty good for a Bay St. lawyer from Prince Edward-Lennox.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Taylor: Oh, yes, we have all types of things. We need this and we must hammer away until we get this alternative route for the development of Lennox and to add more industrial growth and a better tax base. I am sure all of you will assist me in that regard.

Mr. Foulds: We'll give you the rest of the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Taylor: Well, we don't worry about the Spadina Expressway.

Mr. Lewis: What about an airport?

Mr. Taylor: As a matter of fact, I'm glad you raised that question. We have a very strong pressure group that has determined the best place to have an airport, from all points of view—

Mr. MacDonald: They want it?

Mr. Taylor: —is in the Long Point area in Prince Edward county.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, now that's settled!

Mr. Singer: That is obvious!

Mr. Taylor: I might say one of the objections was that the planes might have to circle over the international boundary. If you are promoting an airport in my riding, I can assure you that you will be welcomed by some people—but in only one regard.

Mr. Lewis: Well, between the hydro plant, the cement plant and the industrial complex is there room for an airport?

Mr. Taylor: You bet there is room for an airport. We have some smaller ones now.

Mr. Singer: What about Norris's seat? Where are you going to put that?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): In Downsview.

Mr. Taylor: I didn't hear that.

Mr. Lewis: Have you told Norris of your plans?

Mr. Taylor: Oh, Norris is working very hard within the riding on all kinds of these developments, and we are proud of that too.

Mr. Reid: Maybe you can put a distillery in the corner.

Mr. Taylor: Well, maybe you'll criticize the planning that has gone into your area, but I can tell you that we don't want these perfectionists who plan for pristine things. After all, planning by some of these people is planning perfection—

Mr. MacDonald: With this government, you don't need to be afraid of perfection.

Mr. Taylor: —but perfection is finality and finality is death, and we don't want that in Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. MacDonald: He is a philosopher.

An hon. member: Don't you want the resurrection down there also?

Mr. Lewis: Did you hear that, Mr. Speaker? You took note of that?

Mr. Gilbertson: Sock it to them.

Mr. Taylor: Something else. When we talk about industry, we want good wages too—

Mr. MacDonald: All that and good wages too?

Mr. Taylor: —and a decent standard of living. We want that too.

Mr. Gisborn: Like Proctor-Silex?

Mr. Taylor: Oh, we've got great industries in our county, but we're looking for more and we're looking for more help from the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. White). As a matter of fact, I have been assured of his co-operation and we are getting his co-operation. I am sure we will see great growth over the next four years.

Mr. MacDonald: It is going to read well back home anyway.

Mr. Taylor: No question about that.

Mr. Foulds: Putting industry back there!

Mr. Taylor: Just a minute, we are conscious of our environment. The member mentioned the Sandbanks, but I tell him this that we have to have something more constructive—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Less destructive. The member means less destructive.

Mr. Taylor: Just a minute, more constructive. That is right, it depends on which way one looks at it. What we would like is for this government to assist our area in a pilot project for the treatment of waste, garbage, and I might say—

Mr. Young: There wouldn't be any garbage in Prince Edward-Lennox, would there?

Mr. Taylor: We do have some—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Why doesn't the member tell the government to send it down to—

Mr. Taylor: —opposition visitors coming round and we end up with garbage.

Mr. MacDonald: The member sounds as if Prince Edward-Lennox has been neglected.

Mr. Taylor: Well, in some areas, it has!

Mr. Cassidy: What was the former member doing all those years?

Mr. Taylor: He was looking after the basic things.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Taylor: Now we are looking at some of these facilities that the sophisticated cities have.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the member certainly knew his predecessor all right.

Mr. Stokes: He was pretty basic all right.

Mr. Taylor: What we want, of course, is financial help to develop this project and we

will prove to the members how well it will work. That is for garbage and sewage disposal.

Mr. Singer: Garbage, yes!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Send down a few trainloads.

Mr. Taylor: And if the government can help us with water filtration and distribution systems, we are going to look for that too. After all—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Send down a few trainloads.

Mr. Taylor: —we are not asking for anything more than the rest of the province. We just want our share.

Mr. Singer: All garbage.

Mr. Taylor: No more, no less, just our share.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Did the Premier hear that? Garbage dunes!

Mr. Taylor: We are looking for great things from this government.

I might say, if we get away from the county for the moment—the time is drawing on—but I might give a suggestion to my friend from Humber. That is that this government might even consider winding up or dissolving this Addiction Research Foundation and placing that facility under the Department of Health—

Mr. Lewis: Maybe moving it to Prince Edward-Lennox?

Mr. Taylor: —and they might even make Dr. Malcolm the head of that facility.

Mr. Lewis: What is this vendetta against the Addiction Research Foundation?

Mr. Taylor: There is no vendetta.

Mr. Lewis: Does the member for Dufferin-Simcoe—

Mr. Taylor: That is just a suggestion. I would like in closing to say that we have an open mind insofar as denturists are concerned. We have a lot of older people and they need their plates so that—

Mr. Lewis: The member can stop after "open mind."

Mr. Taylor: —we would like to look into this, too. If we can provide cheaper dental plates to the older people of my riding, I am sure they would be appreciative of the government's action in that regard.

Mr. Foulds: I thought it was open mouths, not open minds!

Mr. Taylor: I am saying that we must look into this and explore every possibility of reducing health costs, whether that be through the provision of dental plates or what have you. I am sure we will get all the support and all the co-operation from this government and I shall look forward to reporting back to the members in the near future.

Mr. Renwick moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 16, 1972

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Leluk, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Roy, Mr. Taylor 495

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Renwick, agreed to 522

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 522

No. 15

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, March 17, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 17, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today in the east gallery we have as visitors students from Port Credit Secondary School; and in the west gallery students from St. Victor Separate School of Scarborough and Blakelock High School of Oakville.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Which ministry would you like a statement from?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, yesterday at 5:40 in the afternoon, the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) made certain personal accusations against me which are absolutely false, sir.

The accusations were that I had stated certain things in this House which were, first of all untrue; and second, that I was afraid to state them outside for fear of being sued for libel.

Sir, this is untrue. I have already made these statements, not only outside the House, but in writing to members of the cabinet of the government on the side of which the member for Humber sits.

Sir, I do not accuse him of deliberately misleading the House. I am quite sure it took place through his natural ignorance.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): The member has never been wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I listened to the words of the hon. member, and I would ask him to indicate to the Chair what privilege he feels has been breached.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, the privilege that has been breached is dual: my privilege in stating facts to this House without being accused of misleading the House, especially when those matters are facts; and secondly, sir—

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Prove them!

Mr. Speaker: Order! That is not a point of privilege and there can be no point of order at this time in the proceedings.

Mr. Deans: He was accused of misleading the House. He is clearing it up.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, I am—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member withdrew the remarks of deliberately misleading the House.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member withdrew the remark "deliberately misleading" but left the remark "misleading the House". Surely the member for High Park is entitled to correct the error in the remark of the member for Humber when he said he was misleading the House?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It is a clear point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is a matter of opinion whether or not the hon. member is misleading the House.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I can see no point of privilege. No privilege has been breached.

Mr. Deans: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker: Surely if a member makes a statement in the House and another member claims that he has misled the House, the member who made the original statement is entitled to state the facts of the case in order that it can be determined whether or not he did, in fact, mislead the House?

Mr. Speaker: The matter of privilege is a privilege extended to the members of the Legislature. At the very first opportunity which presents itself to any hon. member, he can rise on this point of privilege for dispensation by the Chair or to correct the situation. No real occasion has arisen to introduce any point of privilege, nor is it, in fact, a point of privilege as far as I can see.

Mr. Shulman: Sir, on this point of order, if I may: if a statement is made about a member of the House, surely that member has a right to correct it. That is exactly what I have done this morning.

Mr. Leluk: That is exactly what I did.

Mr. Speaker: At the first opportunity, the proper opportunity that presents itself. This is not a proper opportunity.

Mr. Shulman: That is the first proper opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made his comments. We'll let it go at that.

Oral questions.

An hon. member: That's all he wanted to do anyway.

Mr. Shulman: Sue me! I will say it outside again.

NEW COMPLEX FOR WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Did he, as part of the cabinet, approve the decision taken by the Workmen's Compensation Board to enter into an arrangement with a corporation called Fidinam Investments, in order to purchase land at the corner of Yonge and Bloor and build a new complex which would have as its major tenant the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, as I recall it, this matter doesn't require approval of cabinet. Cabinet was informed but it was a decision made by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the Premier mean there was no particular document, nor order in council, nor written approval of an agreement made between the Workmen's Compensation Board and the corporation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'll check this out. I don't recall an order in council. There may have been. I don't know that it calls for approval.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, there was an order in council.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Was there? The member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) who was Minister of Labour at the time, might be able to answer more fully to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier inform the House as to whether Mr. Patrick Saunderson, the president of that corporation, was in fact a fund raiser for the Conservative Party or in some other way did service for the party?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the Leader of the Opposition that at all. I have no idea.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Would the Premier inform himself on that matter; and as to whether the corporation made a contribution to his party before this election campaign? He will or he will not do that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Sure.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): By way of supplementary: Could the—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Lewis: That is rather uncertain. Will the Premier report it to the House or will he just inform himself.

Mr. Speaker: One member on the floor at a time, please! Does the hon. member for Wentworth have a supplementary? Will he please state the question?

Mr. Deans: Thank you, I am trying. The present Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), formerly the Minister of Labour, will recall—and I'm asking the supplementary of the Premier—that on Dec. 14 last I asked a question in this House in regard to the investment of the Workmen's Compensation Board in the building being constructed at Yonge and Bloor.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): What is the question?

An hon. member: At 2 Bloor St. East.

Mr. Deans: The Minister answered that, in fact, the Workmen's Compensation Board—I asked the question:

> Am I correct in assuming from the statements the minister makes that the board is involved not only in the leasing of the property, but is directly involved by way of investment?

It went on. The answer was:

> No, Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Board are lessees and in addition they are owners of a particular piece of valuable property.

How can it be then that at this point we are informed through the press that the board have made available to the construction company involved some $15 million in cash, when on that date I was told that there was no direct investment the board in the undertaking?

An hon. member: How come?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Labour, now the Minister of Transportation and Communications, may have that information. He may not. The board may have decided to invest funds. This I can't tell the hon. member. I'd be delighted to find out.

Mr. Deans: So would I.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: Could the Premier tell us the role, if any, that the Treasury Board plays in this kind of transaction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter is a decision made by the Workmen's Compensation Board. The Treasury Board is not directly involved in these things. I don't know whether one can draw a parallel to other institutions that do report to the Legislature, but the Treasury Board has no direct responsibility for a decision of this kind.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is the Premier in fact saying that the Treasury Board had no knowledge of this; did not consider the various implications of it; did not examine the various documents concerning it; in fact knew nothing about it until the story appeared in the paper this morning?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said—

Mr. Singer: Will the Premier tell us what he meant then?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I said that the Treasury Board does not have any direct responsibility. It is not a question of the moneys being like other estimates or funds within the government itself. These are outside the government's direct jurisdiction.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, I didn't ask the Premier about direct involvement. I asked the Premier specifically what the Treasury Board knew about it and what action the Treasury Board took in relation to this pending deal.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to ask some members of Treasury Board to ascertain that for the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: The Premier is on the Board. Can't he tell us himself?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I am not a member of Treasury Board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter supplementary to what the hon. member for Downsview has been raising, surely it would have to be a matter of policy before this commitment of what amounts to public funds could be made by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

As a matter of fact the funds are public in a narrower measure in that they are the contributions of the working people and the industries of this province. Surely the Premier would agree that on a matter of this import—where according to the leader of the NDP a cabinet order is required, in fact the decision is taken by the cabinet—surely it would have to involve the Treasury Board and the okay of those people like the Premier himself, who was then a part of the Cabinet, for the policies involved in the decision.

Mr. Speaker: Is that a direct question?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Or a statement?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sure, sure! Isn't the cabinet involved to that extent? How can the Premier then say that this board is independent of cabinet decision. Obviously it is not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the board is not independent of cabinet decision. The cabinet determines certain policy directions. In the same way it is not independent of this Legislature if this Legislature makes certain determinations. But as a matter of practice, the Workmen's Compensation Board has done a number of things without the direct involvement of the cabinet. I shall ascertain whether there was in fact an order-in-council and whether or not Treasury Board did deal with this particular proposal.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am even more confused. There was, of course—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will ask the question.

Mr. Lewis: I am, I am!

Since there was of course an order-in-council—order number 3197 in the year 1971—discussed in this House on Dec. 14 last with the Minister of Labour, I take it that the building of this particular structure could not then proceed without an order-in-council.

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is not able to answer, could he please refer these questions to the Minister of Transportation and Communications who was the Minister of Labour at the time. I take it that it could not proceed without the order-in-council, that is without cabinet approval

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether there is any statutory requirement or not. I asked the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the former Minister of Labour, to inform himself, when I learned that this question might be raised here this morning. I am sure he would be delighted to answer any questions.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member for Scarborough West has the next supplementary. He was waiting his chance.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, does the Premier recall—I take it his minister does not recall—that at the time of the passage of the order-in-council there was apparently indicated a $15 million outlay by the Workmen's Compensation Board for mortgage purposes?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall the discussion of a $15 million outlay at the time of the passing of the order-in-council—

Mr. Singer: The Premier doesn't recall very much about what goes on, does he?

Mr. Speaker: Order?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but it could very easily have been the case.

Mr. Lewis: Will you redirect the questions, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: No, I shall not. The member may ask the question of a minister, but if it is a supplementary that is being asked—

Mr. Lewis: It must be to the Premier, yes.

Mr. Speaker: —he may redirect it.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier may redirect it. Can the Premier redirect the gist of these questions to his minister, who sits waiting breathlessly to answer us?

Mr. Singer: Also bereft of knowledge.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I realize the Minister of Transportation and Communications is not really breathless or necessarily that eager—

Mr. Singer: Or knowledgeable!

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): So why deny him the chance to give us the knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House—I have said just about five minutes ago that it was suggested to the Minister that he bring himself up to date to discuss this matter this morning. There is nothing to preclude the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of the New Democratic Party from directing a question to him. It is very simple.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, so that it will be in order and please the Premier, I so direct these questions to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Will he inform the House as to the nature of the business with Fidinam Corp. regarding the Workmen's Compensation Board's deal with them?

Hon. Mr. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): What a way to run an opposition!

Mr. Bullbrook (Sarnia): What a leadership race that must have been with you two!

Mr. Deans: That is the statement the minister was going to make in December, remember?

Mr. Lewis: You mean he has a prepared statement, and we have gone through this whole charade?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Precisely. Why doesn't the member ask the right man the right question. He'll learn.

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to make a statement I can—

Mr. Singer: Really a game of one upmanship. It proves how smart the minister is.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Proves how dumb the member is.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I can answer the questions of the hon. members of the opposition, and I will answer them on the basis of the material that was in my hands when I became Minister of Labour. This was one of the first matters with which I dealt, and it is on the basis of the material that was given to me at that time that I then took the matter to cabinet. I had to take the matter to cabinet simply because the Workmen's

Compensation Board may lease without an order-in-council, but in order to sell and in order to buy an order-in-council is required.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was the Premier at that cabinet meeting?

Mr. Singer: Or does he listen if he goes?

Hon. Mr. Carton: The first thing I inquired Mr. Speaker, was the need to move. Was there a need on the part of the Workmen's Compensation Board to move? This is really the *sine qua non* of any move.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I suppose it is.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Right! In order to assess whether or not the move could be made I talked to each member of the Workmen's Compensation Board, the three independently. I not only—

Mr. Singer: Some of whom weren't talking to each other.

Hon. Mr. Carton: For your information, Mr. Speaker, and I direct this to the hon. member for Downsview, I find that if you want to get the true answers you speak individually to the people concerned. It is not what comes out in caucus, for example, it is what comes out individually.

Interjections by hon. members.

An. hon. member: Did anybody talk to Cauley?

Mr Lewis: He wasn't even there.

Hon. Mr. Carton: He was not there at that time.

In any event, I was assured by each of the members of the board, the chairman, Mr. Legge, the vice-chairman, Mr. Decker, and the other member of the board for whom I have a great deal of respect, Mr. Douglas Hamilton,—I inquired into the need to move and I was assured there was an absolute need to move. I was assured in fact that preparations should have been made many years ago.

Mr. Lewis: Did each of them know the minister was talking to the other?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister let them in on this little conflict of his?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member is really turning into being the comic of the House these days.

Hon. Mr. Carton: In any event, on the basis of what they advised me, I then was assured that a move was needed.

Incidentally, there had been a study going on for some five years as to the requirements for the move. There had been some studies done as to whether or not additions may have been made to the existing building. This was not found feasible, and therefore one of the important factors in this whole move would be the need to sell the building at 90 Harbour St. This was one of the financial criteria that was determined by the board when they entered into this complete transaction.

First of all, these are the financial criteria, and this information, sir, was in my hands since last April. The financial criteria are as follows:

> The developer must be prepared to purchase the board's present land and building at a price approximating current values to ensure an equitable return on the board's 1953 investment by today's valuations.

May I add, sir, that the company that we are leasing from—Fidinam—submitted an offer of $3.5 million, which was at least a half million dollars more than any of the other eight companies.

Mr. Singer: Is that an irrevocable offer or—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Notwithstanding that, and with all due caution I asked for an option for a further year in order that if the opportunity came for a better sale price we would be able to accept it, and this was granted.

Carrying on, sir; The other financial criteria—and bear in mind this was what was presented to the companies involved which were interested in building this particular building:

> An opportunity should be provided for the board to invest in the mortgaging of the development to provide both security of tenancy and a useful and secure investment of funds at a high rate of return.
>
> The board should have the opportunity to own the land, in total or in part, on which the development is constructed as a further security and financial advantage.
>
> The rental rate for the new accommodation must be competitive and it must

recognize the value of the board as a prime tenant. Additional tangible allowances at optimum levels are required for incidental expenses, such as partitioning, for decorating and for parking. The financial agreement should provide for additional space to be available to the board at reasonable cost in future years.

Those were the financial criteria Mr. Speaker.

The criteria for accommodation were as follows:

The building must have sufficient space to meet the present needs estimated at a maximum of 210,000 sq ft and additional space for expansion in the next 20 years, which is estimated at a further 80,000 sq ft.

Because of the large computer complex, humidity, temperature and static electricity must be controlled. This would require first class air conditioning and double-glazed windows.

Lighting should be at the 100 foot-candle level in all work areas. Uniform modules are required for lighting, windows and power and telephone services to facilitate interior design planning. Considering the board's organization structure, column-free floors of between 15,000 and 16,000 sq ft are desirable for best space utilization.

Free access to the building by pedestrians and handicapped persons was essential.

A safe location is required for loading and unloading of vehicles, including taxis and the board's rehabilitation centre bus. Unimpeded freight pickup and delivery services must be facilitated. Adequate parking space on the pay-for-use basis must be available for visitors, and in addition, sufficient parking space for the board's own vehicles.

Next are the location criteria, sir.

The building must be located as to provide optimum access by public transportation for staff and visitors. The location must provide fast access to major automobile routes. Access to rail, air and bus transportation facilities must be provided. The location must be prominent and easy to find for persons unfamiliar with the Toronto core. The location must provide sufficient cafeteria and/or restaurant facilities on an immediately available basis to accommodate the board's 1,600 staff and the probability of additional facilities in the future.

Banking facilities immediately adjacent to the board's premises are desirable—particularly of those banks with which the board conducts the major proportions of its business.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the information, I think all members do. But I really think that we are taking the time of the question period for what amounts to—

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): The member wanted the answer.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second now.

Mr. Deans: Just wait a minute. Don't get too involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: —not simply an answer, we are getting virtually a ministerial statement. But, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: I am on a point of order, sir, can I finish?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member for Scarborough West had risen on a point of order. I would ask the hon. minister to please be seated.

Mr. Lewis: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that in December last the minister made a commitment to the House that he would, he said: "Insofar as the matter is concerned"—precisely this matter—there is a very lengthy explanation involved and I will refer it to the order paper. I can provide these fairly shortly, Mr. Speaker—meaning the explanation.

Now what was a commitment to the order paper is now turning out to be a lengthy explanation during the course of the question period and I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, if you could add a few minutes to the question period so that we can pursue these matters.

Mr. Speaker: I had the feeling that the words of the hon. minister were developing into a ministerial statement, although in my view it hasn't gone an excessive length of time at this moment. If it consists of very much more, perhaps we should leave it until ministerial statements, at a more appropriate time; or if the House is agreeable we will add to the question period the length of time taken by the statement.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I apologize. This is an important matter and I think that it has to be dealt with in detail.

Mr. Lewis: We just want some time left to ask the minister questions about it.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Carton: Sir, there were 12 organizations that were interested in making submissions. When the criteria were determined and presented to the 12, four of them were not interested and there were eight submissions made. The eight submissions made were by Fidinam Ontario, City Park Holdings Ltd., Great Northern Capital Corp., Olympia and York, Hammerson Property Corp., Cadillac Commercial Properties, Harbour Square, Bregman and Hamann, and Metro Centre Developments.

Mr. Lewis: Is it true that all of those companies contributed to the Conservative Party?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Everybody contributes to the Conservative Party.

Mr. Shulman: If they want to stay in business.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about this Sanderson man.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The last four—

Mr. Speaker: The time for this exchange will not be added to the question period.

Hon. Mr. Carton: The Hammerson Property Corp. Ltd. submission had a total rentable area of 232,000 sq ft, which would not provide for adequate future growth and therefore this was declined.

Cadillac's proposal at Bay and Charles St. was unsuitable because the floor areas of 27,000 sq ft were too large for efficient space utilization by the board. In addition, Cadillac did not want to purchase the present premises and also the rental rate was too high.

Harbour Square could not present a specific plan in terms of cost, rental or purchase of the board's present premises. It was too indefinite, Mr. Speaker, and this was rejected; likewise the Metro Centre Development proposal.

The four that were left were Fidinam Ontario, 2 Bloor St. E., City Parking Holdings Ltd., 88 King St. E.; Great Northern Capital Corp., Dundas at Chestnut; and the Olympia and York location at University and Wellington.

I have a chart—with all the criteria—setting out how each of the last four placed in this particular chart. The financial considerations were these: Fidinam offered $3.5 million for the board's existing premises. The second highest bid was $3.25 million by City Parking Holdings. Fidinam offered an opportunity to invest $15 million in a first mortgage on the development at 10 per cent interest for 35 years.

The Great Northern Capital proposal was $10.5 million at 9.5 per cent for 30 years. City Parking proposed $12 million at nine per cent for 35 years, and Olympia and York did not want any investment in their particular premises.

Fidinam's rental rate of $7 per square foot is five cents higher than City Parking and Great Northern, and 30 cents higher than Olympia and York. However, they offered 6,750 sq ft of space at $3 per square foot for storage, which more than offset the difference.

In addition, Fidinam offered $250,000 for internal finishing and 30 free parking stalls for board vehicles. By contrast, City Parking offered 50 free parking stalls only, while the other two developers offered no incentives.

On the location criteria, the Fidinam development is superior to the other three from every viewpoint. It is a development that is one of the best known and in one of the most important sections of Toronto, with excellent access both by public and private transportation.

On the accommodation considerations, again Fidinam was superior to the other three developments and met all the board's criteria. It is a first-class accommodation by all modern standards and the proposed rental recognizes the value of the board of a fine tenant.

City Park Holdings' proposed building on King St. E. is a single building with limited parking facilities and the board would be dependent to a large extent on outside restaurant services. Its most significant disadvantage is the absence of double glazing which may result in humidity, temperature and static electricity control difficulties. The Great Northern Development in Chinatown plans for 11,000 sq ft areas on each of its upper floors, and this is well below the board's criteria for optimum benefit in departmental groupings and interdepartmental travel.

Olympia and York, by contrast, at 22,000 sq ft per floor and with 85 foot candle lighting, would not satisfy the board's criteria.

Taking all these criteria into consideration, sir, the recommendation of the board was that this particular submission by Fidinam be accepted.

I have a chart, and bearing in mind the leader of the New Democratic Party's remarks, I will not read each one of them.

There is a chart here, sir. I do not profess to be a financial analyst, but they can be examined. The thing that appealed to me the most, quite candidly, and this is the basis upon which I made my recommendation—bear these figures in mind, sir, these are the net annual leasing cost statistics relating to the four final submissions: The net annual leasing cost of Fidinam having regard to all the factors, was $636,000; the net annual leasing cost of City Parking was $1,248,000; the net annual leasing cost of Great Northern was $999,000; and the net annual leasing cost of Olympia and York was $1,459,000.

So by far, the net annual leasing cost of the Fidinam project is very much lower, in fact it is one-half of two of them and two-thirds of the other of the four proposals.

Bearing this in mind, sir, I was concerned because of this particular fact and I have never met the gentleman involved. I called Mr. Saunderson and had him attend right in this Legislature in my office downstairs on the first floor; the first and only time I have ever met him—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister and he had a meeting on the second floor.

Hon. Mr. Carton: —and I inquired as to their finances. I was assured at that time that CN Investments were investing $30.5 million, and there was another very substantial financial backer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Thirteen minutes will be added to the question period.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, at the end of that statement, was that CN Investments or CP?

Hon. Mr. Carton: CN Investments.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the minister if, as a part of his review when he took over the portfolio, he examined the reasons given by the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board for locating this ultra-expensive facility at the only place in town where the two subways cross, when an alternative north of Highway 401 on the proposed extension of the Yonge line was already owned by the Workmen's Compensation Board, and would have the added advantage of being of far easier access to those many people who do business with the board who drive in from outside of town. Did he consider, from the point of view of his responsibility as minister speaking for people dealing with the board from across the province, that alternative which had obviously been opted for by people on the board some years before?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The member should be aware that the subways cross at some other point.

Mr. Singer: The Bloor and Yonge subways cross at some other point?

An hon. member: On the University line, yes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I inquired about the possibility of constructing the premises on the acreage—the member is talking about the acreage in the north?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, I inquired about this, Mr. Speaker, and very definitely was told by all three commissioners that this would not be a practical solution because of the fact that it would not be accessible.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Would not be accessible right on the 401?

Mr J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That is right. Not accessible for the Workmen's Compensation Board members!

Hon. Mr. Carton: This is what I am told.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary: This is a matter that is a substantial issue—

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am talking about the acreage where the Workmen's Compensation hospital is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The point really is whether or not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think the point really is whether or not a facility such as this has to be built in the heart of Metropolitan Toronto, on the most expensive real estate and in one of the most expensive buildings that could possibly be procured.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is one instance where the people would be adequately served, and those people working for the WCB could be conveniently served, by building this facility outside of Metropolitan Toronto. Surely this is one area where the minister should have given his grave concern.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I did give this my grave concern and this was one of the matters that was discussed at cabinet. This was gone into; it was the conclusion, based on information that was given to me by the people who are on the Workmen's Compensation Board, that it could not practically be located in an outside area, and in particular at the place on Highway 401. All I can do is take the advice of the people who are dealing with the workmen's compensation cases.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I will go further: I think that location on 90 Harbour St. is a ridiculous place to have for the Workmen's Compensation Board people because of its inaccessibility down there.

Mr. Deans: So do I.

Mr. Renwick: I agree with that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the minister is making it plain then that this is the policy decision on the part of the whole cabinet, not just the Workmen's Compensation Board. Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I stated at the outset that we had to get approval of cabinet in order to have the order-in-council to allow: (a) the sale of 90 Harbour St.; and (b) the purchase of part of the property at Bloor and Yonge.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think it is a waste of the workmen, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: By way of a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth has a supplementary.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have one supplementary question, a technical question. Were there finders' fees on the $15 million paid by Fidinam and did they go into the trust fund of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister attempt to find out the answer for the House?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary—and I have two or three supplementaries—since the minister's details were a little hard to follow, will the minister table in the Legislature all of the agreements, contracts and other documents relating to this sale so that we can have ample opportunity to examine them?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I will table whatever contracts are available. Bear in mind there is an option; we have an option for one year on the sale of 90 Harbour St. Notwithstanding that I am convinced we got better than market value—and this is based on the advice of two or three consulting firms that felt we would not obtain that price—and, as I say, subject to the fact that the matters may not be completed, I would be very happy to table all the information I have given this morning, including the comparative sheets.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the minister is overly defensive. Surely if there is a document that is part of a pending deal, a copy of that could be tabled so that he could be advised of it. Is the minister suggesting that he is going to withhold certain documents because the deal is not completed, or is he prepared to take the public of Ontario into his confidence and table all the documents relating to this deal in this Legislature within 24 hours?

An hon. member: How about Sunday morning?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I cannot undertake to table documents that I do not know even exist, because this has not been completed.

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, if there is a pending deal there must be a contract now. If the cabinet approved of something in April, it must have been on some sort of a contractual basis. Surely there are records relating to that. Can the minister not table those documents in the Legislature so that we can examine them and come to whatever conclusion we might choose to in regard to them?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I have no objection to this, Mr. Speaker, but obviously I will not undertake to do it within 24 hours.

May I point out, incidentally, that I understand there is a committee meeting on March 29 and I would suggest this could be gone into at the same time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain why we will not give a commitment to table, at the first convenient moment, the pertinent documents here in the Legislature without looking for an out?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am not looking for an out, Mr. Speaker; I will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the minister also table those management consultant studies and other documents which determine the actual location of the board? I concede it is a tough problem to resolve about where one locates, but surely if they decided on Yonge and Bloor there must have been some analysis of the flow of claimants, of the outside Metropolitan Toronto traffic, of the routes, of acceptability; whether they are rather more highway-oriented than subway-oriented or otherwise.

Surely there must have been something other than a seat-of-the-pants feeling about where it should be located. Because it is the opinion of many, Mr. Speaker—through you to the minister—that the location served the convenience of certain senior board members, but not in fact the pattern of claimant flow or of the companies involved.

I think the Legislature is owed an explanation for the actual choice, given the availability of the alternative site at much less expensive outlay.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the consultants I mentioned were the consultants that were brought in to determine whether or not the building at 90 Harbour St. could be sold, whether it was feasible to make an addition to that particular building.

But I would imagine that the answer that the member wants—through the Speaker to the Leader of the New Democratic Party—could be provided by the Workmen's Compensation Board itself. They are the ones, Mr. Speaker, who would be in the know as to the flow of claims as to where the particular people came from.

Mr. Lewis: Didn't they give the minister that information when he talked to them individually?

Hon. Mr. Carton: They gave me that information verbally. They told me that this was the best location, yes.

Mr. Lewis: On what grounds? What reasons did they give the minister? Did they say that it was comfortable for them personally to be on the subway; that they had a special traffic in claims from downtown ridings? There is a large province here. What did they do other than follow a hunch? What did they give the minister as evidence?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker—and this is apart from what I was told by the Workmen's Compensation Board officials—I would suggest the hub of a metropolitan area with two million people is not a bad place to locate.

Mr. Lewis: No; I am saying it is a tough decision, but I would like to know what went into it.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Again Mr. Speaker, I was advised this was the best location. It was simply on the basis of the facts having regard to the claimants. It was the claimants, not members of the board, not members of the staff. It was the claimants.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Starting with the Premier, I wonder if I may ask him a supplementary. Do I take it from his remarks, in regard to the policy of the government and of cabinet, that it is indeed the policy of the government to allow boards, commissions, and perhaps government departments, to invest public moneys in private enterprises such as we heard about this morning?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that this doesn't happen with great regularity, it is not a question of complete policy. If it makes sense from the economic standpoint for the Workmen's Compensation Board to invest its funds in investments that will pay back a return, and where there is some ownership or equity involved as I understand it, it may make great sense to do so. But this doesn't pertain to most other government agencies—certainly not the government departments. I can't understand that part of the question from the hon. member for Rainy River at all.

Mr. Singer: It is a very good question. Certainly it is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It isn't a very good question as it relates to departments of government.

Mr. Singer: It is about time that—

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, the Premier has indicated this morning that he knew nothing—

Mr. Speaker: What is the question?

Mr. Reid: Does the Premier know what is going on? He indicated earlier he didn't know anything about this. Yet he stood, Mr.

Speaker, and said: "No, this is not the policy." He said on the other hand he didn't know anything about this particular deal, when he was a member of that cabinet that passed the order-in-council—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with respect, that is not what I said. I listened very attentively, as I would assume the hon. member for Rainy River has listened, to the very excellent explanation given by the former Minister of Labour. As I listened to the explanation—

Mr. Singer: It was less than excellent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: These matters are all questions of judgement, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Downsview doesn't feel the explanation given by the Minister of Transportation and Communications is really a very full explanation, a very reasonable one?

Mr. Singer: It is not even adequate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But his assessment, Mr. Speaker, like so many other assessments he has made in the past, has been somewhat erroneous, as results on Oct. 21. would indicate. I would assume, being human they will be erroneous judgements in future.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the Premier going to pull that scoreboard thing on us again?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

DOWNTOWN TORONTO TRADE CENTRE

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Development if he can give the House the information that was contained in his statement to the press regarding his lease on facilities for a trade centre in downtown Toronto, which we read about a day or two ago. Would he not follow his own admonition of making such statements to the House?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, in fact a trade centre was announced some months ago. What we did the other day was to show models of the facility, in an audio visual presentation showing artists' depictions of various possible exhibits.

Mr. Reid: With John White standing behind it!

Hon. Mr. White: We had some number of Ontario-manufactured products there for the edification of the press, and apples and cheese and other fine products from rural Ontario.

Mr. Reid: And a little baloney in the picture.

Hon. Mr. White: None of this could have been accomplished in this chamber. That's the reason this was held elsewhere.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: What is the department paying for those facilities and what is the term of the lease?

Hon. Mr. White: The total cost is approximately $400,000 a year, and I think my memory tells me that—

Mr. Singer: What is $400,000?

Mr. Reid: That is a lot of cheese.

Hon. Mr. White: Well, do the members object to this? Just so we'll know. Do they object to this?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Go ahead. I asked the rent; let's have it.

Hon. Mr. White: I think the rental part is $205,000, but I would want to confirm it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is the term?

Hon. Mr. White: I will have to get that information.

IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT ON STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, a final question, as far as I'm concerned, of the Premier. Is he going to announce the appointment of an implementation committee pertaining to the recommendations of the federal royal commission on the status of women as they pertain to this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the question of government policy in this matter will be announced in due course.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): What was it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I saw that.

PAYMENTS TO FORMER WCB VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General. I assume he would wish to make a statement in respect of moneys paid to the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have received the figures from the Workmen's Compensation Board and I have them for tabling this morning.

By way of explanation, I would advise the members of the House what is in the statement that I have prepared, and I think it best if I simply read it. The reference is to J. F. Cauley:

1. Payments based on accumulated vacation and sick leave credits made between May 2, 1969, and Aug. 19, 1971:

May 2 to Dec. 31, 1969—$18,173.75; Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 1970—$27,001; Jan. 1 to Aug. 19, 1971—$17,135.25; a total of $62,310.

2. Retroactive salary increase for the period Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1968—$8,125.

That was based on the order in council that I referred to the other day, changing the salaries of the members of the board of Workmen's Compensation effective Oct. 1, 1967.

Mr. Bullbrook: Was he a member of the board?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct.

Mr. Bullbrook: Was he a member of the board when the order in council was passed?

An hon. member: No.

Hon. Mr. Bales: It was made retroactive to Oct. 1, 1967.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is the minister's legislative authority for so doing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: In the order in council there was a change as well for the board as of Oct. 1, 1969, and that did not apply.

Mr. Bullbrook: Section 62 gives the minister the power to pass orders in council for members of the board. Was he a member—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Sarnia does not have the floor. The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary: I cannot believe this. Is that what the minister is tabling?

Hon. Mr. Bales: It was the information that was requested of this House and I'm pleased to provide it.

Mr. Lewis: No; come on!

Mr. Deans: The minister can't be pleased.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has got to be kidding. He had that information from the Globe and Mail four or five days ago.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: That is the member had it from the Globe and Mail!

Mr. Lewis: What does he need to come in with that for?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The member asked me the other day.

Mr. Speaker: Would one of the members please take his seat?

Mr. Lewis: I understand why the minister would want to sit in these circumstances. I'll remain standing.

Hon. Mr. Bales: I'm obeying the Speaker's rules.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, why is the minister deliberately evading the questions that have been asked of him all week? What has he got to hide?

Why will the Workmen's Compensation Board not give him a breakdown to report to this House of the actual accumulated sick leave credits and vacation pay which would equal the sum of $63,310, if I heard him correctly? Why is none of that information available? We had the Globe and Mail figure many days ago.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, may I read from Hansard of Tuesday, I believe—

Mr. Lewis: Well there have been several—

Hon. Mr. Bales: Just a minute. Tuesday's Hansard, and it is the member's request: "By way of supplementary, would the minister be kind enough to table in the House tomorrow"—and that was Wednesday, we didn't sit—"the actual amount of money which has been paid in order to differentiate it from what has been written."

Mr. Lewis: Well all right then. May I quote from Hansard of yesterday in which I asked the minister to explain first—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. minister has given the reply to a question. Does the hon. member have a further supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I have a further supplementary. The minister knows the intent of the question. This is dissemblance in the true meaning of the word. This is the definitive, the quintessential meaning of dissemblance, this is! What a performance!

Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, why is the minister refusing to give the details of that to which we are entitled, inherent in the question I asked, and which I particularly set out specifically yesterday?

I asked him, by way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—to refresh his mind—how he reconciled the board's policy of the maximum amount which can be given by way of sick leave credit and vacation pay to an employee. I asked him to explain what it was. How it can be that the Dec. 31, 1968, notice of credits which J. F. Cauley received showed 351 days of attendance credits and leave of absence plan, and 25 weeks of outstanding vacation credits; and even taking into account the months of 1969, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister to explain how they would reach a figure of $62,300, which was at least $10,000 inflated beyond what it should be.

I asked the minister further to explain why he was receiving salary cheques throughout. I asked the minister to explain why there were a number of normal deductions including—what is it, limited—

Mr. Deans: Long term disability.

Mr. Lewis: The long term disability which you do not deduct from sick credits, as I understand it.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, I asked the minister to flesh out all the information which was required in detail. He said, if I recall, that he had an overall figure from the board the night before which didn't satisfy him and that he was going back for the details. Now he presents us this morning with the overall figure. Where are the details?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the Workmen's Compensation Board to calculate the figures. I wanted them checked properly and I am satisfied from their assurances this morning that this has been done. The actual details must be in their own records and the board itself must deal with those matters. The member himself—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is a hearing before the standing committee of this House where representatives of the board will be there with the necessary detailed information.

Mr. Lewis: Shameful performance!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: The board is again walking all over a member of cabinet, Mr. Speaker, which is the normal practice of that board.

Mr. Singer: There isn't one of them who is prepared to be frank with the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Bales: We are being perfectly frank.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, why doesn't the minister simply state to this House that he was asked by the Workmen's Compensation Board to use his powers to buy their way out of a very embarrassing situation, rather than have a clean termination of the services of a man whose abilities were no longer respected by the board?

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is not the case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister would be safer to admit it.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The member opposite received information from the board at his request yesterday, so I am advised, and it sets out the provisions whereby a person of long years service with the board and nearing retirement may receive payments related to his sick credits and holiday credits. It is on that basis that Mr. Cauley has received payments.

Mr. Lewis: No, that is not true.

Mr. Deans: There was not sufficient—

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—no, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I will listen to the point of order.

I wanted to interject something regarding this form of debate. It seems to me this is a complete misuse of the oral question period.

This has developed into a full-scale debate, in addition to which it has been clearly indicated that the Workmen's Compensation Board will appear before one of the standing committees of the House, at which time this sort of questioning and debate may take place.

It seems to me that further questioning of this type on this topic during the oral question period will be out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I speak to a point of order for a moment? I haven't risen in this House this morning. I wanted to direct a supplementary question in connection with the payment of $8,125. Nothing has been asked in that line; I submit to you most respectfully I should be entitled to put that question.

I agree perhaps the form of the dialogue that has taken place has been in the nature of a debate, but I ask you to permit me to put a supplementary question as should be my right.

I rise therefore to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I regret that I cannot permit any more supplementary questions on that topic.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order—

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, Mr. Speaker, most respectfully to you sir, I have not asked one question this morning. Now, I suggest to you, if I may—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I suggest to you that we do indulge the leader of the New Democratic Party—and justifiably so; this was the issue that arose through him—but why am I not entitled to ask a question now?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Because the Chair has determined that there have been sufficient and a reasonable number of supplementaries. And I so rule.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have two points of order I would like to make.

The first point of order relates directly to what the minister just said, which I would like profoundly to correct. I received a submission from the board yesterday. It indicated the formula on which moneys were extended to a person by way of early retirement plans. It did not tell me, however, how Mr. Cauley received $10,000 or more beyond what such a formula would normally provide. And that is the question that I had asked of the minister. That is the first point of order.

The second point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that although I accept the decision you have rendered—

Mr. Speaker: Order! That cannot be a point of order. What the hon. member asked and what the hon. minister gave by way of reply takes care of the situation. There's no point of order.

Mr. Lewis: The other point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that while I respect your decision —I have to, I am a member of this House— I tell you, sir, that your office is now being used to protect the board from the Legislature and to make it possible for the minister again to avoid his responsibilities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I have a question, a new question?

Mr. Speaker: Well, the Chair is and always has been flexible. I will permit the hon. member for Sarnia his question.

AUTHORITY FOR PAYMENTS TO FORMER WCB VICE-CHAIRMAN

Mr. Bullbrook: This is a new question that I will direct, sir, because I don't want to challenge your office at all and I disassociate myself from the inference and implication of the remark of the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to direct a question to the Attorney General. Can the Attorney General assure this House that the $8,125 paid to Mr. Cauley pursuant to order-in-council was by virtue of section 62 of the Workmen's Compensation Board Act and was within the power of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council so to pay, since Mr. Cauley wasn't a member of the board at the time the order-in-council was made?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the Act before me and I am not sure what section of the Act the member is referring to.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, it is the section that gives the minister power to pay the board.

Hon. Mr. Bales: May I just proceed? There was an order-in-council passed changing or increasing the salaries of the members of the board, and some time subsequently there was an order-in-council accepting Mr. Cauley's resignation.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

PITS AND QUARRIES REGULATIONS

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, a very mild question for the designate Minister of Natural Resources. Can the minister tell the House when he intends to place Orillia township under the pits and quarries regulations?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, and Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I met with a very interested group from that particular area and I assured them at that time that I would review the priorities which we have established for the designation of townships in southern Ontario; and I intend to do that.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, what recourse do those citizens have in Orillia township in dealing with Limestone Quarries Ltd. As the minister knows, the blasting operations of this company having caused considerable physical damage to the properties; having caused lowering of the water table; having caused contamination of the water supply; having caused enormous discomfort to all of the community immediately on the environs; they apparently have no protection from the minister. What other recourse might they have; short of civil suit?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I did explain to that group when I met with them, Mr. Speaker, that until the area is designated, their only recourse would be through the courts.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is it not possible to hasten the regulations in this case to somehow facilitate the rights of the people involved as well as the rights of Limestone Quarries Ltd.?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I assured them that I would be doing this.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister give them a date?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I can't give them a date at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I draw to your attention a statement made by the hon. member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) in his address in the debate, I believe yesterday, on Mar. 16. I quote from the hon. member's statement.

> Early on the second Sunday prior to election he [referring to Mr. Ben, the former member for Humber] went to this home with two police officers, the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Brant, and interrupted holy mass. They tried to force their way in to canvass these elderly citizens.

I would say to you, sir, on a point of order, that this statement on the part of Mr. Leluk is incorrect. He is not in possession of the facts and he does no service, certainly not to myself, nor Mr. Ben—nor himself—when he makes a statement in those terms.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence moves that when this House adjourns today, it stand adjourned until Monday, Mar. 27.

Mr. Reid: That is the first thing the minister has done.

Mr. Singer: Now we know how the minister thinks. It certainly requires a lot of thinking to determine whether you should do that, or not.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If so, it is an improvement over the hon. member's performance.

Mr. Reid: I know what I'm doing. The minister doesn't know what he is doing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Because he won the election and we didn't?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: We always know what the hon. member is doing.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

REORGANIZATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to Provide for the Reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Motion agreed to; first reading the bill.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TOURISM

Hon. Mr. Davis moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief word of explanation!

The first bill I introduce is the omnibus bill dealing with the restructuring of government that is taking place. It provides, basically, for the provisions of the Cronyn report, and they are brought about by the task force recommendations. There are some 20 parts in this bill, but this is the omnibus bill dealing with the restructuring of governtaking place.

I think it is obvious to the members opposite that the term "department" will disappear. It will be replaced by the term "ministry."

One interesting aspect of the omnibus bill is provision for the integration of the Ontario Water Resources Commission into the regular structure of the Ministry of the Environment. This is contained within the omnibus bill.

The other four bills that were introduced relate to the renaming and restructuring of the individual departments. There is also contained in the initial bill, or the first bill, provision for the parliamentary secretaries and the honorarium they are to receive.

Mr. Singer: What happens to the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root)?

REAL ESTATE AND BUSINESS BROKERS ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Real Estate and Business Brokers Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, these amendmends extend the prospectus requirements, which used to apply only to subdivision lots or units outside Ontario, so they now apply to subdivision lots or units in the province as well. The purpose of the bill is to prevent the sale of our north in huge lots, as is now taking place in the United States without any government supervision or any control whatsoever of this particular racket.

ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE SCHOOL, ELORA

Mr. Worton moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to incorporate St. John's College School, Elora.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BUSINESS CORPORATIONS ACT

Mr. Deacon moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Business Corporations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend the grounds upon which a person is disqualified from acting as a director of a corporation. At the present time if a person is an undischarged bankrupt he may not be a director of a company, but he may be a director even though he is in a mental institution or serving a prison sentence.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I should like to take this opportunity to inform the hon. members that the annual Speaker's dinner will be held on Wednesday, April 12.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the Throne debate and I would like to add my compliments to you, sir, on your elevation as Speaker of this House. I find you, despite the difficulties which these tense moments that occur in the House lead to, a man who is eminently fair and a man whom, over the course of years, we here have learned to respect for your innate sense of fairness in the way in which you conduct the affairs of the House.

I think also the chairman, the Deputy Speaker, is also a man who is in the same tradition as yourself and will lead to a real understanding of the mechanisms of this House for the purpose of transacting its business. Each of you, and both of you together, have, I think, a dedication to the transaction of the business of the House, which is a necessary counterpart to the political partisanship which so often preoccupies our time.

I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) is not in the House. I wanted to say to him, not because he was delivering any kind of valedictory address, simply that I enjoyed his remarks in the Throne debate. I think that the Leader of the Opposition has a unique capacity which no one else in the House really has and that is that he can evoke memorable word pictures of the Province of Ontario which remain in a person's mind long after he has spoken about them.

I think particularly of this last address of his when he evoked the scene of the hydro man coming to the door of the farmhouse in the Province of Ontario. I think all of us can, in our own way, picture exactly both the humour and the sight and the scene that his words brought to our attention.

I think also he evoked a picture for all of us when he described the take-off of the airplane to take him on the flight over the autumn of the Province of Ontario through to Rainy River. All of us would lose if he were not in the House, because I myself carry memories of that unique capacity of his to evoke those memorable pictures.

I want, Mr. Speaker, to say to the House that at the provincial level of politics the riding of Riverdale is in very good health. I assume very shortly it will be in equally good health federally. It leaves something to be desired in a portion of the area covered by Riverdale riding so far as its municipal health is concerned, but certainly as a result of the election in October, the Tory party is in disarray in the riding of Riverdale. There is very little doubt that there is but a small remnant of the Liberal Party in the riding of Riverdale—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The member will admit that we are in better shape than the Tories.

Mr. Renwick: I won't even admit that you are in better shape than the Tories. I think that when the federal election is fought in the riding of Riverdale it will likely be a contest between my colleague the member for Broadview for the New Democratic Party and the Conservative opponent, that is, of course, if the Conservative Party is able to find somebody to contest the seat against John Gilbert in the federal election which, I understand, is somewhat doubtful.

I want to say to the House that we have also a unique riding in that we have within the boundaries of Riverdale riding, at the east end of the riding, the headquarters of what is known as Western Guard and what was formerly known as the Edmund Burke Society. At the west end of the riding, we have the headquarters of the Maoist Canadian Labour Party. The stabilizing influence, of course, in and throughout the whole riding is the New Democratic Party.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hear, hear.

Mr. Renwick: That is why we are able to maintain—

Mr. MacDonald: The Edmund Burke Society is taking over from the provincial Tory candidate.

Mr. Renwick: —such strong support in Riverdale riding. Riverdale riding, for those members of the House who are not aware of it, is east of the Don River, with the exception of that part of it which was gerrymandered out of the area covered east of the Don by the commission which redistributed the boundaries. But for practical purposes it runs from the Don River—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Gerrymandered; you heard that.

Mr. Renwick: Certainly the writ of the New Democratic Party runs from the Don

River through to Coxwell Ave. and from the lake up to north of Danforth. It is unique in another way, that is, that it is a part of Ward 7 and a part of Ward 8 in municipal politics.

This, perhaps, will draw the attention of the House to the immense pressures to which that part of the city of Toronto is, and is about to be, subjected because of the pressures and the conflicting views with respect to development in the city of Toronto. A portion of the riding included in Ward 7 is represented by Alderman Karl Jaffary and Alderman John Sewell who, it is quite clear, were both elected in the last municipal election because of their stands for people against the massive development pressures which had developed in the Ward 7 area. The balance of Riverdale riding is Ward 8 and is represented by Alderman Beavis and Alderman Clifford who, to say perhaps kindly about them, are traditional municipal politicians, who support basically the proposition of the expansion of the area of Riverdale riding through development.

The first developmental pressures are being felt in the riding to a severe degree. We have now in our midst Bramalea Consolidated. For those of the Tory members who read the Guerilla newspaper, it showed in its chart exactly where the funds of Bramalea Consolidated are derived. What one can say about the worldwide financial network, which supplies funds to companies such as Bramalea, is that the last thing which it has to consider is the needs of the individual citizens in the areas where the pressure of development is first felt.

If anybody has the time, perhaps he could come to Gerrard and Marjory Ave. or Gerrard and Pape Ave. in that area of Toronto, and see what has been accomplished by Bramalea up to date because of the inadequate planning facilities and planning procedures provided by this government for the guidance of municipal governments.

My colleague, the member for High Park, introduced a bill in the House in December highlighting one of the minuscule but most important defects in the planning system; it is that when a developer gets a piece of property he can get a permit to demolish before he has to embark upon any of the other complicated parts of the planning procedure.

If you want to demoralize an area in order that the area will be totally incapable of responding to the threat of development or of participating in development, then when the developer has acquired certain properties in the area you grant him the right to demolish those properties—and without even any corresponding obligation to do housekeeping to maintain it as an attractive part of the area.

At this time of the year, that part of Riverdale riding which is now owned by Bramalea Consolidated looks as though a bomb has struck it. It is an effective device that permits the developers to demoralize a whole community; it saps its vitality and its ability to withstand the pressures of development or to participate constructively in the redevelopment of that area. It imposes stresses and strains on a community which in my judgement are intolerable.

It therefore means we will go to meeting after meeting with people who have little time to devote to continuous attention to community affairs. They work all day at a relatively low level of the socio-economic life of the Province of Ontario and there is only a limited amount of time that they can pit against the continuous lobbying and pressure of the development companies.

I am saying to the government that in an area such as the riding of Riverdale and an area comprising Wards 7 and 8 in the city of Toronto, which is going to feel the impact of this massive pressure for development, it is absolutely essential from the viewpoint of the people living in the area that the government of this province revamp the whole of the planning procedures to prevent the piecemeal, hodge-podge destruction of an area of the city until people simply throw up their hands, move out and go elsewhere in order to avoid the impact of the development.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for York East, immediately to the north of Riverdale riding, will perhaps listen carefully to the remarks I have made, because the Department of Municipal Affairs has the basic responsibility for remedying that iniquitous position to which the laws with respect to planning have deteriorated in the province. I am sure that other members in this Legislature can draw attention to similar situations in their riding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal briefly with one facet of the election in the Riverdale riding which was designed to divide one of the groups in the community—the immigrant community from Greece. It was very much part and parcel of the attack made on the New Democratic Party by the Conservative candidate in the last provincial election that the New Democratic Party was a Communist party, that the New Democratic Party was

allied to radical elements of the left wing of the democratic strata of thought which formerly existed in Greece, and that in some way or other we were Bolshevists, that we were persons who were destructive of democracy, and that only those in the riding who supported the Greek junta were interested in stability, democracy and freedom.

I want to draw to the attention of the House—and to my constituents in the riding of Riverdale who are from Greece—that regardless of the position of the Vice-President of the United States, and regardless of the position of the former Conservative candidate in Riverdale riding, all is not well in Greece. In no way can the public relations statements of the Vice-President of the United States or the public relations statements of the governing military junta in Greece, overcome the fact that Greece has a totalitarian, authoritarian, Fascist, military government.

Despite the so-called return of democracy in Greece by measured trends, I want to put on the record of the House a short statement by the International Commission of Jurists—a body which endeavours on an international basis to watch and to safeguard as best it can the civil liberties and other democratic rights of citizens throughout the world—to which, I may say, the government of Canada, along with other governments, grants funds in order to make certain that it can continue to survive. It also charges nominal fees to those lawyers who want to be members of it.

The review of the International Commission of Jurists, which I received just a couple of days ago, had this to say about Greece:

> Apart from the continuing arbitrary arrests and detentions without trial, two important developments have taken place in Greece since the promulgation of the 1969 constitution by the military regime. They are: the constantly-increasing power of the armed force, and the provisions relating to the constitutional court.

I will not quote it all, Mr. Speaker. I will quote only small excerpts from it.

> The armed forces are a fourth branch of the government. The provisions of article 131 of the 1968 constitution have made the armed forces a self-governing body beyond the reach of the civilian government. The basic structure of the armed forces is set out in articles 129 and 130. They emphasize the mission of the armed forces to protect the existing political and social system against internal enemies.
>
> This power was further strengthened by the decree of Dec. 14, 1968, regulating the structure and powers of the supreme command of the armed forces. They are politically and administratively independent and are placed above the sovereignty of the people.
>
> By a decision dated Jan. 9, 1969, all powers relating to the command of the armed forces were transferred from the Minister of Defence to the chief of the armed forces. These powers included the authority of the Minister of Defence to allocate financial resources. Financial control of the armed forces is, therefore, completely withdrawn from Parliament.
>
> Another disquieting feature of the 1968 constitution is the creation of the constitutional court. This court assumes overall control of all political activities. Under article 98, its members are appointed for life by the leadership of the military regime. The constitutional court decides on the meaning and the extent of competence of the chief of state, the Speaker of the Parliament, and of the government, and decides appeals against legislative or administrative acts. The decisions of the constitutional court are irrevocable. All political parties are controlled by the constitutional court and the charters of every party must be approved by the court.
>
> Political parties whose aims or activities are manifestly or covertly opposed to the fundamental principles of the government shall be outlawed or dissolved by the decision of the constitutional court. The deputies of the party being dissolved shall be declared deposed of their office and the seats held by them in Parliament shall remain vacant until the termination of the parliamentary period. The effect of this legislation is that Parliament has become subordinate to a court set up by leaders of the military regime.

Mr. Speaker, the point is obvious. I would suggest to any future Conservative candidate in the riding of Riverdale that he not align himself, or endeavour to align the Conservative Party with the government of a country such as Greece, as it is embodied in the military junta which controls that country. It does no credit to the Conservative Party and I know very well that my friends on the government benches would be as anxious as I am to dissociate themselves from any suggestion that the Conservative government of the Province of Ontario condones the form of government or the practices and procedures of the government in Greece.

Mr. Gaunt: Spiro Agnew campaigned against it in their election and won. That's how he did win.

Mr. Renwick: I may say to my friend that I derived a tremendous amount of support from the people from Greece in the riding, simply because of the reaction against this particular attack which was made upon the party and made upon those men who support an attempt to return democracy to Greece, such as Prof. Papandreo who is now lecturing at York University.

Mr. Speaker, before I speak about the major matters which are on my mind, I want to deal very briefly with three postscripts or addenda to the position of our party with respect to the auto pact. The leader of our party in his contribution to the Throne debate on behalf of the party, made our position quite clear. But I now refer to that part of our amendment to the amendment to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne in which we have urged the government to adopt in its discussions with the federal government about the auto pact that there be no abandonment of present safeguards, no decline whatsoever in the present share of production and a guarantee from the government of the United States and the automobile manufacturers that Canadian value added would equal the value of the Canadian market for North American cars.

I have three brief comments that I want to make about that. The first one, Mr. Speaker, is a remark made by the Hon. John Connolly, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, considerably before the imposition of the new economic policy on Aug. 15, in the United States.

Senator Connolly, speaking to the international banking conference in Munich, Germany, on May 28, 1971, categorically stated that "we are not going to devalue, we are not going to change the price of gold, we are controlling our inflation, we also are stimulating economic growth at a pace which will not begin new inflation."

This is a policy which was, of course, reversed within something like 2½ months, because of the deterioration of the economic position of the United States.

But in that address he had, specifically, a point to make and a comment with respect to the auto pact. And I think we've got to be aware, in its stark reality of what the position is—not for bargaining purposes but the actual position—of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States about the Canada-US auto pact. He states, and I quote:

> A second area where action is plainly overdue lies in trading arrangements. The comfortable assumption that the United States should, in the broader political interests of the free world, be willing to bear disproportionate economic cost does not fit the facts of today. I do not for a moment call into question the worth of a self-confident, cohesive Common Market, a strong Japan and a progressing Canada to the peace and prosperity of the free world community. The question is only, but the only is important, whether those nations now more than amply supplied with reserves as well as with productive power should not now be called upon for fresh initiative in opening their markets to the products of others.

He deals briefly with Japan and then has this to say about Canada:

> Must Canada maintain tariffs on private purchases of United States autos at a time when a balance of payment surplus has resulted in a floating exchange rate.

He goes on to conclude that part of his remarks:

> I would suggest that all of these and more are proper matters for negotiation and resolution among us on a more equitable basis.

You can see what the secretary of the treasury is, in substance, saying is that we must have a free trade, a complete continentalization for trade purposes of the automobile industry. I mention this because it is a stark and clear statement of the position of the United States government and must be kept in mind against a background of information, propaganda and statements which would seem to indicate that somehow or other there are going to have to be concessions with respect to the auto pact. That is a course which is for the purpose of highly conditioning Canadian public opinion and Ontario public opinion to accept what to us in this party is unacceptable.

The second postscript that I want to add on this question of the auto pact, to which reference has not been made, is a potential threat to the production of automobiles in Canada under the auto pact which has been such a valuable stimulus to our economy. It is the potential threat of the domestic international sales corporation which is a creature of the United States government with respect

to tax credits to the so-called DISC companies.

I quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Economist of Feb. 12, 1972, in which it deals at some length with the Canadian scene and has this to say about the potential threat of the DISC to the Canadian automobile production. It opens with, again I say, this indication that somehow or other we have to give up something under the auto pact.

> There are concessions that the Canadians expect to have to make. One is an overdue revision of the American-Canadian auto pact altering some of the transitional features that have worked in Canada's favour since 1965.

It goes on to deal specifically with the domestic international sales corporation:

> But there are remaining risks for Canada in the domestic international sales corporation—DISC, part of the Aug. 15 package which has now been enacted in modified form by Congress. DISC provides for deferment of taxes for exports and import substitution and can be regarded as an American counter to the border taxes that are being increasingly levied in Europe and elsewhere and which effectively give an advantage to exports without outraging the principles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. But if DISC were operating in the automobile industry, it could encourage the American owners of the auto industry in Canada to take their productions so far as possible into the United States. This was exactly what the auto pact was intended to discourage; it succeeded beyond expectation with a large increase in Canada's auto employment at American wage rates and a surplus in its auto trade which has become hardly tolerable to the world's biggest auto industry.
>
> It is true that Canada's share of the North American car output is still appreciably lower than its proportion of North American demand. If Canada were to relax the 15 per cent import duty, or the embargo on imports of used cars, the difference would be still greater; and the rise in the Canadian dollar will add to it. But if DISC were applied as the law is written, it could herald a return of Canadian automobile manufacture to the indifferent levels of the early 1960s. It seems rather early for Canada to contemplate totally free trade in automotive products, but Canada must give something and soon.

Mr. Speaker, I simply put that on the record to point out that there is nothing which Canada at this point in time can give under that auto pact without running into the risk which is inherent in the DISC position. There is indication, for example, that the present safeguards in the auto pact are no longer necessary because, since the auto pact was initiated in 1965, we have far exceeded the safeguards to preserve Canadian production and improve it. Since we have far exceeded it, therefore, they are now no longer necessary. But I would indicate to you that the position of our party is that times can change in the face the operations of companies such as these domestic international sales corporation which can be located in the United States. Times can change rapidly in the automobile industry and we would find that even the minimum safeguards presently in the auto pact are an essential part of the production of the Canadian automotive industry, practically all of which is in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the member a question? Wouldn't he agree that it's snowmobiles that are really the basic problem with the auto pact at this moment in time and the increase of their manufacture in Canada?

Mr. Renwick: I understand the snowmobile argument. It may well be that, while not knowing the whole details of the snowmobile argument, nevertheless we have had a substantial benefit because of the Bombardier company and other companies getting a headstart on the market in the production of snowmobiles.

I noticed, however, the other day—and I guess this is a warning that its supremacy in the field is disappearing—that the Bombardier plant, which is located in Quebec if my memory serves me correctly, has had substantial cutbacks in its plans for the future and substantial cutbacks in its labour force.

I think the snowmobile question is perhaps a separate and distinct question, but it will have to be absorbed within a general framework of the automotive pact. I think that is possible, but I do not for one moment think that the problem of the auto pact can be solved only in relation to an isolated segment of the trade which has had a boom development over the last few years and where, with tremendous initiative on the part of the Bombardier company, it had really a first-class jump on the world market, and particularly on the United States market in that field.

The last postscript, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to add to the comments about the auto pact is that there is no question that the balance of trade between Canada and the United States in automobiles has provided a surplus in the overall balance of trade of Canada in the last little while, from a substantial trade deficit which was existent in the automotive industry prior to the inception of the auto pact.

I want to point out that the overall balance of payments between Canada and the United States is still in favour of the United States—not in trade necessarily, because that is more or less even and will fluctuate from surplus to deficit on a more equitable basis than it has in the past. But there is very substantial money income derived by the United States from its investments in Canada. I quote from the Wharton Journal of the business school at the University of Pennsylvania:

> The shift from an export to an import balance [that is, speaking from the point of view of the United States] has been still more rapid and larger in trade with Canada from a surplus of $0.7 billion in 1965 to a deficit of $1.7 billion in 1970.

And I believe there is a substantially increased deficit on trade so far as Canada is concerned as a result of 1971. But it goes on to say:

> However, US investment income was very large in the case of Canada; more than enough to cover the trade deficit.

So again for the purpose of clarification, I hope, of the argument with respect to the developing problem of what Canada needs to bring to the bargaining table about the auto pact, we must bear in mind that there is not an overall deficit in the balance of payments with the United States, even though we have enjoyed a surplus on trade balance in the last year or two.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn, if I may, to a difficult and complex topic from my point of view. Others may not find it difficult. I venture upon it, of course, because the economists—and I am not an economist—are somewhat in disarray at the present time with respect to their understanding of the problems that the basic questions of economic policy have produced in the last while for all of the countries in the industrialized West.

It doesn't matter whether we are speaking about the United Kingdom or Europe or the United States or Canada, the problem is all the same—and the economists appear to be not only in severe disagreement themselves but unable in many respects to focus in on any area of agreement about the specific problem.

The specific problem at this particular time—and this government is faced with this problem regardless of its tendency to issue optimistic statements about what it is doing to overcome it—is the continued persistence of high unemployment, coupled with the continued persistence of inflation at an unacceptable rate.

That combination of factors creates an impasse in the development of sound policies in the Province of Ontario which we in this Legislature have got to begin to try to understand. I would hope the remarks I have to make today will be of some assistance in focusing attention upon this area for debate.

I am going to state very briefly the conclusion, because I find it difficult to put the whole argument and I don't want to leave it like a whodunit as to what I am going to end up with.

What I am trying to say here is that we in the Province of Ontario have got to deal with an overpriced economy if we are going to be able to deal—perhaps ahead of any other country in the industrialized western world—with the question of continuing unacceptable levels of unemployment and inflation.

We have got to face up to it in terms of what I diagnose, in my understanding of the problem, as an overall high-pricing of our economy that will operate to our detriment, both with respect to our material wealth and with respect to the internal tensions and stresses which it will impose upon society in the province of Ontario. If I may, Mr. Speaker, in developing my thoughts about this particular topic they are going to be, in a sense, random because I haven't been able to put it all together into one package nor does it necessarily lend itself to some globally perfect viewpoint. But I want to try to get certain points across in connection with my concern—I am sure a concern shared certainly within our party in a very real sense, and a concern shared, I am certain, by all of the members of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in the amendment which my leader introduced at the close of his remarks, we dealt with several points and I want to draw the House's attention to two or three of the points which we made in our amendment, to explain and give some substance to the reasons why we consider the govern-

ment's programme to be a failure in these particular regards.

We indicated that there was a failure to initiate programmes for public participation in the growth of the economy of Ontario and in particular in the areas of the resource industries. We indicated that there was a failure to initiate programmes to expand and develop the secondary manufacturing sector of the economy so that it will be modern, efficient and able to compete in world markets and we indicated a failure to initiate procedures for review of managed prices and marketing practices to maintain stability in the price and quality of goods, services and utilities.

Those three indications of our disagreement with the government's policies are within the ambit of the remarks which I want to address to the government. I think those who are in the House at the time that the leader of this party spoke will recall that he stated to the House, toward the end of his remarks, the position of our party in this Parliament and in this session with respect to these matters. I quote from my leader's comments at that time:

> I have one last observation. In the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, we see the next four years as a period of competing social philosophies in this House, sharper and more toughly defined as economic and political realities emerge. We in this caucus would be the first to concede that the Tories have an infinite adaptability, a great flexibility, in areas of social reform. Where that flexibility wears down, where the impasse occurs, where the crunch comes, is in the area of basic economic change.

And it is within that framework that the remarks that I make are directed, and that is to point out clearly, to get clearly on the record at the initial stages of this likely four-year Parliament, the views that this party holds with respect to the responsibilities of government in the field of economic growth and development.

The government's position is relatively clear from the statements which have been made in prior budgets, and in the statements which have been made both prior to the election and in the mini-budget which was introduced in December, and in the address of the Lieutenant Governor in the opening of this session. These are two areas—and I want to put them on the record. There are many consequences that fall from the differences and I want to state our position clearly on two of the basic ways in which these questions are now framed for the purpose of public debate.

The government has adopted the policy of the government of President Nixon in the US, the doctrine of the full employment budget.

I want to make the distinction as to what we understand by a full employment budget, from the point of view of the New Democratic Party and what the Conservative Party understands. I want to do it as succintly as possible.

The Conservative Party position, as I understand it, is that when they state they are engaged in full employment budgeting they are designing a budget to balance expenditures with receipts only when the economy is operating at its peak potential. That, of course, is a hypothetical figure as to what that particular position is. As I understand it when this government now has a deficit it means that if we had an acceptable employment rate, and if we had an acceptable degree of growth in the economy, and if we had an acceptable degree of inflation in the economy, the receipts of the taxing structure would equal the expenditures which this government would make.

Given those assumptions it is quite clear that what the government of this province says is that it will head for a balanced budget at the point in time when the economy is operating at its peak potential.

I want to say to the House that the New Democratic Party stands for a full employment budgeting policy understood in a different sense. The New Democratic Party would stand for a budget designed to aim for a surplus at full employment so that sufficient funds can be channelled to needed levels of public expenditures. I think we should be quite clear that that is the policy of this party.

We believe that there are urgent public fields where public expenditures are necessary which in any sound system of government financing would mean that when the economy is operating at its peak potential and we are deriving the revenues which are required and our expenditures are needed, that is the point in time when we would expect to generate the surplus that would provide the flexibility to initiate programmes which are required to meet a broad range of priorities of social and other needs within the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: I agree.

Mr. Renwick: That is the first of the major distinctions that I want to make between our party and the Conservative Party with respect to government financial programmes.

The second one is, Mr. Speaker, that we all pay lip service without very much distinctive thought to growth and price stability and employment as being the major factors with which we are involved and that somehow or other our problem is to solve all three. We all want an acceptable level of growth; we all want high employment and we all want price stability. Of course, all that begs the question of how we go about achieving those objectives.

The New Democratic Party adds a fourth ingredient to the tripod that is traditional when one is talking about this problem, and that is the question of fair shares. Fair shares, in our view, is an essential component of any overall programme for economic development.

I say to the House that the Conservative Party emphasizes growth. It believes, in its emphasis on growth, that growth will solve all other problems including employment and, of course, it doesn't accept any responsibility—if you read the statements of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and of the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and of others who speak on these matters—accepts no responsibility with respect to price inflation in this government. It mainly hinges upon saying to the people of the Province of Ontario, "If we can just have growth we will solve the employment problem and we will also solve, if the government at Ottawa is as sane and as intelligent as our government is here—we will also leave it to them to solve the problem of price inflation."

The New Democratic Party says that its policy is based upon a fair-share policy and the fair-share policy, if I may put it succinctly, Mr. Speaker, is a full employment economy with stable prices and growing real wages.

And I want to emphasize that the fair share addition to our policy, as distinct from the policy of the Conservative government, is a growth in real wages.

Let me make a distinction, Mr. Speaker. So far as those persons who, for whatever reasons, are unable to participate in the economic life of the Province of Ontario we, of course have—since the founding of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the founding of New Democratic Party—urged upon the governments at all levels in and throughout Canada the proposition that persons not participating, for whatever the reasons may be, in the economic life of the country are persons entitled to a fair share. And that fair share in this province is not fair at the present time.

And we, of course, have had our debates in the social and family services debates about that whole question of the level of the assistance programmes of this government for those persons.

But I am not speaking about that area of fair share. We will still pursue that because that is an essential ingredient of a democratic socialist policy to make certain that those who cannot participate are adequately and properly sharing within the abundance of the economy of the Province of Ontario.

But when I speak of fair shares within a range of an economic policy, what I am speaking about is a developing governmental policy which will insist in equal measures—not giving undue prominence to one area over another area—which will insist in equal measure on four elements: growth, employment, price stability and fair shares, meaning a growth in real wages.

And that in my judgement, Mr. Speaker, distinguishes quite clearly in the broad fields of financial policy the position of this party from the position of the Conservative Party in the Province of Ontario and from the position of the Liberal Party in Ottawa. I make no distinction between the Conservative Party in the government of the Province of Ontario with respect to its programmes for government economic activity, government economic planning—if you want to use that term—and the procedures which are followed by the Liberal government in Ottawa. The two parties at both levels and in these areas are totally indistinguishable.

I want to highlight that particular point because, despite what the Treasurer has said, and as part of the sham game of fighting with Ottawa—which is an abdication by this government of its responsibilities to deal with the problems—never even on one single occasion when specifically asked, has either the Prime Minister of this province, under former Prime Minister John Robarts, or under the present Prime Minister, or under this Treasurer or under the former Treasurer, indicated that he would do other than what the Liberal Party did in Ottawa with respect to the problem of inflation.

What they have said is that "in our ongoing current battle with the federal government—and so that we can pose as good guys—we will say that we are going to introduce policies which counter the policies of the federal government." But never on one single occasion has this government indicated any disagreement in substance with the response of the federal government to the question

of the inflation that was prevalent in the economy and continues to be prevalent in the economy. It is just part of the camouflage that the government draws over any conception of its responsibility in this field.

I am saying basically, because I want to relate this to my concern about our high-priced economy in the Province of Ontario, that it is no longer sufficient and it is no longer adequate for the government of the Province of Ontario to assume that it has no responsibility in the field of inflation. It has a very direct responsibility in that field.

It has a responsibility which will have to be undertaken by this government. It has got to get away from the idea that in some way or other, inflation is monetary policy and monetary policy is federal government responsibility and therefore Ottawa is the bad guy if it embarks upon steps which are necessary for the purpose of controlling inflation.

This government has to accept responsibility in all areas of what, in our position, is a four-legged position—that is growth, employment, price stability and fair shares. The reason it has to accept responsibility in those areas is that we can learn very instructive lessons without in any way finding ourselves in the position that we have to adopt the kind of measures which were taken in the United States because of what occurred in the United States.

They suddenly woke up to the fact in August—and quite literally—that monetary policies and fiscal policies were not working. They realized that the traditional method of dealing with an economy by large aggregates of decisions with respect to fiscal policy and monetary policy, was not in any way capable of dealing with the problem with which they were basically faced. That was, a problem of continuing high unemployment and a continuing and unacceptable level of price inflation, for which they were paying the price in the international currency markets, for which they were paying the price with respect to their balance of trade, and for which they had to adopt the drastic and serious changes in their policy in the announcement made suddenly on the night of Aug. 15.

I want to refer back to the statement which Mr. Connolly made to which I referred earlier, and when I noted at that time that as late as May 31, the government of the United States did not intend to devalue and did not intend to raise the price of gold. It stated categorically that traditional methods of aggregate fiscal and monetary policy were quite adequate to maintain growth, were quite adequate to bring down unemployment and were quite adequate to maintain stability of prices and to control inflation.

Between May 31 and Aug. 15, their position changed completely. Their position changed and it is very clear why, if one looks at the course of events which took place during the period of 1970 and 1971.

I had occasion to look at the Business Situation Review, which is published monthly by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, to see what their comments were. That bank is the principle component of the central banking system of the United States. I would suggest that to anybody who read, month by month, the situation reports of business of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, one element would stand out without question as a key element in the problem with which the United States was faced in the summer of 1971—unexpectedly, without realizing what was happening other than the fact that their economy had gotten out of their control—that was the runaway increase in the industrial component of the wholesale price index in the United States.

I want to quote very briefly from three or four of those particular business summaries, to show what happened. In June, 1971, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in its business situation report, reviewing the overall operation of the economy, said:

> Consumer non-food commodity prices have moderated significantly over the four months ended in April.

And they viewed that with a sense of equanimity—that that was progress. Then it goes on to say:

> At the same time, industrial wholesale prices—that is, the industrial component of the wholesale price index—rose sharply in April and May. For the first five months of the year these prices advanced at an even higher rate than that experienced in 1970.
>
> Moreover, recent announcement of further price advances for a number of metals and metal products underscore the likelihood of continued upward pressure on industrial wholesale prices, which will in due course be reflected in the consumer price index.

Very briefly, what they said was simply that there was a runaway situation with respect to the industrial prices at the wholesale level. That was in June, 1971. In July, 1971, a month later, we find substantially the same statement. I quote from the July Federal

Reserve Bank monthly review of the business situation.

> The price situation is thoroughly unsatisfactory; industrial wholesale prices recorded very large advances for the three months ended in May.

It then goes on to show that the consumer price data for May showed sizeable increases in virtually every product grouping. Then in August of the same year, and in the same review:

> Recent price developments continue to be thoroughly disappointing. Aside from some temporary moderating influence there is little, if any, evidence of slowing down in the rate of inflation. In fact, during the most recent months both consumer and wholesale industrial prices have been climbing more rapidly than they did earlier in the year. Cost pressures, moreover, remained very strong.

That particular statement was made before the President's announcement. The President then made his announcement, and in the September statement on the business situation the Federal Reserve Bank had a rather more elaborate statement, from which I will quote very briefly, as to what their conception of the events was:

> The highly inflationary background against which the freeze was initiated is illustrated by the recent performance of industrial wholesale prices. In August, the index of these prices rose at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 6.4 per cent, with almost all of the increase having taken place before the price freeze.
>
> This huge rise has been exceeded in July, when the index jumped at an annual rate of 8.4 per cent, a record increase for the last 15 years. Industrial prices during the first half of the year had advanced at an annual rate of four per cent, a somewhat more rapid pace than for 1970 as a whole.
>
> In short, despite almost two full years of distinctly sluggish activity in the industrial sector, prices have continued to advance at inflationary rates that were without modern precedent for a period characterized by such marked weakness in demand.

Just to finish that particular series of quotations, Mr. Speaker; by October the report was:

> Under the freeze, the rise in industrial wholesale prices came to an abrupt halt in September. And when the final figures were in, the result of the freeze in August was to reverse entirely, and in fact to induce a slight decrease in the industrial component of the wholesale price index.

The conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is inescapable. In the United States at that time there was an unacceptably high level of unemployment. Everybody agrees with that. There was a runaway in prices at the industrial level of society at the wholesale level. The significant factor was that in a period of sluggish economic activity, which had persisted for two years, you had a runaway price at the basic components of the pricing system of the American economy.

The runaway of those prices at the economic level was because the market system in these major segments and components of the United States economy no longer worked. The repudiation of the free market can never, ever be clear. The free market is posited upon the assumption that there will be price adjustments downward during periods of economic slack, during periods of economic inactivity, and that the result will be that the market mechanism will provide for a fluctuation upwards and downwards in prices.

The conclusion is inescapably clear as well, that monetary policies of governments and fiscal policies of governments can only operate, if, in fact, there is a market economy within the price structure. That is the significant lesson which we in this province have got to learn and have got to absorb.

I'm quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that the members will have noticed that I have not referred to wages, because I now want to deal with the problem with which this party is faced in this debate. Because the pat answer of the Conservative government, the pat answer of the federal government in the United States is that the reason for price increases at the industrial wholesale level in that runaway manner is because of wage demand; and that the granting of wage increases produces that spiralling of the prices; and that it is the wage component of the price increases which leads to the built-in bias of our economy, leading to an inflationary and high unemployment economy; and that the culprit is the working man who works for his wages and no one else. I'm simply saying, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal now—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Is the member saying that that is what the federal government did?

Mr. Renwick: That is what the federal government in Canada says—

Mr. Bullbrook: They say it makes a contribution.

Mr. Renwick: I am simply saying, with whatever degree of emphasis that one wants to put on it, that the federal government at Ottawa and the government of this province, if they ever recognize that prices were responsible and that some thing has to be done about it, would couple wages with it, inequitably and inadequately. We would have a wage and prices board. That's the traditional method by which the response is made.

I want very clearly to put across to the members of the government that this party dissociates itself for valid reasons from any suggestion that that is the key problem of the economy. You do not shift the responsibility to those who work for wages in the economy. You accept the responsibility that you're dealing in a managed price economy.

Let me put it clearly on the record, because, as I say, I am but a layman in these particular fields. I want to put on the record the results of what, in fact, happens in the business cycle over a 10-year period, as described by an article in the Wharton business school journal of the University of Pennsylvania, which is generally accepted as having a reputation in these fields and for drawing accurate conclusions from the statistical information which is available.

The particular statement—I'm going to read my version of it because it is important that we have it on the record and I don't want to fool around with trying to extemporize about it—is as follows:

> A study of the most recent business cycle, 1961 to 1970, based on information contained in the economic report of the President of the United States, transmitted to Congress in February, 1971, together with the annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers indicates clearly the following timing of changes in four series as the cycle proceeded.
>
> The four series are money supply, return on shareholders' investment, consumer prices and hourly earnings. Timing of changes took place in this sequence:
>
> Greater than normal increases in the money supply began in 1961. As the economic recovery got under way, the next series to take off was the return on shareholders' equity. It recovered to normal by 1963 and was some 30 per cent above normal by 1966.
>
> It was not until 1966 that consumer prices started rising more rapidly than normal, and hourly earnings did not break out until 1967. Thereafter consumer prices and hourly earning rates accelerated more or less in step.
>
> The conclusions appear obvious:
>
> 1. Wages respond or wage demands are generated toward the end of the cycle when the inflationary impact of price increases at the producers' level has been transmitted to consumer prices and then only after the decline in purchasing power has become evident.
>
> 2. In many industries only a small number of corporations supply a majority of the products: Because of the market powers of such large producers, prices of many manufactured goods are maintained firmly during periods of decreased demand. The producers reduce output sufficiently to do so; when demand recovers, producers increase output and increase prices, reaping outside profits.
>
> 3. When the economy is underemployed we are dependent almost entirely on monetary and fiscal stimulation to the economy because prices are maintained or increased and seldom decreased.
>
> 4. An undue reliance on fiscal stimulants and monetary stimulants, in the absence of price response downward when market demand falls, distorts the operation of the economy by structuring into the economy the inflationary bias which depreciates the value of our currency internally and makes it increasingly difficult to sell our products abroad because of high prices.
>
> 5. Fiscal and monetary action by government in the absence of price fluctuation as demand fluctuates, far from stabilizing the economy, creates at best an unstable equilibrium for short periods.
>
> 6. When there is a failure of the marketplace as a result of managed prices, government is forced to trade off growth and employment at the expense of fair shares and price stability, or fair shares and price stability at the expense of growth and employment.

Mr. Speaker, those are the conclusions I want to put before the House to distinguish the position of this party from the position of the Conservative Party at the provincial level and the federal Liberal Party at Ottawa. The two parties envisage the problem as a trade-off. As I have just stated, you've got to trade off growth and employment at the expense of fair shares and price stability and that's exactly what the government and the federal government are playing about with.

The provincial government for its own particular political position takes the view that the inflationary aspect of that trade-off is not their responsibility but that it is

Ottawa's. They don't deal with fair shares, of course, because that is contrary to the Conservative philosophy. On the other side of the coin they say that we, at the provincial level, have got to take steps to trade off growth and employment at our level because we've got to stimulate growth and employment by expansionary policies at the provincial level in order to counteract the stability in prices policy of the federal government.

I am saying to the government of the Province of Ontario that that trade-off is unacceptable to the New Democratic Party and is an improper phrasing of the problem as we look at it. Again, at the risk of embarking in areas which I am not able to deal with competently, I want to point out where the substance of that particular view had its origins.

A man by the name of A. W. Phillips produced what is know in economics as the Phillips curve. Mr. Phillips was at the London School of Economics. He studied the relationship between wages and employment in the United Kingdom from 1861 to 1957 and drew a curve relating changes in unemployment to changes in the wages rates. These equations in modern Ontario terms usually imply about six to eight per cent unemployment at zero inflation rates and four or five per cent unemployment at three or four per cent inflation.

I would say that in substance if one looks at the mini-budget of the government of the Province of Ontario, introduced in December, one will see that that is the Conservative Party's description of the price that we have got to pay for our economic policy. It has been very clear that the Conservative government in the Province of Ontario and the federal government in Ottawa under the Liberal Party have always said that an acceptable level of employment is around about the three per cent level.

They have never indicated that full employment means full employment. They have never indicated that one per cent unemployment is an unacceptable level because what they've been caught up with is the fact that if unemployment goes to six to seven to eight per cent and is unacceptable, they've got to bring that down to what their version is of the acceptable level of unemployment.

Let us say it is around three per cent, and that's reflected in the Conservative party's mini-budget as well. Then you simply say "Well, all right. You bring it down to that but you have got to accept for full employment" —in their version—"an inflationary bias in the economy." That's been the traditional trade-off.

The problem with which they are faced, the impasse with which they are faced, the problem which they have not dealt with—and the indication is that there's no attempt by this government to deal with it—is that they cannot now deal with the proposition that there is an unacceptable level of unemployment. The Treasurer indicates he hopes it will be between four and five per cent. The federal government assumes that if we have to get down to that level of unemployment, we will have stimulated again the inflation.

I am saying to the members of the Conservative Party that our position is that you do not have any such trade-off. There is absolutely no necessity in an economy such as ours to have to feel that the level of unemployment bears that kind of a relationship with the inflation of the economy. If it does, then what you have is the continuing cycle. You can't break it.

Those who are highly protected in the industrial components of the economy—and I cite the steelworkers and the automobile workers—have to generate wage demands and other benefits within their own industries for the purpose of meeting the devaluation of the currency which they earn. I think it's fair to say that the modern steel industry in Canada and the Steelworkers who negotiate on behalf of the workers in that industry endeavour to get wage rates that will counter the depreciation in the value of the dollar and will add to the growth in their real wages so that they will not always be behind, trying to catch up.

Rather than castigating the members of the automobile union or of the Steelworkers for their part in responding to the kind of economic cycle that I described a few minutes ago, what is the effect of it?

The effect of it is that it stimulates other groups who are now part of the demonology of our society. That is the teachers' groups, government employees, people in service industries, other people who are not highly protected in highly efficient industries, because that is what the automotive industry and the steel industry are.

It generates demands because the wages which they are earning cannot buy the kinds of things which their expectations lead them to need. They cannot buy those kinds of things because the depreciation in the currency builds in an expectation on everyone's

part that the value of the dollars which they have will continue to depreciate.

So we start off, all of us, trying to get more in order to protect ourselves. The ratchet effect—and it's a very real ratchet effect—is that teachers and public servants and persons in service industries, people in the professions, people in all of the commission industries, want to try to protect themselves against the depreciation in the purchasing value of their dollars, and that's at the tag end of the cycle, and that's what in many ways happens.

So our position is simply that you do not create a demonology, which is at one time the Steelworkers, or the Autoworkers, or set unorganized workers against organized workers, or a demonology which turns against the teachers and complains that they are demanding more than they should get. Or, that the public servants of the Province of Ontario are told, as they were in the last budget, that they were to be the example. They were the ones to have a price freeze on their wages which was the policy of this government.

You don't do that. You try to understand what the nature of the problem is and you try to deal with the problem. You don't create demons within the society about organized labour, or about new emerging groups of organized persons in the service industries, or a demon about the federal government and its response.

What you face up to is that we have in the Province of Ontario a managed-price economy, without any public scrutiny of those prices, without anyone having the information or the knowledge to determine the reasons for those price increases and we suffer the consequences.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the decision of the government of the United States on Aug. 15 sent a shudder through, and raised very real questions about the viability of, the secondary manufacturing industry in Canada, which means in the Province of Ontario.

The question is very clear that we have got to, in the light of that situation which developed, look at what is required with respect to our secondary manufacturing industries. We must look at the problems of the resource industries. We must look at the same questions with respect to the pricing resource industries.

We have to look at the level of prices which are charged by the professions in the Province of Ontario. We have to look at the level of prices charged in the commission areas, whether it is in the field of insurance, whether it is in the field of real estate transactions, whether it is in the field of brokerage commissions on the exchange, or the whole range of commissions which are charged in our economy.

The reason we have to look at it is very clear: If we are going to have secondary manufacturing industries in this province, if we are going to be able to process the products of our primary industries in this province and in Canada—I only use Ontario as the prime example of the place where leadership has got to come from in the field of these problems—if we are going to be able to create a developing tourist industry in the Province of Ontario that will be attractive to people and not simply rely on extolling the virtues of the beauty of our countryside, then we are going to have to be able to examine the prices that are charged throughout the whole of our economy because those prices will determine whether or not we can compete in the markets of the world with the products of this economy.

I am saying—and I come back to my original statement—the reason we are unable to compete, the reason we are always crying about this problem, the reason the government can't focus its attention upon it is that we are unable to produce the products which will sell elsewhere in the world at prices that can compete on the world market.

I believe, and my party believes, that we have got to recognize that we are living in an international community of world trade and that the standards of living, not only of ourselves but of people elsewhere in the world, are going to need free trade, the free flow of capital, goods and technology.

The policies of this party must be directed toward ensuring that that kind of free flow can take place, because if it doesn't take place it will be to the detriment of the standard of living in the Province of Ontario, let alone that we will be unable to make any contribution to the standrd of living throughout the world.

Let me perhaps digress and look at another aspect of the same problem, Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes which remain until the adjournment.

A very real distortion has taken place in Canada in its thinking about the problem, and I want to suggest that a good portion of it is aberration. It is an aberrant policy from which we in this party and the government of the Province of Ontario must disassociate

ourselves. It has strident exponents and it has the quiet liberal exponents as well. The strident exponents are those who adopt a policy of economic nationalism. The quiet liberal exponents of this aberrant policy are those who are related to the Committee for an Independent Canada.

Every one of us prefers to be a Canadian. Every one of us believes instinctively and, if necessary and if forced to occasionally, we're able to articulate why we prefer to be Canadians. Perhaps we're not too good at it. I think many of us are learning very well to articulate the differences and why we want to be Canadians.

But the Canadian people are not interested in being put into the crunch between whether they want continentalism on the one hand or some kind of chauvinistic economic nationalism on the other hand, because the history of the country has never been that. The history of the country has always been subjected to the pressures from the United States, subjected to the pressures and advantages of the cultural protection we have in the Province of Ontario because of the Province of Quebec and because of the French-speaking people in Canada. We also have the protection of our natural resources and our vast hinterland for the country.

I am saying—and I am sure that the members of this House will agree with me—that anybody who endeavours to provide a choice, as the only choice for Canadians, between continentalism on the one hand and a chauvinistic economic nationalism on the other hand is playing a loser's game, because that is not the game which Canada has played historically or traditionally. It has had on occasion to make very powerful responses to protect its independence in an interdependent world and in an international community from the United States, as it had to achieve its independence in time past from the British Empire.

I think the aberration which has occurred has been a result of, in the language of the musical Hair, "that dirty little war." I don't think that in the period of time that I have lived there has ever been an aberration of United States policy which has produced the kinds of aberrant responses in other people that it has engendered. That war has epitomized for the people in the United States a tragic result of the consequences of their policy, a tragic questioning of their value, perhaps a revitalization of their social and economic and political life because of it. But it produced in Canada the spectre of American imperialism. It created a sense of anxiety about American tensions. It created in varying degrees a solace for those who want to pursue a path of economic nationalism.

I don't know what the result of the United States policy in the future is going to be. I think that somehow or other the war may end—God only knows. I think that it requires a lot of impetus to the government of the United States to make it finally get out of Vietnam, and to recognize that it had no business there in the first place.

But I think that the time has come that the proper response is not one now which should hide any longer the fact that the Canadian people are not engaged in trading off continentalism for economic nationalism. Economic nationalism is a minus numbers game, as far as we are concerned, and it is a game in which all of the players lose. We have got to find a resolution of the problem elsewhere.

The democratic socialist tradition as a strain and thread of western thought has always been internationally oriented. It has always believed in internationalism as it has always believed in democracy. It has never believed in authoritarianism and it has never believed in the nation state. It has never accepted the proposition that socialism will advance on the face of the globe as an acceptable democratic system of government, only if it can be dealt with on an authoritarian basis by some unholy alliance between those who believe themselves to be on the right and those who believe themselves to be on the left.

What we are saying is that democratic socialism is internationalist in its outlook. It is not interested in protectionism, but is interested in developing a world community in all of its aspects. That doesn't mean that we accept the unbridled right of multinational corporations to deal unilaterally with matters which affect the life of people in the Province of Ontario. Nor does it mean that the government of the Province of Ontario can shed its responsibilities within its own economy of dealing with the gut question, which I have endeavoured to raise before the House today.

The major question is that we have got to now look at stabilization procedures and processes and mechanisms for inquiring into the pricing structure of the Province of Ontario. We have got to provide, and I carefully distinguish, because I don't want it said in any way—I am opposed to controls. I don't want us to have to adopt the drastic steps which were taken in the United States. I want us to learn the lessons which are in-

volved. I am saying to this Legislature that if you look at the professional fees which are charged, and the commissions which are charged in the commission areas, if you look at the structure of prices which are charged by those who manage prices, if you look at all of those areas you will find that there is nothing but a unilateral decision made about it. That includes my profession, the legal profession, and it certainly includes the medical profession.

There is absolutely no sense; and again I am not creating a demonology, I am simply saying that the qualitative value of the services of doctors in the Province of Ontario compared with the qualitative value of services of other persons, is not in the range of $42,000 on average as compared with $5,000, $6,000, $7,000 or $8,000. We are all dependent on everyone else in the economy. There are no demons in it; there are no whipping boys. It is just simply a question that we have got to recognize that prices are managed. They very seldom go down; they always go up. And the extent that they go up to makes the government's attempts to solve the problem of inflation and unemployment by fiscal and monetary policies ridiculous.

The only way to solve those problems is for this government—either on a continuing basis or on an ad hoc basis—to take certain selected industries and begin to understand the way in which prices are determined, both at the primary level of industry and at the secondary manufacturing level of industry; how prices are determined that all of pay one way or another for legal services, for real estate commissions, for brokerage commissions, for life insurance, for fire insurance, for utilities, for all of the ingredients which go into making up the pricing components of our society.

Because, Mr. Speaker, my point is very clear: Until we understand those matters, we will be unable to so gear our economy as to achieve full employment, fair shares, good growth, and stable prices. What we will in fact find is that we will have to go to more protective measures; we will cut down government expenditures; we will protect ourselves within our own little preserve; we will adopt a policy without articulating it clearly as we will tend to look after ourselves; we will get the "I'm all right, Jack" operation going for us.

Mr. Speaker, when we look now at the problem which has concerned me, from another aspect, the problem which has concerned all of us, it has lead to a large number of people to make studies of it. A select committee of this House has made its initial report. We know about the foreign ownership of substantial segments of our economy. We know about so-called foreign control in varying degrees, about the decisions which are made. We are all uneasy about it. We all don't think that it is a solution simply to raise the question: "Oh, if we only owned it things would be different, or if we only controlled it, things would be different."

What we have got to find is the criterion on which we decide as a government where it is legitimate for government to intervene in the economic planning of the life of the community of the Province of Ontario, and I suggest for your consideration that the criterion on which we decide as a government where it is legitimate for government to intervene in the economic planning of the life of the community of the Province of Ontario, and I suggest for your consideration that the criterion is quite simple. The criterion is, what does this industry, and what does that industry and what does this other industry contribute toward the exporting of its goods and products on to the world market?

It is no longer sufficient for the government of the Province of Ontario—as it does in its ads which are published abroad; and as other governments in Canada do—indiscriminately to invite people into the Province of Ontario to manufacture goods or to provide services only for the Ontario economy, or only for the Canadian economy. The criterion is very simple: "Are you here for the purposes of developing not only the Canadian market and providing goods and services and products which are necessary for the Canadian economy, but what is your pattern for your overseas sales? What are your plans with respect to the development of overseas markets? What are your plans to assist the Province of Ontario to be less dependent upon the market in the United States?

I suggest to you that if we use that as a criterion we will very readily be able to distinguish a broad range of flexible government policies which can be used to improve the export position of the Province of Ontario, not for the purpose of undercutting other people but for the purpose of providing goods and services at their real cost to people. I include in that area, as I mentioned before, the tourist industry of the Province of Ontario which is, in fact, an invisible export so far as we here are concerned.

That can be the criterion. I think, so long as we in this government make our policies

clear—that we have a range of flexible methods by which we can influence the decisions which are made by industries and governments ranging all the way from a slight slap over the wrist to, if necessary, taking over the natural resource industries if they do not respond to our needs to provide their place in the markets of the world at a viable economic level for Ontario. It is not a single road. It is not a single technique and it is not a single method.

We can certainly guarantee that government can legitimately intervene on that criterion in any business or in any service. I am asking, as an addendum to the principal remarks which I am making, that the government give serious consideration to the same criterion with respect to subsidies; to criteria with respect to the provision of assistance with venture capital; to the provision of assistance with respect to permitting companies to obtain credit; that the criterion which the government of the Province of Ontario establishes is that those goods and services not only supply the Ontario and Canadian market but are for the purpose of providing us with markets elsewhere in the world. I mean elsewhere in the world away from the United States, because we have an undue reliance on the United States, as formerly we had an undue reliance on the United Kingdom.

The path for the maintenance of Canadian independence and the solution to the so-called conflict between economic nationalism and continentalism is in the international world and in the international markets. That is the position which we have got to go toward, so far as this government is concerned, and that is the position which the New Democratic Party wishes to take.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone on at somewhat inordinate length. I am going to try to wind up by simply saying that we disagree that the so-called expansionary policies, the so-called basic stabilization formulas of the government of the Province of Ontario are going to achieve their objectives. They are not going to achieve their objectives because they have got no criteria with respect to the determination of how and when they are going to intervene for the purpose of assisting; or intervene for the purpose of intervening in the decision-making process of segments of the economy.

They have no intention whatsoever of embarking, either on an ad hoc basis or on a continuing basis, on studies of the costs of our economy; whether they are costs of basic goods in basic sectors of the economy whether they are costs of utilities; whether they are costs of services; or whether they are commission costs and other costs on which I am not competent to speak.

I want to say to the House that disguised as a conscious and deliberate choice by government, we can forecast that the government in its budget at the end of March will opt for government austerity by cutting back on the programmes which tend toward fairer shares and will contribute to potential price instability by continuing present fiscal stimulants to business and granting new ones.

We in the New Democratic Party are committed to the development of an expanded secondary manufacturing industry capable of competing in the world markets. We can forecast that the government will not begin to grapple with the central core problem of pricing practices and the whole complex of problems related to marketing practices in major segments of the resource industries at the extractive level, the resource industries at the secondary level, secondary manufacturing industries, professional and other service industries, and in the utility industries.

Is it too much to expect a recognition by government of this problem—an acknowledgement by government that, far from having a marketplace economy, we have inherited an economy where prices in all segments are too high, where obsolescence has a high value and where special interests are highly protected? These characteristics of our economy, if not recognized now by this government, will compound our future problems. These characteristics militate against our objectives of fair shares and price stability, and militate against growth and employment. These characteristics lead to demands on government for legislative programmes and for budgetary policies to solve problems beyond its means to solve.

The result is that everyone demands of his fellow citizen all that the market will bear. We have a high-priced system which has no legitimacy.

The major consequences are everywhere evident in Ontario. We protest our reliance on foreign capital, but cannot do without it. We protest the ecological destruction of our province but cannot prevent it. We protest the pace and direction of development in our cities and cannot alter them. We shudder at the impact of decisions made beyond our borders and can only suffer their consequences or plead for special treatment.

We are incapable of introducing substantial tax relief, let alone equity, into our tax

structure but have no difficulty in perpetuating embedded privilege. We substitute a demonology for problem solving. Our favourite demons now are the federal government, American imperialism, foreign capital and multinational corporations.

We can forecast that the government's fiscal policies will strongly favour private over public use of resources and business over consumers. We can forecast that they will be inadequate for rapid restoration of full employment and will be devoid of sensitivity to the priority needs of Ontario.

Any stimulus expected from the December tax cuts will be largely offset by curtailment in government expenditures. Stimulus through tax cuts alone will be taking a backward step relative to meeting the priority needs of Ontario. Every time there is need for fiscal stimulation there is a tendency to achieve that stimulation through tax cuts, despite the priority needs for increased public expenditure, for facilities and services to ensure the quality of the environment, better health care, housing, urban redevelopment, education, recreational resources, rapid transit, tax sharing with municipality and other needs in the economic sector.

Mr. Speaker, if I may in conclusion simply point out to the House that I have tried to distinguish that in our understanding and in our policies for the fiscal, governance and financing of this province, we share a path of our own, separate and distinct from the policies of the Conservative government which we believe are incapable of solving the problems. We believe in a fair-share economy, and a fair-share economy is, as I have stated, one in which we have full employment, that people have a real growth in their wages, that we have price stability and that we have a low level of unemployment, if not no unemployment.

In those areas we stand to do battle with the fiscal and economic policies of this government. If we do battle, because of the government's inability to see the merit in some of the thoughts which we have in this area we will fight them everywhere. If, on the other hand the government believes there is any merit in some of the thoughts which we have had on this vexed and complex problem, then we will support them in those initiatives. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr Spence moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, March 17, 1972

New Complex for Workmen's Compensation Board, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Carton: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid 528

Downtown Toronto trade centre, questions of Mr. White: Mr. R. F. Nixon 537

Implementation of report on status of women, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon 537

Payments to former WCB vice-chairman, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis 538

Authority for payments to former WCB vice-chairman, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Bullbrook 540

Pits and quarries regulations re Orillia township, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis 541

Reorganization of the Government of Ontario, bill to provide for, Mr. Davis, first reading 541

Ministry of the Solicitor General, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading 542

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading 542

Ministry of Natural Resources, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading 542

Ministry of Industry and Tourism, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, first reading 542

Real Estate and Business Brokers Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 542

St. John's College School, Elora, bill to incorporate, Mr. Worton, first reading 542

Business Corporations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Deacon, first reading 542

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne: Mr. Renwick 543

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Spence, agreed to 559

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Bernier, agreed to 559

No. 16



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 27, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 27, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors with us this afternoon: In the east gallery students from Smithfield Middle School of Rexdale; and in the west gallery students from Oakville-Trafalgar High School of Oakville.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, on November 3, 1971, I announced that a study was being undertaken of industrial milk marketing in Ontario.

There have been some rather substantial changes developing in the production and marketing patterns for industrial milk in Ontario, and it was quite clear we needed to have an in-depth study made to determine our current position, how we reached that position and what policies might be recommended in the long term interest of the dairy industry.

The economic branch of our department engaged the Toronto firm of Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co. to conduct this study. I am pleased to announce they have completed their work and their report has been presented to the department. Copies are available from our economics branch for those who wish to examine their report and the recommendations they make for possible future policy.

I shall not elaborate, Mr. Speaker, on the recommendations made by Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co., except to say that I feel they have done a very thorough piece of work, in a businesslike way. We do not intend to make any hasty decisions with respect to their recommendations, rather we plan to involve the several organizations representing the dairy industry in Ontario in serious discussions respecting the findings of the study. These discussions will begin as soon as the involved organizations have had time to thoroughly review the document and discuss it with their membership.

I should point out in this regard that policy decisions affecting the destiny of the dairy industry in Ontario, or any segment of that industry, involve more than provincial decisions. Our dairy policies are closely interwoven with the national policies of the Canadian Dairy Commission.

We feel there is need for a clearer marketing policy in Ontario, particularly with respect to industrial milk. This is the reason we commissioned this study and this is the reason we want to involve the various groups in serious discussions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): How is the egg study coming along?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, if I may I would like to take this as the most appropriate opportunity of making the first report I can—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Did the minister bring cigars?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —to the Legislature on my recent visit to the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Did the minister hijack that plane?

Mr. Deans: Did the minister bring back any cigars?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Thanks for the advance notice of the visit.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It will not be at great length, Mr. Speaker, but assuredly in the question period, and at other times, I would be glad to extend my remarks in relation to those particular eight days I spent in that republic. The history leading up to my visit is relatively simple.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Did the minister cut the sugar cane?

Mr. Lewis: It is what most of us do during the day!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: About a year ago I was asked by the Cuban government whether or not I would consider making a visit to Cuba. I was, of course, as intrigued as any one of us would be—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): In what capacity?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —with the thought, and I think that any Canadian would be. I think all of us recognize, as Canadians, that we are one of the world's great trading nations, and as a people are outward looking and historically not part—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He was the Minister of Health at that time.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Historically, it is not—

Mr. Lewis: If the hon. minister wanted to take a holiday, say so.

Mr. Ruston: It would look like it on that basis.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): This minister and the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) are going to outdo Stan Randall.

Mr. Lewis: Well this minister has never done this kind of thing before.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Pardon!

Mr. Lewis: If the minister wanted to take a holiday, he doesn't have to be apologetic about it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is not the interpretation that I would judge the media and the people of this province and the country will take of it! If members will allow me.

At that time I was, of course, Minister of Health. And although it would have interested me as a Canadian and as a politician to have taken such a trip, its relevance was very limited. When I became Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, it became obvious to me that the relevancy of the invitation from the Cuban government was very real.

Mr. Lewis: Nothing like real relevance!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Since the revolution 13 years ago—

Mr. Singer: Same old story!

Mr. Ruston: What revolution?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We have, of course, maintained.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't think this is as funny as members opposite seem to think it is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, the minister is ridiculous.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the minister is making a farce of it. Isn't this ridiculous!

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister just apologize and sit down?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is not ridiculous and it is not funny. It is one of the more useful things that I hope I have been able to accomplish in the years I have been in this House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The members opposite are sitting there yammering and have been yammering and don't know a darn thing about what I did and why I went there and what was accomplished. Why don't they wait, and then if they don't think it is useful, then respond? Why don't they wait until they hear what I did?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Why didn't the minister tell us before he went? What was so secretive about the mission?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There was nothing secretive about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister knew about it a year ago.

Mr. MacDonald: After all, the Minister of Revenue had one month's advance publicity before he left.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't think the members opposite are doing themselves credit by not listening.

An hon. member: Why doesn't the minister worry about members in his own section of the House?

Mr. Singer: Why did the minister tell a reporter not to publish the story?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I did not tell any reporter not to publish any stories; and I never have in my life.

Mr. Lewis: Angry and vehement words indicate a weak cause and always have.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well I don't think anything—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Hon. members opposite must have a lot of weak causes then!

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. minister picked up a hot temper in the process.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anything makes me more angry, as it would any of us, than to be judged before you have been able to present your case.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister had an opportunity to present his case before he went.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: How could I?

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister chose not to inform the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: How in the name of God could I describe my visit to Cuba before I had gone there.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. minister might have told us.

Mr. Singer: The hon. minister could have told everyone why he was going.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There was no secrecy; hundreds of people knew.

Mr. Lewis: Oh sure!

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Hundreds of people knew.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Anyway, would the members like to hear. Gentlemen, would the members like to hear. Ladies and gentlemen, would the members like to hear a report on my visit to Cuba?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: All right! The facts are that since the revolution, which was about 13 years ago, Canada has maintained an ambassador in Cuba and has continued to trade with the Republic of Cuba. The trade involving Canada is not large, but it covers a wide spectrum. A very serious and important part of it covers the manufacturers and the workers and the people of the Province of Ontario.

The obvious complementary nature between the Republic of Cuba, its problems and its produce and its trade challenges, and that of the commercial and economic jurisdiction of Ontario are there; and their nature, as I said, is complementary. When I took—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think that would interest the Minister of Trade.

Hon. Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: It does! And it will!

Mr. Singer: Why didn't the Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. White) even know about it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The member asked what a policy minister is supposed to do.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I knew perfectly well that the initiative would avoid risks—would involve risks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Now the first risk, Mr. Speaker, that I think would be obvious was that the visit from the point of view of the—

Mr. Lewis: That the minister should have taken an Air Canada jet—it is safer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It might be misunderstood.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I take the business of this House very seriously, Mr. Speaker. It is not a comedy show.

Now the question of the Cuban situation—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is what the minister thinks!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think it and I believe it.

Now the question of misinterpretation that first concerned me was that involving the Cuban government. I didn't want to go down there and be treated, or see Ontario treated, in a perfunctory manner. On the other hand we are a province, we are not a nation, and I certainly didn't want to go down under the guise of diplomacy of a state. I was down there for eight days—

Mr. Stokes: How was the water?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Did the minister have a great time there?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I was down there for eight days. I had one day of holiday, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is the truth. Listen! If members would like to learn, that is the truth. That was the Sunday before last on my one day off—my one day on the beach—when armed as members would be if they were me, with snorkel and mask in the beautiful weather, I went to the beach.

Mr. Lewis: This is not a comedy show—I take this House seriously!

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): The NDP leader wouldn't know it!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That was the Sunday morning on which I bumped into—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Stokes: His snorkel, his book and his order pad!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, I don't know—if I repeat it—it is the one day of holiday I had in the eight.

Mr. Singer: Oh sure!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I'm not asking for sympathy. I am just stating the facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: If I may, I will describe in a sentence the typical day most of the members would picture. Certainly those who are involved in government will know this happens—

Mr. Lewis: Right! Tell us about our man in Havana—Bert Lawrence!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know how long the member's joke is going to be funny!

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Order please!

I would ask the guests in the galleries to remain quiet, otherwise they shall have to leave. We can't have disturbances from the guests in the galleries, if they please.

This sort of debate across the floor of the House is completely out of order. I think the hon. members should permit the hon. minister to make his statement. If the hon. minister will please continue without heeding the interruptions and make his statement, we would progress better.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: If the members are interested, the other seven days of course, were typical of the kind of mission that many of our ministers go on, federally and provincially. That is a morning of briefing, normally with the officials, and meeting with the ministers; and most afternoons were spent inspecting the different facilities of the different departments, whether they be collective farms, schools, factories or whatever.

I have with me the itinerary itself and can provide copies to the press or others who may be interested. I won't go through it today, but those were typical days. Usually—three times I guess—in the evenings there was a formal dinner given by one of the ministries themselves.

I can say that I would have hoped to have had another day of what I and the members would call holiday but the actual programme itself filled up because I decided that because of the warmth and attention and general care which the Cuban government had taken with regard to the itinerary, and the tremendous seriousness with which they looked upon it, I would give another half day, as a courtesy as it were, to the people in the Ministry of External Relations and go and work for a morning with them on one of their collective sugar cane cutting farms.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Did the minister cut cane?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes, because every department of government down there, the civil service and the ministers, have a quota of sugar cutting—

Mr. Shulman: All the cabinet ministers should do that; they should go out to the fields.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —which they must meet every year. They leave their offices, and as part of what we would call their so-called holidays, they tackle the hard work of the cane fields themselves.

Mr. Lewis: This is out of character!

Mr. Shulman: Can we arrange to send the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. McNaughton) down there for a few days?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: In any case, again the Cubans didn't think this was funny either, and they appreciated it very sincerely.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The second thing that gobbled up what would have been my second day of holiday was the fact that the Minister of Agriculture and Agricultural Reform decided to extend his meetings. This was extremely pleasing to our Canadian ambassador there and to the Cuban officials with me, because it in itself was a recognition again of the importance the government of Cuba placed on the visit.

I may say that the other side of the misinterpretation that concerned me was that it would be considered political, and I can report there was no effort made by the government or any of its officials to grandstand or display, or try and take advantage of any political circumstances involving the visit of a Canadian there. They were scrupulous in that regard.

Mr. Singer: What does that mean? They didn't make a communist out of the minister?

Mr. Shulman: What does that mean?

Mr. Lewis: This was after the revolution not before the revolution. Think of what Batista would have done.

Mr. Singer: They didn't try to persuade him to come back and spread communism in Ontario!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Now my second concern, Mr. Speaker, in accepting the invitation, was in relation to Canada itself. What I had contemplated in deciding to go to Cuba was that it could not be diplomacy in the true sense, because only nations can be involved in that.

Mr. Singer: Oh that!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Nor on the other side was it intended to be a trade mission of the type the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) had been on.

Mr. Singer: What was it exactly that the Minister of Trade and Development and Tourism and Information asked the minister to do?

No one lets the Minister of Trade and Development go anywhere.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It was the highest possible level on which I would think this province can involve itself in what I would call, in parenthesis, diplomatic or commercial diplomacy.

Mr. Singer: Diplomatic what?

Mr. Lewis: Diplomatic diplomacy?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Commercial diplomacy!

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Federal-provincial diplomacy.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say that the Canadian government appreciated, understood and supported the purpose of my mission, which was cleared carefully before I went.

Mr. MacDonald: Why didn't the minister clear it with us if he cleared it with them?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Because I didn't want it—as I said misinterpretation was one of my chief concerns!

Mr. Singer: Did the minister do anything in respect to Ottawa other than just to say he was going?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No.

Mr. Singer: No!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I checked it through with them, because I know that the thing the people of Ontario would react most strongly against would be some smart alec or provincial upstaging of what is a true federal responsibility.

An hon. member: Why didn't the minister tell us?

Mr. Lewis: Come on, what kind of assumption is that?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is quite true.

Mr. Lewis: The minister could have made an announcement to the House that he was going.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I am talking particularly about the question of Canada itself. Canada considered the visit would be useful, and I may say that from the beginning to the end the Canadian ambassador participated fully in all the activities.

Mr. Lewis: Of course, he was dealing with a minister.

Mr. Singer: That is his job!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: He briefed me carefully and fully, and was himself personally enthusiastic because, and some of the members will be interested in this, because there are areas where the mere fact of the representation being political, or via political persons, can and does open doors which the people in the civil service, bureaucratically or not, can't open. So he was very pleased with this.

Mr. Singer: Of course, he was delighted!

Mr. Lewis: It was very embarrassing.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The third area of misinterpretation that concerned me was the reaction of the people of Ontario, and before I went I checked, as I said earlier, with literally hundreds of people. I checked—

An hon. member: Except the Legislature.

An hon. member: Not us!

Mr. MacDonald: We have always been the fifth wheel to the Tory carriage.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I hadn't conceived that I would need the permission of members opposite.

Mr. Lewis: The minister didn't need our permission, but he might condescend to tell the House!

An hon. member: Why? Why?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the role of the government is to act and to govern.

Mr. Singer: That's acting and governing?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: And that the role of the opposition is to criticize what we've done.

Mr. Shulman: We don't expect to be given so many opportunities to criticize.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Members opposite apparently have decided I haven't done anything before they have even heard my report.

Mr. Lewis: Now that we have heard the minister's report we are sure!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The next point, Mr. Speaker, that would naturally concern me, is the interpretation by the people of this province. I found before I went that the financial and banking people were enthusiastic; I found that the manufacturers were enthusiastic. I found, among the ministries with which I am concerned, that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) of course was enthusiastic because—

Mr. Lewis: He is just naturally enthusiastic.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: He has been filled with spontaneous enthusiasm ever since the provincial secretary returned.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —because, as some of the members will know, our agricultural trade and our agricultural relationship with Cuba is, I would judge, by far our most important link and is a very real thing, certainly to the Cuban people who are doing everything they possibly can to increase their yield and the quality of their stock and agricultural products.

Mr. Singer: Why didn't he send along somebody who knew something about agriculture—like the minister?

Mr. MacDonald: If it were this important, the minister would have told us before this.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say that while I haven't mentioned the support of some of the working people of this province, while I was in Cuba I received a telegram from the president of Local 767 of the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Ontario Federation of Labour and CFL. If I may read it in part—

Mr. Lewis: CFL?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: CLC!

"The vigorous initiative—"

Mr. Lewis: I didn't know they were affiliated, but it is encouraging.

Mr. Singer: Which local is that? A Toronto local or an Ottawa local?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A Havana local.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It's Local 767, the address is Scarborough and the president is apparently a Mr. Don Roach.

Mr. Lewis: The Ontario Housing Corp. CUPE local?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if you would justify to me why the reading of this particular telegram that was received by the minister has any relevance in what has been purported to be a ministerial statement.

Mr. Lewis: It's part of the massive public outpouring of support for his venture abroad.

Interjections by hon members.

Mr. Lewis: This is the weakest case he has ever made in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) is trying to destroy all the superministers.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): Wouldn't the member like a massive outpouring of public support?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well I shall carry on with this, Mr. Speaker, because if the opposition—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you rule on the point I raised.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the hon. minister was reading the telegram as an indication to the hon. members that the CLC was aware of the trip and perhaps, as I understood it, had some support of it, to show the reason for the trip.

Mr. Lewis: No, no! A local affiliate of the CLC. I have the telegram.

Mr. MacDonald: How did Don Roach know?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't purport to suggest to the member for Scarborough West that this telegram or any response I might get is representative of the total opinion, but it is representative of an opinion.

Mr. MacDonald: Don Roach!

Mr. Lewis: Your friendly local CUPE Conservative!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I quote, Mr. Speaker: "The vigorous initiative—

Mr. Lewis: It is a slander on CUPE.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: "—publicly displayed by your government, as evidenced by your trade endeavours in Cuba, stimulates not only the imagination—"

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: "—and the entrepreneurship—"If I may so Mr. Speaker, I am so speaking to the people of Ontario at this moment, whether I am speaking to some members of the opposition or not.

> The vigorous initiative publicly displayed by your government, as evidenced by your trade endeavours in Cuba, stimulates not only the imagination and entrepreneurship of Ontarians but all of Canada. Maintain the leadership in this area, which of course in the final analysis—

Mr. Lewis: Come on! This is too embarrassing for words.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Continuing: —

> equates itself to greater job opportunities and prosperity for the entire population of this nation. In our opinion, the only way to solve unemployment is not to make it but to correct it.

Mr. Singer: Take more trips!

Mr. Shulman: What he was really saying that he approved of the minister working in the sugar field.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: What is the date on the telegram?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The 22nd, I would judge.

Mr. Lewis: The minister would judge?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, it says "ONT 22nd"; and I judge that is what it means.

Mr. Lewis: I suppose so.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Now Mr. Speaker, as is evidenced by this afternoon, there was one—

Mr. Singer: How could he know on the 22nd what the minister going to do?

Hon. A. B. R Lawrence: Well, I had been there—

Mr. Singer: The minister had been there two days at that time.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I've never spoken to him. I didn't ask him to send the telegram.

Mr. Lewis: No one would believe that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order please!

Mr. Lewis: When did the minister get back?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Last night.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has worked very hard since then.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the one degree of misinterpretation which I hadn't expected was that members of this House or anyone else would consider it was a jaunt, just to sit in the sand, or for social fun.

As I mentioned earlier, the cost of the trip for Dr. Reynolds and myself via Mexico —to try and catch one of the twice-a-week flights from Mexico to Cuba, which in themselves are not regular, with hotel bills, limousines, double customs—didn't seem to make sense, so I decided—

Mr. MacDonald: So the minister hijacked a plane!

Mr. Shulman: Did Dr. Reynolds also work in the sugar fields?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —so I decided, Mr. Speaker, to ask for the Ontario Beechcraft—

Mr. Ruston: From the member of Kenora (Mr. Bernier)?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —and, having decided to take the Beechcraft, we filled the seven seats with our wives and some of our children.

Mr. Good: I think the minister should have taken a larger plane, then they all could have gone.

Interjections by hon. members

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that taking our wives and children cost the Ontario taxpayers not one penny.

Mr. MacDonald: At this point I believe that one alright.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The Cuban government graciously paid for the total expenses of our whole party of seven throughout the whole time that we were in their country.

Mr. MacDonald: Including the plane?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say the plane would have been going down with two. It holds seven, so we took five more.

I may say, Mr. Speaker—and other members of this House will know that they have experienced this themselves—that formal dinner parties, when you are on this kind of a mission, are themselves working sessions—

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, sure!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —and that they were indeed enhanced by the presence of our wives.

Mr. Stokes: Why didn't he give them—

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may also say, Mr. Speaker, that the Cubans themselves were very flattered that we had three of our children with us.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: They had never seen children before.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is common to all people, but they were particularly pleased with our children. They were particularly pleased—

Mr. Lewis: They were well behaved, I suppose. Cut cane with the best of them.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I would say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Did the minister have a dog with him?

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister draw this to an end?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier's strategy to get out of the caucuses and use children is beyond words.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that as part—

Mr. Lewis: At least the Premier only went to Vermont.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —of this, invitations were received, of course, for the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) and experts in his department to visit Cuba.

They take extremely seriously not only their trade but the agricultural expertise that exists in Canada—that exists at Guelph, and our institutions.

Mr. Singer: Did the minister have anyone along who knew anything about agriculture?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I haven't spoken as yet, of course, to the Minister of Agriculture, but I may report that their attitude is extremely warm to his department and people in agriculture here.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Look at the enthusiasm!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may also report—

Mr. Lewis: What about the Minister of Trade and Development who is convulsing quietly behind the minister?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —I may also report, Mr. Speaker, that when the great tragedy hit them in losing virtually all their carefully nurtured and developed swine population, that the immediate intervention of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: This is not funny. It really isn't funny.

Mr. Singer: It is very sad.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is tragic.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is tragic. It is indeed tragic, and the Cubans—

Mr. Lewis: Why did the minister get himself trapped into this kind of statement about—

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —the Cubans—

Mr. Lewis: —personally discrediting and beyond belief, as it is! Swineherds indeed!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I report to the people of Ontario—

Mr. Lewis: Why does the minister not leave the swine herds and take his seat?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I report to my colleagues, and may I report to the people of Ontario and Canada, the tremendous gratitude that the government of Cuba and the people of Cuba felt at the way in which our experts, technical people, went to Cuba and helped them in the midst of that great tragedy.

May I also mention the tremendous respect they have for the quality of our agricultural products and our stock, and how keenly they support the point which I am just making, that the Minister of Agriculture of this province and any number of his technicians are welcome and totally wanted, I may say, in the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Agriculture should visit it some time.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may also say that the—

Mr. Lewis: That is health, agriculture—

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —department of tourism in Cuba—

Mr. Lewis: Why don't all the ministers go to Cuba?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. Singer: And take their snorkels and their masks!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may also say—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may also report, Mr. Speaker, to my colleague in Tourism and Information that they take very seriously the opportunities—

Mr. Lewis: You know, if I did not see the minister with my eyes, I should say it was the Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). It is too much!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —which can open up in the field of tourism. Tourism is one of those areas where, without great investments on their part, they can do something to help balance their trade and do something to help support the tremendous need for purchases of our sophisticated technological equipment, our machinery. In fact, there is virtually nothing in the economy of Ontario that they wouldn't buy if they could.

Their concern with tourism is very real. I would say that one of the tragedies is to find those glorious miles of beach, the excellent weather, the lovely countryside, the empty houses, against the background—

Mr. Shulman: They are so enthusiastic they were shooting at Canadians on the beach down there last week.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —against the background of the fact that the Cubans themselves don't use these resources in January, February, March because—

Mr. Shulman: If they go on the beaches, they are trying to escape.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: And so they have, with a little investment—

Mr. MacDonald: If this is a short report, heaven help us when we get the full one.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know how long it would have been if I had not been interrupted but it certainly has not been shortened.

Mr. Lewis: As the minister is going through the departments, will he tell us about Cuban correctional institutions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say also, of course, they are interested in the purchase of virtually all our manufactured goods; machinery, parts and those things that really keep people in Ontario employed and keep our economy rolling.

In the field of transport and communications there is not a great deal, I think, that we can do directly on our own. But the key, and this applies to trade, commerce, agriculture, tourism and the works, is to set up, if we possibly can—and we will need federal authority, of course—regular freight flights between Toronto and Havana. The stimulation that this would give to—

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear! By Lands and Forests' Piper Cubs.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —the half a dozen different departments of this government involved—including pulp in Lands and Forests; including cattle—this is a very real concern.

Mr. Shulman: Fly pulp down, would we?

Mr. Lewis: We would fly the pulp to Cuba, would we?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: As I say, Mr. Speaker, my next responsibility would be to debrief myself and meet with the ministers in my own policy field and get down to the work which is essentially theirs. That is, of course—

Mr. Singer: Debrief?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —in each of these departments to follow up with the nuts and bolts, the expertise and the factual background that is needed.

Mr. Singer: The whole ball of wax.

Mr. Lewis: That is just verbal nonsense.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I do not know, Mr. Speaker; I doubt if there is anything I can say this afternoon that will in any way convince the opposition that they have taken a rather shallow, smart and foolish approach to what was something that was done, I think, in good sense, and done with great value.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister won't even put this in his memoirs.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I know this, and it is without doubt, that whether the opposition members think it was of great value, there is no question but that the Cuban government thinks it of extreme value.

Mr. MacDonald: If the minister keeps this up he won't have memoirs.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when the smart remarks of the opposition are forgotten, the manufacturers—

Mr. Ruston: The minister has been stupid.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —the workers, the farm people of this province, will themselves perceive—

Mr. Lewis: Poppycock!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —that it was the important thing to do and a successful endeavour.

Mr. Lawlor: The most grotesque piece of self-justification we have ever seen.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Poppycock!

Mr. Ferrier: Tell us another one.

Mr. Ruston: The minister didn't sell anything.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: And Mr. Speaker, I may say, because it will be conveyed, that I would like in this Legislature to thank the Cuban government, not only for the attention and effort they put into the visit, but of course, as well, I have to thank them for something that I should acknowledge, and I think most Ontario people would acknowledge if they were there, and that is—

Mr. Shulman: Even the Minister of Revenue did better in China. He sold one order.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): The minister agrees that Castro is right now?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —their personal characteristic of great warmth and great hospitality, which is a characteristic which they showed, so far as I could see, on a par with all people.

Mr. Breithaupt: Send them a holstein!

Mr. MacDonald: Subtle proselytization!

Mr. Shulman: The best speech the minister ever gave.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with ministerial statements, if there are any further—

Mr. Ruston: We only had one so far.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: —perhaps I might be granted just a moment to introduce an important visitor, a distinguished visitor, in the chamber today: The Hon. Guy Saint-Pierre, who is the Minister of Trade and Commerce for the Province of Quebec and who is seated in the chamber to my left.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I hope he has drawn a lesson—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): He would be impressed by the member for Scarborough West today.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he will be very pleased with his prospects abroad.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TRIP TO CUBA

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the provincial secretary who has just given us his statement why he did not inform the House as to the importance of this trip when he might have communicated this to us before we rose for the Easter recess?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, I had, as a matter of fact, a press statement—a statement for this House—prepared the week before last, but there was very little in the way of concrete facts that I could give members.

I balanced my mind for days whether to release the statement, whether to have a press conference, or what to do in this regard. because I certainly didn't want to be disrespectful to the House. But one of my problems was that the visit itself, and what was actually to be done, was not decided on, and was not indeed known to me by way of reaction, until I got to Havana itself.

Mr. MacDonald: Sounds like a fishing expedition.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It seemed to me that it would risk the essence of my meeting to start announcing and speculating and blowing bugles or making grandstand announcements of all the things I hoped to do—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Like some ministers!

Mr. Ferrier: The minister didn't know what he was going down for.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No. I really mean this—before I went there and before I had seen what they were prepared to do.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, that is pretty weak.

Mr. Lewis: That just doesn't hold water.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That was the reason, Mr. Speaker, that although there was nothing secretive, I can categorically tell you that hundreds of people knew of my visit—

Mr. Breithaupt: Name one!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Oh no. There is no one I haven't—you know, been prepared to discuss it.

Mr. MacDonald: Name one!

Mr. Lewis: Whom did the minister tell?

Mr. Ferrier: Does the minister usually make trips without knowing what they are for?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: So I felt, Mr. Speaker, until I actually met with them and saw the itinerary that they prepared for me, that the risks of spoiling of it, or the risks of merely speculating in the air, were not worth taking.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is the minister not aware that the real risk to him as minister is what has come to pass, that in fact his trip is seen to have been a junket in the sun that his justification has been both unwarranted and thin, and that the real regret, at least on this side of the House is that the minister's judgement is henceforth in some question?

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't too long ago that the judgement of the opposition was found to be in question. I think it was Oct. 21.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If the minister is relying on that justification, then it is worse than I thought, because it appears that he and his boss and the other ministers over there are prepared to use Ontario's air force to go where they choose, when they choose, and with whom they choose, and let the public pay.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: The public be damned.

Mr. Ruston: Resign, resign!

An hon. member: Arrogance!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, although we speak through you to the members of this House, I am quite convinced the media and the people of this province will realize the importance and significance to them of the visit that I made.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park was on his feet. Has he a supplementary?

Mr. Shulman: Has the minister brought back any concrete results of his trip? Has he initiated any trade pact? Has he made any agreement to sell any of our goods there? Can he show any concrete results, other than the wonderful trip he had and how nice they were to him?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): An autographed picture of Castro for the member.

Mr. Shulman: That is about it.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't have any pieces of paper, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Can he match the one order that the Minister of Revenue brought back from China?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But the Cubans during my visit twice set up meetings with Commandante Curbelo—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They found the minister on the doorstep and said: "What are we going to do with this guy?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —who, I am advised—

Mr. Singer: He had some snorkeling gear.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —as head of the agricultural reform programme is considered to be the most important administrator in Cuba and, although I know nothing of the real pecking order, I am advised that he is number two to Fidel himself, Prime Minister Fidel.

Mr. MacDonald: On a first-name basis now?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That is intriguing. The Cubans don't call the Prime Minister "Castro;" they call him "Fidel."

Mr. Ferrier: How about just plain Bill?

Mr. Lewis: Just plain Bill, just old Fidel. All the same family.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just like Stephen and David. The same thing all the way.

Mr. Lewis: He is known as a red Tory over there.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the assurances of a man of that significance in relation to a field which is their prime concern of course—and the whole guts of their economy in Cuba is mainly agricultural—didn't require from me, nor would I cast it as a requirement, that a protocol be written, or a statement be signed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Yes, if the minister, Mr. Speaker, had not been recognized by Mr. Sutton of the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, would he have bothered to report at all to the people of Ontario on his trip to Cuba?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A good question!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I suppose I met about 150 people from Ontario during the time I was down there, because Unitours—and I compliment them greatly for this, and I would say to my colleague in industry and tourism that that group, the people who organized that, are really entrepreneurs to be followed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What did the Minister of Trade and Development have to do with that?

Mr. Lewis: What is Unitours? What have they to do with the minister?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Unitours is a group which has had the brightness and the initiative to set up a series of—I think it will be five—charter flights to Cuba.

Mr. Shulman: But that first flight was the one that was fired at by the Cuban troops.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Answer the question: Would the minister have reported it?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I can report that the Ontario tourists—and as I say I suppose I met 100 of them, because I was invited one evening to a reception and met them, of course, in a hotel—that every one I met on the Unitour's tour—

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister have reported?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —was enthusiastic.

Would I have reported? Of course, no question!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Is it true that the minister turned blue when Bob Sutton discovered him?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I would say that Bob Sutton and I had a very pleasant chat.

Mr. Lewis: Yes I am sure. The minister should hear his account of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

If the hon. minister will please simply reply to the question directed to him, we would get further.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West is next.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary of the minister, Mr. Speaker: Can he report to the House the precise nature of his advance preparations for the Cuban trip, the arrangements that were made in advance, and perhaps table the correspondence for us with various Cuban ministries and with the ambassador and with the officials in Ottawa?

I presume with the extended itinerary he had meeting so many—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's presumptions cannot be part of the question.

Mr. Lewis: You are quite right and I am not presumptuous Mr. Speaker.

May I ask the minister then, can be table the advance material? Would he also take the House into his confidence now, after the event, of those with whom he discussed it prior to going amongst the several hundred? Would he tell us those among the banking and commercial community those amongst the manufacturing community and the agricultural community. I take it he had cabinet approval. Can he give us some flavour of the advance preparation?

Mr. Singer: What Ottawa people, civil servants, cabinet ministers?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I'll see what I can do, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: The hon. minister will need a day to work on that one.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: But, of course, what I was doing insofar as most of the commercial and manufacturing communities were concerned was really testing the waters.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: With a snorkelling mask?

Mr. Lewis: Oh it is a great day!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Insofar as formal communications are concerned, there was very little. I had meetings in Ottawa with the Cuban ambassador. He came down here and met with me and Ontario governmental officials. I had two or three meetings with the Cuban consul and the head Cuban consul in Montreal. I don't know unless my department has it, of any significant inter-state exchanges in the formal sense.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I haven't really—I'd like to pursue it.

The minister has nothing as trivial as written correspondence about the intended trip? An outline of what he might, perhaps, have expected to see over his seven days' work, one-day vacation? Nothing in terms of purposes for going, from Ontario's viewpoint, set out on paper at any time? None of this is available by way of advance preparation for the visit?

And doesn't the minister see how little trust we in the opposition can have when all of this is absent?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has presented his question. Would he please be seated.

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister expect us to take it seriously? How can the minister expect us to take it as more than just a pleasure jaunt?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member will please permit the minister to answer the question.

Mr. Lewis: I've landed in countries too. I don't even hold ministerial status—and they look after you for a week—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may answer the question.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't think it is a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: Well it is! What formal documentation—supplementary—what can the minister table in the House to show us—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could advise us, in view of the obvious agricultural thrust that this trip was supposed to have taken, and in view of the fact there were at least two vacant seats, and in further view of the fact that neither the minister nor his deputy are well known for their depth of agricultural knowledge; why he didn't take along the Minister of Agriculture and Food, or some senior civil servant of that department who could adequately survey and report to the province about agricultural matters?

Mr. Breithaupt: Or send the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson)!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Well Mr. Speaker, it was not within the concept of the visit itself. As I mentioned earlier it is my hope and expectation that four or five of the departments that I have mentioned will be down there with their experts. In seven working days I don't think a crowd of Ontarians from this government being down there would have accomplished that much—

Mr. Singer: I wasn't talking about a crowd—I was talking about one agricultural person.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: My own purposes were to move through these meetings—

Mr. Roy: Nothing to do with agriculture!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —on a policy basis as best I could. I didn't purport to get into the techniques—

Mr. Shulman: I hope the minister did better in Cuba than he is doing here.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I didn't get involved in either our stock or—no, it wasn't a matter of technique.

It was a matter really, and this is what I would say was accepted by the Cuban government by my presence there, that they had as senior a person as they could have from the government of Ontario related to resources, saying to them over and over again in a sympathetic and interested and firm way, that we were extremely interested in our relationships with them in the resource field. That satisfied them and it satisfied me. Surely the members can see to be trailed on this expedition by a group of technicians at that particular time, whether it be six or a dozen—

Mr. Singer: I wasn't talking about a crowd, I was talking about one agricultural person.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know what one could do. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that we will want dozens of people in these departments down there over the next few years.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener was next with a supplementary.

Mr. Breithaupt: I was wondering if the hon. minister, as a supplementary, would table a list of the hundreds of people who were aware of this trip?

Mr. Lewis: And the correspondence too, since it has been asked for?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I have had no correspondence myself—

Mr. Lewis: No correspondence himself? How does the minister expect to peddle this stuff in the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Ruston: Make up some tonight!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I think my deputy has had some correspondence. I do know we had three or four hours of meetings with the ambassador, as I mentioned, on two occasions; and with the consul in my office and in his offices sorting out what I wanted to do. As I mentioned—and I know that some members of the media will be interested—I have the agenda that was worked out. I think the hon. members will find that this in itself shows the purposes of this government were understood in detail by the government of Cuba.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, could the minister tell us how far in advance of his departure date he advised the Department of External Affairs that he was going?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't see my deputy here, but my guess is about a month.

Mr. Singer: About a month; was that in writing?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know. I will check.

Mr. Singer: Or would it be true that the writing only went two days before the minister left?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know, but—

Mr. Singer: No; well check on that!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —Mr. Ritchie was in discussions with my deputy, as I said, about a month before we went. The conversations were several. Whether there is something in writing or not I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, how is it possible for a senior provincial secretary of the Province of Ontario to go on what he calls a personal, commercial diplomatic mission to an independent sovereign jurisdiction without correspondence exchanged with Ottawa, without advance correspondence with the Cuban government and without some serious material on record as to the purposes of the visit? How is that possible in this day? And also without notice to the Legislature?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I don't know how you respond to that. There is no question but that the Department of External Affairs and the Ontario government were in contact with my office well in advance of our departure. They had no problem in understanding the purpose of the mission. They were supportive of it; their ambassador was fully briefed. The thing flowed without any great degree of formality. Maybe the days have changed from the old stuffed shirt diplomacy that we are used to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has further questions?

REQUISITIONING POLICY FOR GOVERNMENT PLANES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Can he explain to the House the procedure whereby his colleagues in the cabinet can requisition one of his planes for a trip of this nature or of the nature of the trip taken by the Premier during the past week? Is it necessary for the minister to give his approval or is there one minister through which approval is cleared?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, just by coincidence I have a statement along those lines.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —with your permission, sir, I would like to read it into the record.

The Department of Lands and Forests coordinates all non-scheduled air transportation for departments, boards and commissions.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. If this is a lengthy ministerial statement, it would not be proper to provide it at this time. However, if it is a reasonably brief, not too lengthy reply to the question, it may be given.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very short and to the point.

In the case of a cabinet minister requiring flying, a department aircraft is provided, subject to priority demands such as forest

fire protection or other emergency. This has been the policy since the inception of the air service in 1924.

Where a commercial aircraft must be hired for a cabinet minister, the charges are submitted to his department for payment. The justification for a flight is the responsibility of the requisitioning department or minister, not the Department of Lands and Forests. Where flying is requisitioned for a deputy minister or other departmental employee, the air service records the hours flown and bills that department for the full cost of the flight at the rates prescribed for that type of aircraft. This is an interdepartmental transfer of funds.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: As a further supplementary, I wonder if the minister can indicate what billing would be sent to the provincial secretary's department and to the Department of the Premier for the use of those planes last week?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't have that information as yet—and I think the leader will understand that—for obvious reasons. But when it is available, I will certainly make it available to the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Is it proper for the minister's planes to be used for skiing holidays?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is this facility available only to cabinet ministers and to deputies, or is it available to all members of the House or only some? Just who determines the availability?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well Mr. Speaker, in answer to this question I have to point out that under the terms and conditions laid down by the federal authorities, only government personnel are authorized to use Ontario provincial government aircraft.

Mr. Breithaupt: What about the families?

Mr. Singer: Well Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. minister perhaps understood my question. Is such a government person as the member for Brant (Mr. R. F. Nixon) entitled to submit such a requisition and have it honoured?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh I don't think so, Mr. Speaker. I repeat, it is government personnel, and the—

Mr. Singer: Aren't members of the Legislature also government personnel?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, as members of the Legislature, my colleagues to the right of me do not have the privilege.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Ask him; he'll tell you!

Mr. Breithaupt: What about members of families? Are they government personnel?

Mr. Speaker: Are there further supplementaries?

Mr. Stokes: I have a supplementary I would like to direct to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Has the minister circulated a copy of the speech that he made in the London area recently, suggesting that all people in southern Ontario should go north to "thunder country" for a skiing holiday rather than adding further to our balance of payments problem by taking skiing excursions in other jurisdictions?

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I asked if there were supplementaries; that certainly is not a supplementary.

Mr. Stokes: That is a direct supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: That is directly supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: He wants everyone to use the plane.

Mr. Speaker: I rule the question is not supplementary.

Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary, right!

Mr. Lewis: Am I to understand the minister that only members of the executive council and their deputies have a right to requisition Department of Lands and Forests planes?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Under the authority laid down by the federal Ministry of Transport, that is correct.

Mr. MacDonald: While you preach and learn!

Mr. Lewis: Can I have an explanation of that? What does the minister mean about the federal Ministry of Transport?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We obtain a charter to operate this fleet of aircraft in the Prov-

ince of Ontario and we must abide by the rules and regulations laid down by the federal Ministry of Transport—

Mr. MacDonald: But you don't.

Mr. Shulman: Only the executive council can use it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the same as any other service in the Province of Ontario that operates aircraft.

Mr. Lewis: But you would draft the charter for federal agreement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, with the federal government; and we must comply with their regulations.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no! You file the charter for approval, do you not, indicating what your request is? They then approve or disapprove. Just out of curiosity, does this mean that executive assistants to ministers will be able to requisition planes?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No.

Mr. Lewis: No: Is there any distinction between superministers and mere administrative ministers?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No. I would point out that we are all equal in this government.

Mr. Lewis: I see.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You'd never know.

Mr. Breithaupt: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener has a supplementary?

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the minister: Are members of families of executive council members considered to be governmental personnel?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No. They cannot requisition aircraft; but as my colleague pointed out, if there is an aircraft going from A to B and there are seats available, I personally see no reason why those seats couldn't be filled. It doesn't cost any more; the aircraft is moving anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if the aircraft are restricted to government business.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, they must be restricted to government business.

Mr. Shulman: Like skiing?

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How does the Premier's skiing trip fit in with government business?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think we will have to accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that members of the executive council are constantly working for the benefit of this province—

Mr. MacDonald: Even on their days off?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and they are always on government business somewhere, some time.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Seven days a week, 24 hours a day.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I take it that if the Minister of Natural Resources gave authorization for these trips, there would have to be a specific request. Now, as I understand it, it has to be submitted to the minister—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The justification for a flight is the responsibility of the requisitioning department or minister.

Mr. Singer: But there is a requisition.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's right. It is the responsibility of that particular minister or department.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then—

Mr. Speaker: I will allow one more supplementary on this topic.

Mr. Lewis: Could the Minister of Natural Resources then please provide for the House —he may have it in front of him; he may have it later today—the requisitions which were given to him by the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, and by the Premier, for the flights they took?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, these requisitions are not in the form of a formal submission, they are verbal requests. After all—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Good: Just a phone call?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly they are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: How does the minister determine whether the object is government business if the requisition doesn't specify it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nice trip, wasn't it? Don't be so silly!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is the responsibility of the minister requisitioning the aircraft, obviously. These are responsible men. These are ridiculous questions.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Childish!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, but not on this.

Mr. Speaker: Right; further questions!

RESCINDING OF FORGIVABLE LOAN TO NORTHERN ELECTRIC CO.

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Trade and Development, who obviously regrets the minor status of his portfolio.

Could I ask him whether the government is considering rescinding, in whole or in part, the forgivable loan granted to Northern Electric Co. in Kingston in consideration of their apparent inability to meet the employment undertaking made when the loan was first granted?

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development; and Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, these performance loans, so called, are dependent upon the performance of the company in meeting the employment increases which become part of the contract. Therefore I conclude, without knowing the details of this particular contract that if they do not increase employment they do not earn the forgivable portion of the loan.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, by way of supplementary, if the minister is aware of this company specifically? If not, might he look into it and see the status of the meeting of the obligations and the status of the performance loan?

Hon. Mr. White: I will do that.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the ministerial assistant in the Department of Intergovernmental and Financial Affairs, the member for York East (Mr. Meen). I presume since COGP said they could answer questions, I may direct a question?

Mr. Speaker: I think not. The legislation setting them up and employing them has not been introduced. There has been no agreement that this will be permitted.

BARRIE BYPASS

Mr. Lewis: It is very difficult to know of whom to ask this question. Let me ask the question of the House leader, Mr. Speaker, since it might be more appropriate. I think he sits on the appropriate—no, I'll direct it to the Chairman of the Management Board, who hasn't yet had a chance, who sits there bereft of any trips abroad and never says a thing. Oh for the good old days! He would know.

Can we ask of the Chairman of the Management Board, Mr. Speaker, how it is that in the Toronto-centred region plan status report of August, 1971, there is a firm government undertaking that before the formulation of development policies, various advisory committees will be set up in places like Barrie, and yet quietly the Minister of Transportation and Communications have a full-fledged recommendation for a major 400 bypass around the city of Barrie, without any advance consultation with the municipal authorities or public whatsoever and will be presenting them therefore with a fait accompli? How is that possible under the circumstances?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, which municipal authorities is the member talking about? Barrie municipal authority?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that's one.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me say, then, I don't see the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) here, there have been many discussions with the mayor and the municipal authority in Barrie on these matters.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, the meaning then of the letter which went out on March 9 from the Department of Transportation and Communications re Highway 400 Barrie bypass. I quote:

> After this presentation and resolvance of any conflicts, we intend to present the

results of our study to the elected and technical representatives of all municipalities affected by the study and possibly to the general public at a later date.

The question is why have the committees that were guaranteed in the Toronto-centred region plan not been set up? Why has this all been done independent of any advisory consultation from said committees? Why is the public left to a later date? Why do major plans of this kind, affecting the entire economic development of the area, take place in private?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would imagine that it is quite proper and prudent to discuss with local municipalities the matter that concerned the member in his earlier remarks, to reach some form of consortium of opinion with those that are closely involved before it is broadened in its form for any purpose. It is a method that has been employed for quite some time.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is right. That is what we are complaining about.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have already stated that there have been meetings with the municipal people, quite properly. Would the members not be the first to scream, and I say this hypothetically, if the public were involved and the municipalities found out about it after the public did. I think the members would. I think they would be just as critical about that as they are about the process that has been undertaken.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister not think that the public has a right to know and to comment on a study of this magnitude prior to being presented with a fait accompli? Isn't that just what's wrong with planning in this province?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is confusing the issue here altogether. His early question was with respect to discussion with those that were going to be affected. Surely that's proper and that's been done.

Mr. Lewis: It hasn't been done.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh but it has!

Mr. Lewis: Not according to the Toronto-centred region plan.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: But it has been discussed with the municipality of Barrie. Everything that the member spoke about in terms of transportation, widening of highways, or anything that will involve that municipality has been discussed with them.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Isn't that a proper—

Mr. Lewis: Well, then—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Isn't that the proper order to do it in?

Mr. Lewis: By way of a final supplementary: How is it that the Department of Transportation and Communications, replete with final diagrams very carefully laying out the route worked out in advance with feasibility studies, sends a memo to Lands and Forests, Agriculture and Food, Environment, Trade and Development, Mines and Northern Affairs, Public Records and Archives, Treasury and Economics, Tourism and Information, Resources Commission, Hydro Electric Power Commission—no municipal authorities at all—and says "and possibly to the general public at a later date." How can one have intelligent economic planning on that basis?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was prompted to rise earlier, Mr. Speaker, and say if this is a question period it mystifies me. This has got into the widest ranging form of nonsensical debate I have heard in this House for a long time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: It is the ministers. They don't like it when they are being exposed. That's their problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, with respect, it is being aided and abetted by this type of question.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. Lewis: One final question of the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker, now that the Ford appeal has been pursued successfully, will the minister accelerate the prosecution of Canadian Gypsum under his Act?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Yes Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact—I am sorry it wasn't here; it was at a meeting last Wednesday night with a group of people from the borough of York area—I indicated that the charges are proceeding. There are some 13 of them I believe; I detailed them in the House. Any other charges, I think we laid two more about 10 days ago, are proceeding also.

I think I also mentioned at the time, Mr. Speaker, that the principals of Canadian Gypsum, the US parent's representatives, are coming to us, I believe tomorrow, to submit further steps in their programme to clean things up. I speculated that perhaps this was the result of the number of charges which have been laid because we seem to be getting a degree of co-operation which is better than has held true for some years.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: In view of the minister's intimation before the Easter recess that the government was contemplating amendments to the Act that would make mandatory fines of some substance on a second conviction and therefore make the whole process meaningful, is it possible that amendment will be brought in so that this acceleration of charges against Gypsum can be made meaningful?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think what I said at the time was that we were looking at the penalty clauses. I want to point out to the hon. member, and this was brought up again last Wednesday, that I still believe there has to be some latitude in the hands of the judge in dealing with offences, because there can be a great difference in the degree of the offence.

I think I suggested to someone last week that I would hesitate to see a minimum fine on second offence say of $1,000 or $2,000 when in actual fact it might be a very small infraction, by a very small operation. I think I used the example of one of our few remaining cheese factories which inadvertently dumped some more whey.

It is a very difficult question. I have a feeling, though, that we have to take a look at it. I think we do need an improvement; perhaps some other kind of a scale which I am not competent to discuss at this moment in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: A final supplementary: What exactly does the minister mean when he says "we must leave leeway," when the courts fine $1,000 instead of a possible $5,000 on the first offence and reduce the second fine to $200 when it could have been $10,000 on the second? What do you mean by "leeway" in light of that experience?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I mean, Mr. Speaker, that if the minimum fine on a second offence for anybody was $2,000, and the Plum Hollow Cheese Factory, which is known to the hon. member opposite, were charged with a second offence of dumping some whey in the creek and the minimum fine was $2,000, I think that would be too severe. I think the judge has to have some leeway, because there can be a great deal of difference in the severity of an offence—first, second, third or fourth.

Mr. MacDonald: The courts are making a mockery of the Government's laws.

Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Lands and Forests has a reply to a previous question.

FACILITIES FOR HANDICAPPED IN BRONTE CREEK PARK

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Waterloo North inquired in an earlier question regarding special facilities for the handicapped at Bronte Creek Provincial Park. I have this reply for him.

The Bronte Creek Provincial Park will open in phases with the surplus facilities ready for public use in the summer of 1973. A unique feature of the park will be facilities designed especially with the handicapped in mind. At the present time, my Bronte Creek advisory committee is attempting to involve people representing the blind, the paraplegic and the mentally retarded and other handicapped groups in park planning programmes.

I recently had correspondence—this is on March 8, 1972—with the chairman of the Action League for the Physically Handicapped Advancement, wherein I encouraged representatives from the league to participate in the advisory committee's public hearings to be held in Oakville and Burlington on March 28 and 29 this year. The advisory committee has already received, studied and considered several written submissions from other interested handicapped groups. My staff from the parks and recreation branch is also meeting with the experts in the field of therapeutic recreation to discuss their ideas and concern for the development of special facilities in this particular park.

Mr. Good: Was the minister's invitation to the Action League for the Physically

Handicapped Advancement offered after my question was asked in the House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I cannot hear the question.

Mr. Good: Was the minister's invitation for consultation with the Action League given to them after my question in the House?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh no. These actions were taken long before the member's question was asked.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Last summer.

Mr. Good: The minister is misleading the House, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No I am not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

SOLICITING OF FUNDS BY DRUG PREVENTION GROUP

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is he familiar with an organization, a private organization, called Drug and Narcotics Prevention, which is now soliciting funds in Ontario privately, apparently for something along the line that its title indicates; which organization, to say the least, has some dubious references from other places in Canada where it operates?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): No Mr. Speaker. That is the first I've heard of it.

Mr. Singer: Well would the minister undertake to look into it and to give us a report as to what he thinks of it and what action, if any, he is going to take?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I will look into it. What did the member call it again?

Mr. Singer: Drug and Narcotics Prevention.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

MINI-QUEEN'S PARK FOR THUNDER BAY

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A question of the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker: When does the minister expect his department to select a site for the mini Queen's Park for Thunder Bay which was announced by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) on March 17?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would say that would be very shortly, within the next few weeks.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister expect his department to select a site that will aid in the unifying of the two former cities of Port Arthur and Fort William into the new amalgamated city of Thunder Bay?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I spent last Thursday in Thunder Bay looking over several sites in conjunction with the member for Fort William and the planner for the city. We looked at several sites. We are now assessing those and I was not made aware of any particular site that would meet the qualifications of the member.

Mr. Foulds: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that he has consulted with the member for Fort William, and in view of the article that I have from the paper that the complex is to serve the entire region, would the minister not consider it at least a matter of courtesy to consult with the other elected representatives of the people in that region?

Mr. Singer: Hear, hear! Good question!

Hon. Mr. Snow: Well Mr. Speaker, I was invited to come to Thunder Bay by the hon. member for Fort William.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker? When the official announcement is made, will the name of the member for Port Arthur be included? Because the minister has assured us on many occasions all members are treated alike.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, all the members are being treated alike and—

Mr. Singer: Some more alike than other!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —I will not say whether any member's name will be included in any announcement.

Mr. Shulman: If it is not, the minister is going to be in trouble.

Mr. Stokes: Has the minister given any consideration to the thought of moving the entire Department of National Resources to northern Ontario, rather than provide a sop for the member for Fort William by establishing a mini Queen's Park in the riding of Fort William?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: That question doesn't make sense.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that it falls within the jurisdiction of my department to decide where the total Department of National Resources should be located.

Mr. Stokes: Has it been discussed at the ministerial level, to the minister's knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question here for the House leader. In view of the remarks made by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. MacNaughton) about nonsensical questions in this House, I wonder if he might advise the House where the Prime Minister, all the superministers and all the rest of the ministers are, when we only have one superminister, the member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence)? I wonder if he would advise the House where all these people are?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is not proper.

The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

LOSS OF HEALTH BENEFITS BY THOSE UNDER TRAINING

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask a question concerning DISC legislation, but I do not know of whom I could ask it on that side of the House. As a result I will ask, of the Minister of Social and Family Services, why is it that a recipient of Social and Family Services benefits, when removing himself from that and taking adult education, immediately loses the health benefits associated with Social and Family Services? It is no inducement to the individual to take himself off the department's programmes and upgrade or skill-train himself because he loses his health and medical benefits.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): I think if the hon. member would give me specifics or the names of those persons, I would be glad to look into it; because I believe they should continue to receive those health services.

Mr. B. Newman: I will give the minister two different cases.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

NORTHERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. LEGISLATION

Mr. Stokes: I would like to ask the superminister of Resources, who is also responsible for Trade and Industry, when the legislation which provides for the operation of the Northern Ontario Development Corp.—which has been in operation for year and a half—is going to be proclaimed.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, my role in the government is that of provincial secretary and I would be grateful if the members would use the term Provincial Secretary, Resources Development.

I think the reply to that can be given. I will ask that it be given by the Minister of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Lewis: Very sensitive. "Superminister" is meant as a compliment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

FREEZE ON NURSING HOME CONSTRUCTION

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider lifting the freeze on nursing home construction for the purpose of enabling small nursing homes to become economically feasible under the amended regulations?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No Mr. Speaker, we won't license any more nursing homes until we find that there is an actual need for the beds in the particular area. Once we find that there is a need there, then there will be no question about more nursing homes being licensed.

Mr. Speaker: The hon.—

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary: Is the minister taking into consideration the fact that some of these small nursing homes will be closing down and will not be in a position

to continue operation because of the size they are forced to remain at?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't know, Mr. Speaker, where the hon. member is getting his information. There are 483 nursing homes in Ontario. As of today I have been notified that two will not be able to carry on. One is a small nursing home of 15 beads which didn't intend to carry on anyway.

Mr. Good: Where is that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is being amalgamated with another home. There is one other small nursing home of 16 beds that feels that it won't be able to carry on. We are in the process of getting in touch with them to see if we can be of any help to them.

Mr. Good: Very fine!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Of the total 483, there was one large one which wasn't too happy with the rates. I don't know yet whether they are going to continue in the programme or not. There are 19 others that didn't reply to my questionnaire. We will be getting in touch with them this week for them to decide whether or not they are to participate. But really, I haven't had any—and I have been in close contact with the administrator of the nursing home association—I haven't had other information that there are small homes that can't operate.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the —I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko presented the following reports: The Ontario Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation annual report, 1970; The Annual Report of the Agricultural Institute of Ontario for the year ending March 31, 1971; and The 1970 Annual Report of the Ontario Research Foundation.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that from tomorrow this House may resolve itself into committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I have another motion which I understand has been agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that notwithstanding the provisions of standing order No. 25, the speakers concluding the throne debate for the three parties will speak, and the votes will be taken on a sitting day to be mutually arranged subsequent to today's sitting.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HISTORICAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Historical Parks.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, as a part of the reorganization of the government, the historical parks branch of the Department of Tourism and Information will form part of the new Ministry of Natural Resources. The legislation covering historical parks has been contained in the Department of Tourism and Information Act, and as part of the changes in legislation to implement the reorganization of government, these provisions are contained in a new Act to be administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES ACT

Mrs. Scrivener moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Establishment of Regional Transportation Authorities.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide for the establishment of regional transportation authorities. These authorities would operate within designated regions and be responsible for studying transportation requirements and for co-ordinating the planning for all modes of public transportation within the region.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, the Occupational Safety Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill replaces a series of Acts dealing with safety matters and brings the whole field of occupational safety under one statute. The Ontario Safety Advisory Board replaces the present Labour Safety Council of Ontario and is given expanded powers.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wonder if I might ask of the House leader, through you, with regard to tomorrow's business if the government is providing an opportunity for representatives of the media to be locked up some hours in advance of the delivery of the budget statement so that they can be briefed and be knowledgeable on it prior to its release.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I would think that would be the case. I have not had an opportunity of discussing this with the Prime Minister, but I am sure it would be the case. I will confirm it with the hon. member before the day is out.

Mr. MacDonald: By way of supplementary question then Mr. Speaker, if the government is willing to extend the element of trust to members of the media, what conceivable reason is there the government is denying an opportunity for financial critics and a research person to be also locked up so that once the budget has been given they can respond with some knowledge instead of off the top of their heads?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will have to take that as notice, but I can say, very humourously, that it might be wise to have him locked up more often.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, as one of the hon. minister's colleagues said earlier this afternoon. This isn't a humourous place." Since Ottawa now concedes this as a regular practice, why can't the same thing be done in the Province of Ontario? Is it unreasonable to say that the financial critics of the opposition should be extended the same trust as the members of the media?

Mr. Ruston: They should have.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, it's not, to my knowledge at this moment; but I'll check it out and see that he's informed in good time today.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. House leader will be kind enough to inform me, as financial critic of this party, of the details as well.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, I would certainly be glad to include the member at that level.

Mr. Lewis: On that same point, Mr. Speaker, what conceivable reason would there be for excluding opposition critics from a closed briefing which is closed, confidential—nothing leaves the room—when in fact we know it is being extended to the media and is the practice in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I must say, Mr. Speaker this of course is not Ottawa. I cannot take serious objection to the suggestion of the hon. member, but if he will allow me the courtesy of communication and allow me to get back to him, I shall do that today.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in a reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): It is a pleasure for me to take part in this Throne debate again. I don't want to try to change the customs around here, Mr. Speaker, so I would first like to congratulate you on being elected Speaker of this honourable assembly. You have proved yourself to be fair and impartial in your decisions and I know, Mr. Speaker, that if this government decided to appoint or elect a permanent Speaker, you would certainly be an excellent choice.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs and of Lands and Forests): Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: So I wish you well in your honourable position during your term of office.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all the new members who were elected to this Legislature last October 21. No doubt they'll find the same as I did, when I first entered this Legislature. I found the work new, but it wasn't too long before I felt at home. I might say with all the new members that were elected to this honourable assembly on Oct. 21, I would imagine there would be a Premier among these new members. I'm

thinking especially of the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy).

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: Being rather old-fashioned, I would particularly like to welcome two new lady members. I think it's a great pity that the Premier (Mr. Davis) of this province didn't carry out his promise that he was going to appoint one of these ladies to the cabinet.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): He's still got three years.

Mr. Spence: I didn't know that, Mr. Speaker. I hope that he keeps to his promise. I might say that the government has done some reshuffling of the cabinet recently.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Same old deck though.

Mr. Spence: And I believe that this was done in order to fool the public into thinking that activity is action. It's still the same faces, Mr. Speaker, across the House. The ladies would have made an excellent change in the front row. I might say that they were put up in the back row and I hope they won't be there permanently.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Hear, hear.

Mr. Spence: Perhaps some of the new members have come here expecting to be spellbound by great and stirring speeches. Well, in my years in this Legislature I've heard many fine speeches. I've heard speeches overflowing with facts and figures to back up arguments. I've heard speeches which sounded like stories from old Buck Rogers' comics and I've heard members read into the record everything but their latest laundry list. I must confess I have not been spellbound too often, Mr. Speaker.

I want to say here I was most disappointed in the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) in regard to my ex-colleague of this Legislature, Elmer Sopha. He was an exceptional speaker, I thought; always exciting to listen to; a master of the English language. But there aren't too many like him. Many members, like myself, are doing the best we can for our constituents and growling our way through our speeches, trying to make an impression on the government.

The last provincial election was an unusual one in many ways, Mr. Speaker. For the first time, as far as I can recall, the candidates attended meetings arranged by the principals and staff of the different high schools. After each candidate had made a short speech there was a question period opened up. I thought this was a very good idea, giving the students of these district high schools an opportunity to hear the policies of the three different parties. I must say I was very impressed with the knowledge and enthusiasm of these students in our district high schools in my part of the province.

It was a unique election, too, because of the amount of publicity. I understand that the advertising experts maintain that they can brainwash the public into buying almost anything with a big publicity campaign. Well, after the last election it is perfectly obvious that the advertising experts were correct, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the people during the election campaign had to turn off their television sets; others had to turn off their radios because they were unable to stand the grind. I don't know much about brainwashing but I think it was more like the old Chinese water torture.

Certainly it was one of the most expensive provincial elections ever and I am very glad I didn't have to foot the bill for the "big blue machine."

Mr. Speaker, I must say the results of the election were very disappointing to me personally. We saw some fine men go down in defeat—men who contributed a great deal to the proceedings of this Legislature, regardless of their political affiliation. I must say too, Mr. Speaker, I have been very disturbed by some of the methods reported to have been used. In all my years in this Legislature I never heard so many appalling stories and rumours about election practices.

I am also very concerned about the balance of parties in this Legislature. Even if the two opposition parties combine in an effort to put the brakes on this government it will have no effect if a question is put to a vote. I earnestly hope that I am mistaken in the feeling that the government intends to use this Legislature as a sort of rubber stamp, making a mockery of the legislative process.

With the recent reorganization of government and the appointment of five so-called superministers, we have yet another step in the process of centralization of power in the hands not only of a single political party, but in the hands of a small group of men. I do not think the saying that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely applies to

the hon. gentlemen opposite, but history has many instances of the dangers and pitfalls of too much power with too few people.

With all the difficult and different fields of government activity today, I find it difficult to believe that the super cabinet ministers—no matter how fine or intelligent they may be—are qualified to set policy in so many areas. Obviously the members of this Legislature and the people of Ontario will have to watch this policy decision-making process very carefully.

Mr. Speaker, during the Speech from the Throne it was absolutely amusing to hear the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is going to adopt a policy of restraint in spending. In the past months, thousands of dollars have been spent irresponsibly. For instance, did the government really feel it was necessary to spend thousands and thousands of dollars to tell the people of Ontario that this is a great place to live? I understand a colour page of advertising in one of the daily newspapers costs over $4,000.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we hear from the Minister of Trade and Industry (Mr. White) that Ontario Place had a deficit of $2.2 million. It was originally estimated that it would cost around $13 million but the final cost, I understand, will be around $26 million—just double the cost to the taxpayers of this province. The least we could have hoped for was that it would be a profitable enterprise.

Last year's budget had the largest deficit in the history of this province; one wonders what kind of a deficit there will be this year.

We are told in the Throne Speech that there is to be a tri-level conference involving the federal, provincial and municipal governments. I wonder if the municipalities will be pleased to hear this news. As my leader said in his fine speech during this debate, the conference which was held at the Ontario Science Centre a number of years ago did not actually benefit the municipalities very much. As we all know, after that conference the provincial government took over the responsibility for assessment and took steps toward regional government.

In the Throne Speech we read that there are to be two more regional governments in the Province of Ontario. I must say it was unusual to read in the paper about the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs going down to the regional government of Niagara before the last provincial election and giving them $1 million to help cushion the high rise in taxes of different municipalities in that regional government. Then I understand he went to the regional government of York and handed over around $750,000; I also understand that he went to the Muskoka regional government and handed them a sum of money.

Mr. Speaker, after all this money that comes from the taxpayers in every part of the province has been handed to the regional governments so that they would be able to beat their taxes, a few weeks ago in the committee on procedural affairs we had the mayor, a number of officials and city solicitors asking for a private bill to be introduced in this Legislature to have the city of St. Catharines secede from regional government. This is unbelievable.

When the bill setting up the regional municipality of Niagara was before this Legislature, I remember the member who represented Niagara Falls at that time standing on his feet here for half the afternoon and the night session and asking questions about the cost of regional government in Niagara. He asked about roads, about law enforcement, about water and so on. The answers he was given certainly were not satisfactory to him, so about midnight he walked out of the Legislature, disgusted, because he wasn't getting the answer to the question, What will the cost be to the taxpayers if regional government comes into existence?

I think it's time that this government told the people when these regional governments are being set up what the costs will be, so they know what they are getting into, instead of having mayors and people so dissatisfied. I think they should be really informed what to expect and what the costs will be.

A few years ago the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough), and at that time the hon. provincial Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) held a series of meetings with municipal representatives and they told those municipalities that they were partners. They also told these municipalities they were municipalities of tomorrow. Now we hear about this tri-level conference, and the government's wishes to strengthen local autonomy of these municipalities. It's going to be another instance of provincial ministers holding meetings with the municipal representatives, discussing their problems, leading the people to believe they are earnest and sincere in their wishes to increase local autonomy. Does the government really intend to strengthen local governments, or are we going to be subjected to another round of high-flown phrases, with no real action to back up these fine words?

I have been talking to some of the reeves and mayors in my area, and I understand that today the municipal councils only have complete control of about 10 per cent of their budget. All the rest of the budget is under control of the provincial government, controlled by subsidies for law enforcement, for meeting health standards, education, and expenditures on roads. It's time the government of this province increased unconditional grants to our municipalities, giving the local elected officials more control over the expenditure of their money.

On the subject of roads—to make a detour, Mr. Speaker—with the provincial belt-tightening programme the counties of this province have been notified that they must cut their road expenditures for 1972. In Kent county, that means $120,000 less to be spent this year alone on our county road system. Mr. Speaker, I must say that the province sets the standards to which roads must be built before subsidies will be approved. This represents some four or five miles of county roads that will not be constructed in Kent county this year. Also, some provincial highways have been handed back to counties, and this means that the local authorities will be responsible for extra costs such as weed-cutting, road repairs, and snowploughing, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, these actions on the part of the government mean that there will be poor roads in many parts of rural Ontario, and if there is anything more guaranteed to make people bitter than poor roads, I don't know what it is, unless it's an increase in taxes.

Here again, the provincial government has forced the municipalities into a very difficult position. In order to cope with pollution problems, many municipalities are installing new sewage and water systems. The government has said that it will take care of the costs for this over and above $120 per home for sewage and over $100 per home for water supply. This means that where both systems are to be installed, homeowners will have an additional $220 extra taxes a year to pay.

If the government would take some concrete action to encourage industries to locate in these rural areas, the taxes from these enterprises would help to pay for some of these necessary services. If something is not done, many of the homeowners in these towns and villages will simply not be able to meet their taxes.

It has been obvious for some time that a completely new approach is needed to establish industries in these rural areas. We all had great hopes when the Equalization of Industrial Opportunities programme came into existence, I might say under the Ontario Development Corp. However, in spite of the municipalities being designated as eligible for assistance under the programme, very few industries have located in southwestern Ontario, for instance. Perhaps an all-party committee of elected members of this House should make a study of why more development is not taking place under the EIO programme. If making grants available to the private sector does not prove effective, perhaps it is time some more direct government action was taken to encourage development where it is so badly needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the agriculture industry—I must say a word about it—is going through one of the most difficult periods in its history. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture recently presented a brief to our caucus—and I would expect to all caucuses of the different parties of this Legislature—informing us that the net return from agriculture has gone down over the past three years 38 per cent. Today, products such as eggs—pork is somewhat better in price now—and corn are being sold below the cost of production. Statistics show that over 2,000 farmers yearly are leaving agriculture across Canada. Rural Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is going backwards.

We have often been told that the farmers of this province must become more efficient. What a lot of nonsense this attitude is! I don't believe that there is another industry which has done more to increase its efficiency over the years than our agriculture industry. If the business of operating the government of this province of ours was run half as efficiently as the average farm, we wouldn't have millions of dollars of a deficit in our budget, I can tell you that.

During the last session, I several times drew to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) the great need for improved transportation facilities for farm produce. It is vital that transportation and storage facilities should be improved. In this connection, I brought to the attention of the minister the fine port facilities which are for sale at Erieau in my riding. However, nothing has been done and, in fact, I sometimes wonder if the government has deliberately ignored the needs of rural people, concentrating on urban problems.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Is that just the rural people in the member's riding?

Mr. Spence: All over.

Mr. Renwick: I know that.

Mr. Spence: That is right. Some of the hon. members opposite may think, being a farmer, the complications of modern living are too difficult for me to understand. But it doesn't take a university degree or a QC to figure out that if a little more attention was given to the problems of rural Ontario, this would relieve some of the great pressures on our great cities.

We have heard a great deal in the last few months about urban problems, but little or nothing is done to improve the conditions in rural Ontario which will encourage people to remain in rural areas rather than move to our overcrowded cities.

Young people have always gone to the cities looking for adventure and increased career opportunities, but thousands of families are uprooted from their country surroundings because they are unable to make a good living. They come to the city completely unprepared for city life, forced to make the move by economic forces beyond their control. This forced migration is not only cruel and difficult, it is costly to society in general as well as to the individuals themselves. In many cases, families lose their homes, their savings, and their way of life. Rural communities lose their tax base for public services; community institutions and associations falter and fail; the small towns and villages fall into disrepair and we are all the losers. If this trend is allowed to continue unchecked without government action, Ontario will be a place of ghost towns and villages, a silent testimony to the short-sighted policies of a series of Conservative governments, which have allowed a once-prosperous, thriving agricultural industry to fall by the wayside.

Densely populated urban areas are breeding grounds for poverty, crime, drug addiction, family breakdowns—all of which cost the people dearly, not only in terms of human suffering, but in terms of dollars and cents spent on social and family service organizations work. I am not saying to be poor in the Ontario countryside is easier or any better than being poor in our cities, but in the cities the poor are hemmed in, because they are herded together in tight little areas by their very poverty.

Many of our finest people from rural areas who have grown up surrounded by fresh air and space find themselves suffocating in the steel and concrete of our cities. In many cases they are the displaced people of today, as much the victims of government inaction as the displaced people after the last war were the victims of government action.

We cannot look after the cities and ignore the rural areas; the problems are interlocking. The distribution of population has always been determined by the distribution of jobs. Instead of forcing the people to move where the jobs are, in the metropolitan areas, something must be done to revitalize the agricultural industry and to provide incentives for small industries to locate in rural Ontario, bringing the jobs closer to where the people live.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about small industries for our towns and villages in rural Ontario. In southwestern Ontario, we produce seven to 10 million bushels of soybeans yearly. Our processing plants are located 100 to 200 miles away from the soybean growing areas.

To me this is unrealistic. These processing plants should be located in the towns, villages or cities in the soybean growing areas. And I must say I have been informed several times that, because of our freight rates it is cheaper to import processed soybean meal from the United States than to ship the Ontario processed product back into the area where the beans were grown.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, for maximum efficiency and to allow the local produce to to be sold at a competitive price, obviously the processing plants should be located in the soybean growing areas, and this would also be of benefit to the labour force in those areas.

The agricultural industry has been suffering greatly because farm prices are selling below the price that it costs to produce.

Eggs are selling at 17 cents to the producer, for example. We are waiting with great interest the results of the public inquiry into the egg industry. We hope that there will be recommendations to help solve the egg producers' problem. And we do hope that their report will be coming very shortly to assist the egg producers in this province.

Hog prices were well below the cost of production last fall, but they are now improved considerably. However, corn prices are still below the cost of production. These prices will bankrupt a number of our farmers this year. Many farmers are leaving the land, which is a very sad situation, Mr. Speaker.

I might say that if a new approach is not made to help the agricultural industry solve some of its problems, I feel that the big processing industries will take over the farms through vertical integration, which is cer-

tainly something the farmers in Ontario do not want.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. J. McNie (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to, as is the custom, pay my respects to the Speaker. I would also like to pay my respects to someone else this afternoon.

First of all to you, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are all impressed with the way in which you have conducted yourself to date. I am sure, with your good sense and good humour, you are going to be more than equal to the exigencies of the House in the weeks and months ahead.

I would like also, at this time, to pay my respects to my predecessor, Mrs. Pritchard, who is known to a good many of the people in this House. Ada served in this House for a period of eight years. Previous to that she served some 10 years as a very active and productive member of the Hamilton city council.

Her contribution during this period was very unique in many ways, particularly her millinery, as members will recall. Last month the city of Hamilton had a dinner for Mrs. Pritchard. Some of the members of this House were there and will recall that the mayor presented her with a steel builder's bonnet suitably decked with flowers. It was very appropriate in two ways; first of all, because it reflected her interest in different headgear and, secondly, because she was a person, as members will recall, who was always ready for battle, particularly with the Grits and the socialists.

Ada, I think, will be remembered for two things in particular. While she would not want to be remembered as one of the advance guard of women's lib—anything but—nevertheless she did advance the cause of women's rights by her very active participation in the affairs of public life. She was a woman of strong opinions and she never hesitated to speak her mind either in the House or in caucus.

Ada would also like to be remembered for the work she did with senior citizens. She advanced the cause of senior citizens in our own city and throughout the province very materially.

She was a very loyal and conscientious person, too, and few people were as loyal in their support of this House and of the committees as she was, even at great cost to herself at some times. On the other hand, she had another priority and that was her own family and the affairs of her constituency. I think, speaking for myself, that that is the way it should be.

Ada recognized that the role of the member was largely representing the constituency in the government, rather than, as is sometimes the case, representing the government in the constituency. I think in the past decade this has become very much so, particularly as members of government spend most of their time trying to explain to people in the constituency what was happening. This is a very complex age, it is a very complex government, and I think if representative government is going to mean what it should, then what happens in the constituency is going to have to be a great deal more important to the government than it has been, perhaps, in the past.

In other words, the member, to a greater degree than heretofore is going to have to reflect the values and the priorities of the people in the constituency because they are not necessarily the same. They are certainly not synonymous with those that civil servants and sometimes the ministers of our government have, no matter how well-intentioned they may be.

In the Throne Speech, there was one matter that I would like to address myself to particularly. I hope to speak to matters that have particular relevance to my community and, hopefully, that my attention may help to remedy problems that other communities have in a similar way. I am thinking particularly of the references in the Throne Speech to housing.

Like so many Throne Speeches, it did not tell us very much. I would like to think that the housing programme when it has been brought down, Mr. Speaker, will not only refer to new homes—

An hon. member: Another two years.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Hear that, Charlie?

Mr. McNie: —but will also refer to existing homes.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): I hear the hon. member.

Mr. Martel: The minister should open his ears. None are so deaf as those who will not hear.

Mr. McNie: I would hope that there is a recognition that we are never really going to solve the housing problem, and I said this a number of times during the election campaign, until we do a better job of looking after the houses that we've got right now in our various constituencies.

The Hon. Herbert Bruce, the former Lieutenant Governor of Ontario, told us this in 1934 in a study that was prepared for the city of Toronto. Dr. Albert Rose, the dean of social studies at the University of Toronto, told us again in 1966 in a very, very comprehensive analysis of the housing in downtown Toronto. I will quote, if I may:

> The supply of older housing is vital . . . not merely for its own sake as a significant proportion of the total housing stock, but as one of the main opportunities for families with incomes in the lower half of the income distribution of all families, so that they can find housing accommodation at a price they can afford to pay.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, a comprehensive programme of home maintenance and rehabilitation is long overdue and I urge the government to implement such a programme this spring, failing any initiatives on the part of the federal government.

You may recall that last Friday, the Globe and Mail carried another one of its leaks, this one from a confidential task force report that was prepared for CMHC. I would like to quote from that issue. According to the Globe and Mail, this confidential report said as follows:

> It should be the first priority of housing policy to reverse the further deterioriation of existing housing through maintenance incentives and assistance programmes. Programmes which assist in promoting rehabilitation should be given high priority and financial commitment over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, there were some advances made in housing rehabilitation back in the mid-Sixties. If you will recall, at the time these urban renewal programmes were being carried out. In Hamilton, for example, during this period, thanks to some very imaginative and energetic work by our public servants and our citizens, a great number of the older homes in at least one sector of our city were saved. Some of the homes that were beyond salvage were torn down, and they made way for schools, and they made way for parks and for other amenities. But a great many of the homes were rehabilitated by private effort and by encouragement from the municipalities. To give you an example of what was achieved, 10 years ago in this particular area there were some 250 houses described as in good shape, whereas today there are over 1,000 in that area described as in good shape.

There is another dimension to this activity too that I would like to refer to. It is not as obvious but it is a very important one. Some people call it pride—pride in ownership, pride in the community of which they are very much a part. While it is a cliche, nevertheless it is a fact that men today have far more leisure time than they ever had and every man is not happy to spend his time sitting and driving. They need to be more usefully engaged and preferably with their hands. I think that with encouragement and advice and with the proper assistance from government, people in Hamilton and outer communities have already proved that a great deal can be accomplished, and the Chairman of our Management Board will be happy to know, at a relatively low cost.

There are many rewards for this type of programme. Someone said the other day, one of them is for the wife who watches her husband and a neighbour fixing a verandah, and then later watches them standing out on the sidewalk admiring their handiwork. These are the kind of programmes that the government should be concerned with—self-help programmes, programmes that generate their own steam.

Experience in Hamilton and elsewhere, Mr. Speaker, has proved that there is a widespread support for rehabilitation of this kind, provided it meets the priorities and the needs of the community. Not surprisingly in Hamilton and in other centres these programmes have been given impetus by the participation of the community in providing improved sidewalks and roads, lights, garbage collection and other amenities. But progress has been slow and uneven, Mr. Speaker, due especially to the limit of resources, particularly financial resources in the form of low-cost loans or subsidies.

This is a subject that our government looked into very closely a couple of years ago. You will recall a Mr. Matthew Lawson was appointed to make an analysis of the state of home maintenance particularly in the province.

He brought down a report in July, 1970, which was widely acclaimed.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time described it as a very important document and asked the municipalities to com-

ment on it. As I understand it there was a very enthusiastic and a very warm response from the municipalities and from the Ontario Municipal Association and they have been waiting eagerly for some kind of programme that would recognize this longstanding need.

Lawson recognized himself that we weren't going to be able to catch up overnight, but he proposed that no time be lost in initiating programmes to take advantage of the impetus that there already was, because a great many of the communities had resources and plans that could be put to work right away. He proposed further that the provincial government carry out some pilot programmes, these pilot programmes to be carried out in smaller communities—in more remote communities that didn't have the staff or the knowhow.

But a fundamental objective of his programme, Mr. Speaker, would be to reinforce the efforts of the ordinary citizen to look after his own property, and to do this in such a way that the maintenance of property became the normal way of life in his community. It was essentially a self-help programme, a self-generating programme, to help people help themselves and others.

Lawson proposed that financial assistance should be readily available on extended terms, low interest rates and, where warranted, with direct subsidy. One of the things that has helped is the freeze that was put on assessment, but I think we all recognize that the person who engages in any substantial rehabilitation of his premises wants more assurance than he has at the moment that his taxes are not going to be escalated out of sight in two or three years.

Lawson also stressed the need for localizing these programmes and to support them with extensive promotion and education, particularly booklets on do-it-yourself programmes, and extension courses in the high schools and in the community colleges on home improvements. One area which I think it would be a mistake to overlook is the importance of our young people in this scheme.

Today our young people are, as we all know, extremely concerned with the environment. Their schools are devoting a lot of time to town planning and, whether we recognize it or not—and I think those of us who are parents do—directly and indirectly they influence us a great deal on the kind of priorities that we as a family give toward expenses — whether it be a new car, snowmobile, cottage, or some rehabilitation in the home.

Most of all Lawson recognized the government must create confidence in the community. I quote directly from the Lawson report in this respect.

> The confidence that the owner has in his property and the area, greatly affects the effort he will make to maintain it. Public policy can play a vital part in sustaining, creating and destroying that confidence.

Recognizing that, the city of Hamilton has in recent months reassessed its own machinery, set up a new committee called the community development committee, to look at this rehabilitation in the proper light.

And this municipality and other municipalities are looking to the provincial government, and hopefully to the federal government, for leadership and assistance so that they can do justice to the job at hand.

To the great disappointment of the municipalities, no programme has been forthcoming to date, even though there have been a few of the provisions in the Lawson report introduced.

For instance, I made reference to the freeze and there's a reference in the Throne Speech to his recommendation with respect to auto graveyards. I understand that there are some helpful amendments that will be coming through to the Planning Act, that will have a bearing on the minimum standards. Beyond that I don't know, and neither do the municipalities, it's quite apparent.

Like so many worthy programmes I think this one is caught in the syndrome known as "after you, Alphonse," meaning we wait until we see the extent to which the federal government is prepared to participate in this programme. What are the prospects of the federal government participating in this programme this spring? The Throne Speech in Ottawa affirms, if it needed to be reaffirmed, that there is a need.

> It is clear that Canada's housing needs cannot be met only through increases in scale. What is required and what the government will be proposing [Listen to this!] are fresh concepts, continuing research and imagination in neighbourhood improvement, with emphasis on the need for low-cost housing.

Now the one thing I've discovered in the time I've been researching this subject is there's no dearth of new concepts, continuing research or imagination. What there is a dearth of is action—at both the provincial and federal government levels.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. McNie: The action, Mr. Speaker, has all been—or the most part—local action. And it's been very impressive in a great many communities, including Hamilton, Toronto, London, Windsor, Thunder Bay, Kingston; just to name a few of the communities. And these people, both citizens and civil servants, have made great strides in arresting the decay in their respecting communities and in helping to improve the environment. I quote from the confidential report to the CMHC in that connection:

> While the government talks about the involvement and participation of people to determine the kind of housing they would like to have, local groups involved with rehabilitation have been doing it.

So far as I can see, there is no tangible evidence that the federal government is preparing any substantial programme in home rehabilitation for the current year. In fact, the evidence is to the contrary.

Just 10 days ago the Canadian Conference on Housing Rehabilitation announced that its plans for a conference in mid-May had been cancelled. This conference, which was the first one of its kind and sponsored by the Canadian Council on Social Development, was inviting the leading government people from all three levels, professional people and citizens' groups, to discuss old housing. It was cancelled, we are told by its director, Reuben Baetz:

> Because it became apparent that important new federal legislation on housing rehabilitation and neighbourhood improvement, expected early this spring, will be delayed. [Mr. Batez went on]: A tremendous amount of interest has always been expressed in the conference across the country. It is clear that after decades of developing housing measures simply to build new units, Canadians now want bolder, new initiatives to conserve hundreds of thousands of old homes that, with a minimum of investment, could provide good homes for families for many more generations.

Now, as I said earlier, there was a burst of enthusiasm for urban renewal and a great deal was accomplished in the form of community rehabilitation aid improvement. Far more than we're led to believe. Then came the federal freeze which, we're told, was the result of a change in philosophy about urban renewal.

The trouble with the freeze in Ottawa was that it applied to people as well as it did to money, so far as housing rehabilitation was concerned.

First of all we had Mr. Hellyer travelling across the country interviewing people on the streets to get first-hand confirmation of things that he had already concluded before he started. Namely, that the federal government had to take over and intervene directly in housing. Obviously the Cabinet in Ottawa had other ideas.

Then came Mr. Andras with his coterie of academics, only one of whom had any practical experience in housing at all. Dr. Lithiuck's report indicated at one point that urban renewal had deleted and reduced housing. He was challenged on this a number of times and he never was able to substantiate his claim. This is one of the facts that I mentioned earlier. It only served to mislead Canadians as to what actually had been accomplished through enlightened urban renewal. Then came Mr. Basford. He has a task force working on it. That task force is still going to go to work on CMHC's new task force reports. And still no programme. Facetiously, I heard someone ask the question, "I wonder how many houses we could have built if we had used task force reports instead of cement blocks?"

There have been funds released by the federal government for urban development renewal in recent years, but they have been hopelessly inadequate. They haven't even made it possible to rescue municipalities, like Hamilton, from programmes that they found themselves encouraged to undertake by the federal government earlier.

There are federal funds, it is true, under NHA available for home improvement through your bank. But apparently the public doesn't know about it—so much so that in 1971 there were only 7,700 home improvement loans made across Canada as opposed to 37,000 in 1958. Think of it: 7,700 loans made for purposes having to do with everything from building verandas to swimming pools, at rates that were far lower than prevailing rates that were being offered for similar purposes in banks. The fact that there was no effort made to promote them, and there is still no effort being made to promote them, because the problem is a freeze. There have been other federal assistance programmes, too, on a scattered basis, but very few of these have been entered into with any enthusiasm or commitment or follow-through. They rarely provide the municipality with an opportunity to do its own thing.

Mr. Speaker, the municipalities across Canada and this province are looking for leader-

ship and support in the rehabilitation area, because they recognize that this problem strikes right at the heart of, not only the housing problem, but the total environment in the most profound social sense. That is why there will have to be a very large input from our own Ministry of Community and Social Services, if we are going to do anything really worthwhile in community rehabilitation.

Many of our communities, as I said earlier, have qualified, experienced people in their employ and others ready to volunteer. In some of these communities a great deal of planning work has already been done; they are ready to go to work. For instance, in Hamilton we have one community project, called the Strathcona community project, that would make an ideal spot for a pilot project. For several months the city planning department has been discussing with the people in the area what they would like to see done with this particular community. They have come up with a consensus. As they have discovered in Toronto on a similar project, it is possible to come up with a consensus if you have people of right mind approaching the problem. They are presenting this tomorrow night to city council for its official blessing.

This is an ideal spot for the government to move in with a pilot programme. Toronto has several areas similar to Strathcona—Kensington, Niagara, the Junction, Beaches, just to name a few, and there are other cities. Kingston has one—Sydenham. These are all areas where the government could move in very readily with a programme this spring—not next fall or next spring but this spring.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to believe that the federal government will not co-operate with at least a pilot programme this spring. If they are not prepared to co-operate then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of these places where the provincial government should be prepared to go on its own. And whatever additional costs may be incurred by going ahead unilaterally will, I believe, be more than offset by the benefits that accrue to the economy and to our people.

It has been estimated that there are four million people in this country who live in substandard housing. Three quarters of those live in houses that, I understand, could be rehabilitated. Without a rehabilitation programme, thousands of these houses are needlessly going to rot or to be destroyed by bulldozers and the people are going to be forced to move from premises they like in communities they feel a part of, into homes they don't like, that don't suit their needs and that they can't afford.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the government brings down its programme in the weeks ahead, there will be a very substantial programme in support of home rehabilitation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. F. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into this debate, and begin so by expressing my congratulations to you in the office that you hold and, like other hon. members before me, express my confidence in the choice and my knowledge that you will rule fairly and wisely and to the benefit of the business and order of this House.

This year, in Timmins, is the 60th anniversary of the founding of our town. Compared with some of the communities in southern Ontario we are a very young community, yet in terms of the north it shows we have reached a reasonably old age.

I think the comparison between the north and the south shows that a lot still needs to be done in all communities in the north to try to bridge the gap that exists between north and south, and extra attention must be paid to the needs and concerns of the north to try to bring us more and more into the economic life of this province and of this nation.

But I would like to invite all hon. members to come and join us in Timmins for the celebrations that will be coming up in the next two weeks and months ahead. Dates have been set for a number of the events. Homecoming week will be held between July 28 and Aug. 7, and there are a number of things that will be taking place there. There will be ethnic days and many other things.

We are also having a number of sports events this year; among these will be the summer games for the north. We are also hosting the Korean war veterans on the 20th anniversary of their return from Korea and we feel very privileged to have these groups there.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we would very much like to have you and all hon. members of the House visit us some time this summer to help us in our 60th anniversary celebrations.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We'll be there.

Mr. Ferrier: That will be very good.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By aircraft?

Mr. Ferrier: I can't guarantee the Lands and Forests planes, yet though

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, the Ontario Northland Railway might take us part way.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, they might. We are supposed to have a tour of northern Ontario once each four years—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This is the summer.

Mr. Ferrier: And this is in the summer, so perhaps we could choose northeastern Ontario as the place to visit.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I know the council of Timmins will look after it.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): What about the fishing season?

Mr. Ferrier: We've got lots of fish up there too We can accommodate the member in any kind of way that he would like.

I might just make a brief note or mention of the election in Cochrane South and in Cochrane North. It's obvious that the candidates for the Liberal Party were just token and they got probably as low a vote as anywhere in Ontario. In Cochrane North we had a former minister of this government across the way, Philip Kelly, running for the Liberals.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Oh no, how did he get in?

An hon. member: He was the Liberal candidate? At some time wasn't he Tory and Social Credit? Now Liberal!

Mr. Ferrier: He amassed the magnificent total of 543 votes.

In Cochrane South the Liberal ran a fellow they brought in. He got into the fray on nomination day and probably spent $300 or $400 in advertising. He amassed the grand total of 1,270.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): What about the Tories? Who did the Tories run?

Mr. Ferrier: It's interesting to note both ridings are represented by federal Liberals. In the northeast in our area there's a—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I hope the member will send a copy of his remarks to them.

Mr. Ferrier: The member is darn right! I haven't got too many complimentary things to say about them either. There are cosy little agreements by which the establishment votes Liberal federally and PC provincially. Cochrane North has succeeded with this arrangement, but Cochrane South has sufficient worker strength to upset this cosy little agreement.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ferrier: Conservatives and Liberals can and do cross party lines as a matter of course. It makes me rather amused to see the sham battles between the Conservatives and Liberals in this House, when the Liberals try to let on that they are offering effective opposition, when they can get together so easily without any tension at the constituency level.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): What does the member mean? Tweedledee and Tweedledum?

Mr. Ferrier: It is interesting now, though, to see the Premier tell his organization to get behind the federal PC candidates and fight the Liberals in the federal election. I can tell you that it upset the establishment in my riding to a great extent.

The amazing thing is that the Tories have nominated a federal candidate and may even try to show that there is a difference, however slight, between the two old-line parties. With the leadership in the local PCs passing from Wilf's hands into that of a younger crowd, it appears that the PCs may be trying to regain a set of political convictions that many of their elders abandoned and may in fact try to fight elections and get as many Tory votes as they can.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the member predicting an NDP victory up there?

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I am predicting an NDP federal victory.

Mr. Martel: In the Nickel Belt too! The Liberals will lose another one there.

Mr. Ferrier: One thing in the Speech from the Throne that I found very interesting was the fact that the role of the MPPs from all parties will be considered, and a commission has been set up for this purpose.

There certainly is a glaring need for a more enlightened outlook by the government as far as the ordinary MPP is concerned. It is ridiculous and it has been stated in this House many times that a member has to share the secretarial assistance of a girl with another member. Most members gen-

erate enough case work and other responsibilities to keep one secretary very busy all of the time.

Mr. Martel: At least!

Mr. Ferrier: An office at Queen's Park, while fine during the session, is not as helpful while the Legislature is not in session. The facilities that we have are geared more in terms of the in-town members and those who are within driving distance here. Most of the out-of-town members need some office space and secretarial assistance at the riding level to help with case work.

If such is provided now the party organization or the member himself has to pay for such. It does not seem just that the public work that is being done by the member should be subsidized either by his party or paid out of his own pocket. I believe that improvements are long overdue and I am pleased that the government is setting up a commission to study this matter and to make recommendations for improvements. I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that they get this committee set up soon and get it working.

A major question in my riding in the last number of months has been the question of air service in and out of Timmins. The matter, I suppose, developed from the regional air policy of the federal government where Mr. Trudeau sliced up Canada into five particular areas and designated a regional air carrier for each of the areas. For the eastern part of the province, Nordair from Quebec was designated, and for the western part it was Transair from Manitoba that was designated and there was no regional carrier from the province of Ontario.

When this policy was originally designed it seemed very obvious to most of us that it was designed to move Air Canada out of the regional air carrier service within this country. However, this move has been so politically unwise and it has raised such opposition in many of the communities or areas that are concerned, that the federal government in an election year has changed its stance and has now called upon Air Canada to get back into the regional air carrier trade. The federal MPs have become so vulnerable in a number of ridings that, at least before an election, Air Canada has been ordered to expand rather than retrench in its regional routes. It has been told now to go and try to find a jet carrier for these routes and to upgrade its service.

The void that was created by this federal government policy, with no regional air carrier based in Ontario, was taken over by a group of prominent Ontario businessmen with the apparent backing of the Ontario government. They have launched Air Ontario, as it is called. The Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) has been spending a good deal of time in the last couple of weeks and before, deciding whether the provincial government should come all out and back the application of Air Ontario to the Canadian Transportation Commission or not so that Air Canada can enter into the regional air carrier service in Ontario for seven particular routes.

The federal MP for Timmins, in a speech to the Northeastern Ontario Municipal Association, fanatically railed against any of us who suggested that Air Ontario is intent on getting into the regional air carrier service in Ontario. He dismissed Air Ontario as nothing more than a promotion of Howard Aviation. He said there was no threat to Air Canada by Air Ontario in the regional routes. I suppose one can excuse his lack of knowledge of what goes on at Queen's Park, when he is so anxious to opt out of provincial politics as to do little more for the provincial Liberal Party in the last election other than to cast his vote.

It appears that there may be a real battle shaping up at the CTC level with the provincial government possibly backing Air Ontario's application. How independent, then, will that body be when it is in the middle of the battlefield with yet another confrontation shaping up between the federal government and the government of Ontario? Will the federal government bring such pressure to bear that CTC will turn down the application by Air Ontario? Will the Ontario government commit itself to Air Ontario to the extent that if the CTC were to turn down the application, the Ontario government is prepared to challenge the federal government's jurisdiction in transportation and license Air Ontario to operate solely within Ontario boundaries, and thus precipitate yet another constitutional crisis?

It is certainly a possibility, but why, I ask, is the Ontario government now showing interest in backing Air Ontario, when the people in the communities now served by Air Canada are very happy with the service that Air Canada is providing and do not want any other service that Air Ontario presumes to provide? Air Ontario, you see, wants to offer a more economic service, and wants to do away with the interconnecting bookings which evidently are costly, and wants to do away with lunches or meals or that kind of thing on the flight —

Mr. Martel: The Tories want to sell Nordair, don't they?

Mr. Ferrier: —so the kind of services that would be provided on those flights would be less than we have now. There might be long waits at the airport here in Toronto before you could get a flight out someplace else—longer at least than we have now. And now that Air Canada, with the pressure that has been brought upon them by the federal government to stay in the regional air-carrier service, are anxious to continue that service, why the Ontario government would try to get in and back an airline that would weaken that kind of service that we have, which is particularly satisfactory—the people want it, and do not want it interfered with—is beyond me. It is poor politics for one thing. If they have the ear of the people at all they won't back that Air Ontario application; they will stay clear of it. And I hope that they have enough sense to do so.

Now when norOntair, the little government triangle route in the north, had their hearings before that went into operation during the election, some of us asked if that route was to be the means of doing away with Air Canada service. We were told that in no way would it affect our Air Canada service. Air Ontario's thinking is that we would be served by norOntair between Sudbury and Timmins and they wouldn't be concerned with that link at all.

I want to say once again that I am opposed to the provincial government in any way backing Air Ontario's application to the Canadian Transportation Commission. I say that we don't want Air Ontario, we are satisfied with Air Canada's service.

We are now told that the federal government has had an application from Air Canada to lengthen the runways in our area and the airport is to get in the proper electronic facilities so that DC-9s can come in in 1974. So we feel that we are well served by Air Canada now and we have been given the assurance that they are going to stay there. I just do not see where this provincial government has any right now to do anything to undermine the position that we have arrived at with a good deal of struggle and fight.

Transportation is now a big issue in northeastern Ontario as a result of the leadership of Mayor Rene Piche of Kapuskasing. The elected municipal officials, plus the MPs and the MPPs from the northeast, are seeking to meet with the federal and provincial government transportation department, plus representatives of the CNR and ONR, to consider some proposals for change in ownership of routes so that the crippling high freight rates that we endure might be lifted.

In the 1971 Throne Speech in this province is this paragraph:

> An immediate function of the new department will be to undertake a review of the cost of transporting goods into and out of northern Ontario.

Now the department that they are referring to is the Department of Transportation and Communications.

The only result that I have seen openly of that study is the raise of about 10 per cent on shipping charges by Star Transfer that took place on Jan. 1, 1972. I can't conceivably see how a raise in shipping charges by a Crown-owned trucking firm is going to help with the cost of freight rates into the north. There they continue to escalate and it continues to aggravate the present intolerable situation. I wonder what is going on with that study.

At any rate, Mayor Piche, like the rest of us in the north, is fed up with the waiting game and delaying tactics, such as the government engages in with its interminable studies and studies of studies. He is calling for action on this issue right now. The time for talking is over, he says; this time for action has arrived.

What he is proposing is not new, but he is enlisting a united front for his proposals. He is suggesting that the freight rate problem can be solved, at least in part, by the ONR taking over the CNR line from North Bay to Toronto, so that the provincial government can help development of secondary industry in the northeast by negotiating better freight rates for northern shippers.

The ONR at present is able to do just half a job, since what they can do by offering favourable freight rates only applies between the areas concerned and North Bay, at which place the product is shipped on either the CNR or CPR lines at full freight tariffs. Obviously the major markets are down here in the "golden horseshoe" and what help the ONR has given is therefore nullified by either the CNR or the CPR from North Bay onward.

This idea has merit, but it is now a new idea. It has been advanced in this House by the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) before I was elected, and I have spoken about it on more than one occasion. I believe I even spoke about it in my maiden speech.

Mayor Piche suggests that the ONR also take over the CNR lines from Cochrane to Hearst and use it for developmental purposes —something that the CNR is not doing with this line now. I suggested about a year ago in this House that the CNR line be taken over from Cochrane right through to Thunder Bay for developmental purposes. This idea is not new. It has been suggested not only by myself but by my colleague, the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes).

So Mayor Piche is now calling the bluff of the provincial and federal governments who say they are studying, and he is calling for action. The Department of Transportation and Communications had better have something to offer at the meeting that is being called, because nothing else has come to the public's attention of their review of freight cost in northern Ontario as proposed in the Speech from the Throne in 1971. So we want to see some action; and the government cannot talk and study forever.

Actually there are a couple of other routes that should be considered. The present Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), in a speech at Iroquois Falls in late July, 1971, said the government was going to extend the ONR from North Bay to Parry Sound so that the northern shippers could benefit from the lower freight costs of shipping facilities by having outlets to a Great Lakes port.

I did not hear any mention of this proposal in this year's Speech from the Throne, so I wonder if the government has shelved the proposal until before the next election and will bring it out again as they did this time. Or can we expect this route to be completed within a couple of years?

I have also suggested joining the ONR at Timmins to the CNR transcontinental line at Foleyet. Behind this idea is the fact that the Ecstall Mining zinc refinery, nearing completion, could be expanded into a custom zinc refinery to handle zinc concentrates from a number of other places in the north and elsewhere. It would also provide another market outlet and another means of serving the northeastern Ontario market by rail from western Canada supply centres.

There are a great many proposals to help solve the freight rate problem that is borne by northerners. The issue has been raised and the case put in this House by northerners year after year. Surely, then, the time for action is now. I call upon this government to respond in full co-operation to Mayor Piche and the elected officials of the northeast in the demands that they are now making.

We also need in the northeast more roads going north and south. When Premier Robarts officially opened Highway 144—the northern part—in response to my suggestion that, now that that road was opened, others be built, he stated that while the roads I was suggesting may not be the ones to which the government would give top priority, the government intended to build a number of new roads in the north. If this government that we have across the way intends to honour the commitment of the former Premier, then we expect some new roads to open up in the northeast to create and stimulate new economic development in areas not yet realizing anything near their potential.

I have repeatedly advocated the linking of Timmins to Smooth Rock Falls with a highway. Two routes are possible and the mileages involved are not that great. There is much to be gained in terms of linking up the Porcupine with communities on Highway 11 north with a more direct route. It will help the woods products industries in shipping chips and other materials from one facility to another at a much lower shipping cost. It will make for additional shopping and medical facilities at much less mileage for many northeastern Ontario residents.

Another highway that should be built is the Papakomeka road south from Timmins to link up with Highway 566 west of Matachewan. Right now the Texmont Mine is situated on this road and, while the road is partially built of sorts to that mine, a good deal more needs to be done to bring the road at least that far up to an acceptable standard. A number of accidents have resulted so far, because of the condition of the road and more will likely happen unless more work is done. There is the problem of the snowploughing in the winter and the lack of enthusiasm by the government to keep the public road open. The Texmont Mine has operated this winter but has had a lot of trouble keeping the road open, because of the government's fiddling around. When a number of jobs are at stake in a period of high unemployment, one expects more co-operation from the government than has been displayed in this instance.

The portion of this road that is presently used serves a number of wood products operations, Ontario Hydro and the Department of Lands and Forests. It also serves a number of cottagers as well as hunters and fishermen in the summer. However, the potential for great development in tourism, forest products and mining is immense in that area. As far as mining is concerned, a

number of persons in the mining field have informed me that the geological structures in that area are quite promising as far as future mineral finds are concerned. If minerals are to be found, it should be in that kind of geological formation. That is why many Timmins residents wanted Highway 144 to go south from Timmins through this area to join the Sudbury area at Capreol, rather than the western route that was chosen, since that western route is not through a very significant area from a geological standpoint and, therefore, is unlikely to see any really significant mining developments take place along the route.

In order to open up this area directly south of Timmins to future potential mineral, forestry and tourist developments we propose that the suggested road be developed, not just as a resource road but as a bona fide highway. By joining the Papakomeka road to Highway 566 the area is opened up by another route, not just to Porcupine residents but to those on Highway 65 through to New Liskeard and to those on Highway 66 through to Kirkland Lake. This extension of the road will make possible the access of our area to the Allied Asbestos Mining Corp. new development in Midlothian township.

This consideration is of secondary importance to the municipal officials with whom I am working. We believe the area in question has great potential for development as far as northeastern Ontario is concerned, and will benefit a number of established communities in the northeast as far as the economic development of our area is concerned.

I would like to speak about the equalization of hydro rates in Mountjoy township in my riding—an equalization of urban and rural rates. We were told that this would be done when consolidation of the municipalities took place. That may be a long-delayed fait accompli. This has been demanded for a long time by the residents of this community and other communities, and I think the government needs to give a good deal more attention to equalizing of hydro rates between rural and urban people, particularly those rural people who live immediately adjacent to a very builtup urban area.

I would like to go on and talk about the cost of drugs being put on to the OHIC plan. We have advocated that many times here now. I hope some day the government will see the light. I have talked about drugs being dealt with by a central purchasing agency where bulk buying can take place. We didn't get that in the Speech from the Throne. We will keep hammering away at it.

I would also like to see the implementation of a dental plan in this province—at least the beginning of it. It hasn't started yet, but there is a lot of talk around today about it.

These are things that I would like to speak about at some future time, but I will have a chance when the estimates come up.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been a privilege to once again engage in a Throne Speech in this House and to put forward some of the concerns of the residents of my constituency of Cochrane South.

Mr. Deans moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Mr. Deans moves second reading of Bill 13, An Act to amend the Public Health Act; and Mr. Leluk moves second reading of Bill 23, An Act to amend the Public Health Act.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I can't say I am overjoyed to be rising for the fourth time to suggest to the government that the time has now arrived when we should be introducing legislation which would safeguard the lives of many children in this province. I think it is a shame that I should have to get up again— and I first introduced this in 1967 or 1968—I think it is a shame that I should be forced again to reintroduce it.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The government doesn't operate this way, you know.

Mr. Deans: This is true. It is obviously the feeling of this government that this kind of legislation doesn't fall within the requirements of the things that are priorities in the Province of Ontario, and I want to make it clear right now that I disagree with that position.

I want to read to you at some length some comments by other people in the field —people who have expressed a great deal of concern and who have worked extremely hard over the last five or six years to develop childproof containers and to put them to the test—the test being the use of the container by children—who have discovered that the containers that are available are satisfactory and safe.

Before I do that I want to point out, and to agree with those who'll say it, that the bill doesn't go far enough or that the bill

goes too far. There's never a bill introduced in this House that's satisfactory; there's always something wrong with it. This bill will be no exception. There will be someone who'll find some nitpicking little thing that either is in it or isn't in it, that ought to be in it or ought not to be in it. And I agree with them.

The bill, perhaps, is not the very best way to deal with what we all know—rather, what I hope we all know—is a problem in the Province of Ontario. In fact, it's a problem throughout the world. I agree that maybe we should do it in stages. Maybe it would be best say that in the first instance we would provide childproof containers for only those medicines that are a solid substance. Maybe there are no containers at the moment that could hold liquids although I suspect that were the pressure applied we in the Province of Ontario would very quickly come up with a container and very quickly come up with a seal that would hold liquids, whether they be drugs or whether they be household liquids of the bleach and other corrosive varieties.

I would concede to the government if they were prepared even today to move forward and to say, "Yes, we'll introduce some kind of legislation that will make it mandatory in this province on this day to put all solid materials that are harmful to children in childproof containers," I would say that would be a good step forward.

The last time I debated the bill, I read into the record a number of letters that I had received from various organizations. Those organizations said, "Yes, we need it. Yes, we want to support you. We think the government ought to go ahead." The government appeared, in those days, to be willing to move. Since that time it seems as if the whole thing has been pushed to one side and that we're no longer prepared in this province to bring forward the kind of legislation that we require.

I want to read to members from a report of the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning. I think that probably every member of the House has received a copy of this. On page 9 it says, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem." This government is part of the problem. In fact, this government is the problem.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: Because the difficulty that we have in trying to convince the government of the need for such a simple Act, only serves to indicate that it does not understand the magnitude of the problem.

Let's take a look at what the magnitude of the problem really is. In Ontario 4,300 druggists in 1,700 pharmacies create the problem of drug poisoning in children. Today in 1971—today in 1972, I prepared this in 1971—they're still using the same unsafe obsolete containers which created the problems that we had—and they were massive—in 1965. During the time from 1965 when they were first confronted with the possibility of the use of childproof drug containers to today, some six years later, little if anything has occurred which would indicate to me that either the people in the field themselves —I'm talking in very broad terms—or the government of this province are prepared to move to try and cut the problem down.

It was estimated that there would be some 28 million prescriptions dispensed in Ontario in the year 1970; I'm sure that would be low if anything. Based on the normal usage, there would be about four prescriptions for each family, in some seven million people; of seven million persons each would have about four prescriptions. Of those 75 per cent were of the solid variety; 75 per cent were capsules or tablets or some other solid kind of prescription material.

It makes sense that as a first step the government could, quite easily, since there are already adequate, tested, childproof containers on the market, move very quickly in a matter of weeks to make them mandatory throughout this province. I concede we would have to recognize that there are elderly people, and there are people who are crippled with arthritis and people who have difficulty in handling these kinds of containers.

It may well be that to some extent we would have to leave some degree of latitude in the hands of the druggist in that if he knew that he was dealing with an elderly person who couldn't open such a container, that he could be given the right to put into some other form of container whatever it is that this person required for their use. But he would have to satisfy himself that this container would be in the hands of a person who was, in fact, not dealing on a day-to-day basis with very young children, because the majority of the poisonings occur in the age bracket below age six.

The majority of poisonings that have occurred in North America, and certainly in Ontario, occurred in children below school

age. So it would be entirely possible in discussing the prescription that was being requested with the people who were asking for it, to inquire whether or not there were small children in the home. Then it would be possible to take whatever necessary precautions had to be taken in order to ensure that the children's safety was looked after.

I have said before I agree that it may well be that we could say those children are the responsibility of the parents. Maybe the parents should be more careful; maybe the parents should put the prescription drugs up high; maybe the parents should have a locked cabinet in which all prescriptions that are dangerous to health should be placed. But it really is asking too much; it obviously is asking too much.

Parents, regardless of their concern for their children, are parents. I think that we can try as legislators to offset the carelessness of certain parents by guaranteeing that, even if they did leave the medicine chest open, or even if they did inadvertently leave the medication in a place where a child could reach it, that that child would be unable to open the bottle; and in fact that child's life would then be safeguarded.

From what we can see—from what I can see—the numbers of children in the Province of Ontario who fall into the category of being under six runs at about almost 800,000. Taking the tests that have been conducted over the past three or four years, it would be foolhardy to suggest that each and every one of those children is going to be subjected to the pressures of taking some poison inadvertently. Nevertheless, it is fairly clear from the statistics that I have that if child-proof medicine containers are not used for the numbers of prescriptions that are being dispensed in the Province of Ontario today, that we will have some 4,000 or more children poisoned in this province in this year.

In fact, of those 4,000 children who will be poisoned in this province in this year, a number of them will die. There is no reason for them to die. There is no reason at all why, with just a little care, we couldn't ensure that those children's lives would be safeguarded. We could then stand in the forefront of the nations who are fighting to preserve and to stand up for people who can't stand up for themselves; and that is what we are talking about here.

The tests that were conducted show conclusively that such a small percentage of the children who were given the containers that are available were able to open them that, in fact, the tests were almost 100 per cent. There were so few children in the under-six age group capable of opening the container even after having been shown how to open it—that the risk factor involved was reduced almost to the point of non-existence.

Mr. Gaunt: I can understand that; I cannot get them open myself.

Mr. Deans: The member says he cannot get them open himself—and maybe that is true. A lot of members can't get a lot of things open around here.

I want though to refer to some of the statistics that are available. I don't want to take too much time; I know a lot of members want to speak. But just to show the comparisons, in 1966 in the hospitals in the Hamilton area, there were 906 accidental poisonings reported in the Hamilton General Children's Hospital. In the remaining Hamilton civic hospitals there were 567 poisonings reported. In the Joseph Brant Hospital in Burlington, which is nearby and would take care of a number of Hamilton children, there were 325 poisonings reported.

By the year 1968, in the Hamilton General Hospital it had risen from 906 to 1,005—an increase of some 11 per cent; in Hamilton Civic Hospital, from 567 to 636—an increase of some 12 per cent; in Joseph Brant Hospital, from 325 to 487—an increase of some 50 per cent during that period of accidental poisonings to children of that age.

In Toronto, at the Hospital for Sick Children there were 7,754 cases of children who had been accidentally poisoned in 1966. In 1968 there were 9,907—an increase of 27 per cent.

In the only area of the province at that time that used childproof containers the conditions were considerably different. In the Windsor poison control centre, there were 1,000 reported cases in 1966; by the year 1970 there were only 363 cases. In the year 1968, which is the year I have used for the others, there were 505 cases—a decrease of 49.5 per cent. I suggest to every member of this House that this was the only area of the province that showed any marked decrease. The reason was that they moved into the area and sought the co-operation of the pharmacists of the area; they received it and put into use the childproof drug container.

With those kinds of statistics, it is pretty plain to me, and, I think, to every other member of this House, that if we were to have on a universal basis across the province a law which demanded that this type of container be used, we could expect to see

similar if not identical results flowing from this chart in the year 1972.

I suggest that every member of this House should put pressure on the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) and whichever other minister in that government happens to have anything to do with this matter, and to say, "Look, it's my children and their children that we are talking about. I want to see the best possible safeguards enacted in this province to protect the lives of these children."

I can see no reason at all why this government has refused to act. I can't understand why, after four years of continuously asking that this measure be taken by this government, that it has continued to refuse to act. I can only assume it is because the government of the Province of Ontario just doesn't care. There can be no other explanation, because it isn't a very difficult matter; it isn't something that would require a great deal of consolidation.

I reiterate that if we bear in mind that 75 per cent of all medications prescribed in the province are in solid form, that there is already on the market a container that is suitable for that use, I am positive that within six months of a bill being brought into this House dealing with liquid containers the manufacturers, using their ingenuity, could find any number of ways to overcome the problems they now claim exist, we could have childproof containers, we could see marked reductions in child poisoning and marked reductions in child deaths.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Humber.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on this occasion to speak to my Bill 23 which deals with the same principle that the hon. member for Wentworth has just talked about. The only differences in the two bills, and the hon. member for Wentworth mentioned this, is that mine deals with solid medications, which includes tablets and capsules. This is simply because the child-resistant container that is currently available is only suitable for this type of medication. We don't have in Ontario, or anywhere that I know of at this time, a container for liquid drugs which is leak-proof.

I feel very strongly, as the member for Wentworth does, that legislation of the type that has been mentioned here today should have been passed a long time ago. I feel that the legislators of this province have a responsibility to protect young people from themselves. I speak of the age group from birth to six years of age and in particular that group from two to three years of age, who are like vacuum cleaners and eat everything in sight. These youngsters unfortunately can't read directions; they don't realize that the substances they take can poison them.

Unfortunately educational programmes have failed to do what many of us have wanted these programmes to do—that is, to educate adults to keep potentially dangerous medication out of the reach of young children. Unfortunately today people just don't do these things; medications are left about in homes where youngsters can get at them.

I feel very strongly that the escalation of accidental poisoning, not only in this province but in Canada, demands this type of legislation to be passed. Just to quote from the federal statistics in the Province of Ontario in 1970 there were a total of some 21,428 accidental poisonings. In the Toronto area the Sick Children's Hospital, which has one or two poison control centres in Toronto, reported that its total cases for 1971 were 11,753. These figures have been escalating year after year after year.

In Canada, for example, the number of poisonings due to drugs were in the neighbourhood of 31,000 in 1970, and we have every indication that these figures will continue to grow. I feel ashamed that Ontario, the birthplace of the first child-resistant container for this type of medication, hasn't put it into full use in this province.

In Essex county—Windsor—they have a programme over the past five years initiated by the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning, in co-operation with the pharmacists and medical people in that area. Prescription drug poisonings have been reduced by some 88.6 per cent, which is a very significant figure.

Mr. Leluka: A similar programme has been tried in Tacoma, Washington, a community of some 120,000 people, using the very same container. We are talking now about the Palm-N-Turn container, which was developed here in Ontario in 1965. I might say at this time it has met federal government approval as to standards. The reduction of accidental poisonings due to prescription drugs in solid form in Tacoma's 3½-year programme between 1966 and 1969 was about 89 per cent, which is again very significant.

I fail to see why, after we have had two successful lengthy pilot programmes involving this particular container, that this government wouldn't see fit to pass legislation

making it mandatory for all pharmacists and medical practitioners who dispense their own drugs in this province to use this type of container in dispensing solid medications—that would be tablets and capsules. It is obvious that if these programmes have shown such a reduction in accidental poisonings in these two areas that this would hold true, not only for Ontario, but for all of Canada, if this type of legislation were introduced nationally.

In a report from the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning—in the president's report of 1971—we see that in February, 1971, the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning submitted a brief, "The Pharmacist Holds the Key," to the Ontario College of Pharmacy petitioning for government legislation for mandatory child-resistant containers for solid prescription drugs.

In March of this year child-resistant containers for liquids appeared on the Canadian market. This container is specifically designed for household products and chemicals; I don't believe that they've refined this particular container for liquid prescription drugs at this time.

The Hazardous Products Act was passed It defined harmful substances and identified dangerous products. The Ontario Medical Association has petitioned the Ontario legislative assembly to pass legislation for mandatory child resistant containers. The Ontario Pharmacists Association requested legislation which would require that child resistant containers be mandatory.

In June, 1971, the Canadian Paediatric Society pressed for legislation for child-resistant packaging for all potentially hazardous substances and requested the federal Minister of Health and Welfare to act at once toward implementation of this objective through a safety packaging Act for the protection of the children of Canada. In July, 1971, the council of the Ontario College of Pharmacy requested that a regulation be drafted, pursuant to section 52(c) of the Pharmacy Act, which would require that prescribed medication which is not packaged by its manufacturer in child-resistant packaging, such as blister packaging, or strip packaging, be dispensed in child-resistant containers.

I can go on and on and on. There have been many professional groups in this country who have attempted to get such legislation passed.

Mr. Lawlor: The member sees the kind of government he has over there.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury): Oh, yes, dead from the neck both ways.

Mr. Leluk: Now, recently—

Mr. Lawlor: It takes people like the member for Humber to stir them up.

Mr. Leluk: Recently, Dr. Henri J. Breault—

Mr. Lawlor: Does the member think he is going to get anywhere?

Mr. Leluk: —who is the president and medical director for the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning recently wrote to Dr. H. B. Cotnam, supervising coroner for the province of Ontario, re the Tracy Lynn Farr inquest. This was a three-year-old Brantford girl who died in mid-January of this year from an overdose of a prescription drug that had been prescribed for her mother.

Dr. Breault writes:

> It is a tragedy that every day in America one child will die from poisoning; 75 per cent will be hospitalized and 6,000 will be poisoned. Ontario and Canada will get their fair share of these cases. [He continues:] Must our children continue to pay with their lives or with their health while our legislators procrastinate in the passage of a safety packaging Act?

Some of you may recall the Tracy Lynn Farr inquest, which was reported in the Feb. 10 Globe and Mail: "Jury blames mother's carelessness with drugs for death of girl, 3."

This youngster survived two previous overdoses of drugs after getting into the family medicine chest. The jury ruled the mother should have returned a tranquillizer pill container to a locked box in a hall closet where medicines were kept in the Farr home. Mrs. Farr said that she was busy and had put the pills on the top shelf of a cupboard in the kitchen rather than return them to the metal box. The child had used a chair to climb on to the kitchen counter, took an overdose and a week later died.

The jury recommended that further design and development be done to produce a pill container that cannot be opened by children. Obviously, they couldn't have known too much about the container I speak of because it has proven to be some 99.998 per cent effective against tampering by children under the age of six. The jury also recommended

that the use of these containers be mandatory for all prescription drugs in this province.

As I pointed out earlier, in Essex county prescription drug poisonings have been reduced 88.6 per cent. Further, all other poisonings have dropped 64 per cent, so that two out of three poisonings do not happen in Essex county. I fail to see why this could not be done for the rest of this province through the passing of legislation making it mandatory that pharmacists and dispensing physicians be required to use this container in the dispensing of solid prescription medications.

To get a public reaction, I sent out 20,500 questionnaires to my constituents about a month ago. Question 13 of the questionnaire read:

> Should legislation be enacted to ensure that all prescription drugs and other potentially dangerous drugs, for example, aspirin —ASA products—be dispensed or sold in tamperproof containers to prevent accidental poisoning of children?

To date I have received 4,353 replies, which is a 21.2 per cent return, which is exceptionally high. In answer to this particular question I received the following: "yes" answers, 3,635; "no" answers, 419; "no opinion", 258; no reply, 41. The number of "yes" answers to this question, asking for this type of legislation is 83 per cent of the total number of questionnaires returned to date which is quite a significant figure. Therefore, I strongly urge this government to pass this legislation which I feel is very necessary to protect our young people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Sir, I rise to support both Bills 13 and 23 which are basically the same in principle although one is more restrictive than the other.

I should like to point out, however, that I do not believe it would be necessary for the government to bring forth legislation in order to implement the mandatory use of child-resistant containers. Under section 52(c) of the present Pharmacy Act, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing the types of containers to be used for containing any poison or drug, and the designs and specifications thereof. The government and the minister at present have the legislation under which they could bring forth specifications for the mandatory use of containers.

As well, standards have been established by the federal government under the 104GP standards for safety containers for pharmaceutical products. This, in effect, could be applied under section 52(c) of the Pharmacy Act in order to bring in mandatory specifications which the pharmaceutical industry and the pharmacists within the province would have to follow. The legislation under that Act, could pertain as well to almost any poison that one could think of, including the household solvents, etc., that account for more than 50 per cent of the poisonings of children under six years of age.

This matter has been brought before the Legislature on a number of occasions by the member for Wentworth and others. The last time it was debated under a private member's bill it was his bill and I and three or four other members took part, but one significant contribution was made by the member for Quinte (Mr. Potter) who is now the Minister of Health. I would just like to quote from some of the things that he said and after quoting this I am sure we would all agree that it won't be long before he will bring forth the legislation for which he called three years ago. He said:

> I do not believe it is sufficient to say to the pharmacists "please use these containers wherever possible" because it has been stated here today there are still pharmacists that are reluctant to use them, whether because of the cost or because they just are not interested.

In other words, what the present minister at that time was saying is that mandatory legislation was required. He also went on further to say:

> I think we should make it mandatory that the best container possible be used today. I think that we cannot remove the responsibility that is ours to see that we keep these things out of the hands of children as far as possible.

In other words what he was saying was that the minister at that time should have taken his responsibilities and moved to bring in the necessary regulations or perhaps, if I am incorrect in my earlier statements, new legislation. Since he is now the minister, I think the main responsibility at least lies with him. In light of the statements that he made in 1969, I am sure we can all expect either regulations or legislation to cover these points within the very near future.

Over the past number of years, the leadership in the field of research into the use of child-resistant containers has been fostered in our own province by the Essex county poison control centre and the Ontario Association for the Control of Accidental Poisoning. Dr. Henri Breault is the president of

that association and as well is attached to the Essex county poison control centre. It is through his leadership that the matter has been brought forcefully to the public and, through the research he has done over the past seven or eight years, it has been made apparent to government and everyone concerned that there are child-resistant containers available specifically for the solid medications that have, in effect, reduced the incidence of poisoning in his specific area from that type of medication by almost 100 per cent.

As well, because the containers have been used exclusively in the Essex county district, there has been an overlay effect that has caused the reduction of poisonings by other lethal substances. The report of the association points out that because of the awareness that people have gained through the use of the Palm-N'-Turn container in particular, they have become more conscious of the other substances and more protective of their children in respect of all poisons, not only those packaged in the Palm-N'-Turn containers.

The effects, however, can be minimal unless the drug manufacturers themselves accept their responsibilities and use this type of container for the packaging of all their products for which it is suitable. Of course, the common aspirin has been and still is the most-used poisonous drug in our province as well as right around the world.

It took some years for the most notable manufacturer of aspirin, the Bayer company, to move to the use of the child-resistant container, but 12 months ago it finally did so. For the first time in the history of the country, the number of poisonings from aspirins within our jurisdiction has been reduced over the past 12-month period. I think this is notable in that it is the number one poisonous drug that has caused the greatest percentage of the poisonings, particularly among children under six years old.

The people within our province have taken the leadership with regard to this matter, yet the government has been slow to react and bring forward the necessary regulations. Although we have done the most research within our boundaries, other jurisdictions are now moving ahead much more quickly than we are. In the United States a target date has been set for the use of child-resistant containers for the four most common products that cause poisonings among children. By Aug. 15 of this year, under American legislation it will be a necessity to package all acetylsalicylic acid products in child-resistant containers. Following that, oil of wintergreen and certain furniture polish substances will have to be packaged in that type of container by September of this year.

So we can see that legislation is being brought forth in other jurisdictions, taking advantage of the research that has been done within the Province of Ontario, and I would suggest that we certainly do expect from the minister, particularly in the light of his former statements, that he will bring Ontario to the forefront in this type of legislation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: There are three more hon. members who wish to speak; perhaps the hon. members will gauge their remarks accordingly. The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously I rise to support this particular private member's bill. As has been mentioned by several of the previous speakers, the impetus behind the first development of the childproof container for solid drugs came from the Windsor area in the person of Dr. Henri Breault, director of the Essex county poison control association and the Essex and Windsor poison control centre. Some seven or eight years ago he went to various of the manufacturing establishments in Windsor with his ideas and asked could their engineers develop them.

It is with some pride that I mention that the manufacturing company, International Tool, whose engineers took on the project of developing the prototype and then, of course, developing the product which has now been sold, is in my riding.

I cannot see why, with the obvious success, that the childproof containers, particularly the Palm-N'-Turn container, has had wherever it's been tried, that the Minister of Health does not immediately bring in regulations requiring that the Palm-N'-Turn bottles, or another childproof bottle, be used for all solid prescription medication.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bounsall: The studies as alluded to, were done in two locations in the States – one involving a large air force base; the second a large army base – and thirdly in the Windsor area where the success, as reported, has been outstanding.

The requirement, I think, is for legislation requiring this for use by our pharmacists in the province. It is interesting to note that it took about two years after the Palm-N'-Turn was invented and was available for purchase and use by pharmacists in the Windsor area, before pharmacists on the whole accepted it. And this was in a community where you were getting tremendous pressure from the developer of it, Dr. Breault, and the company that was producing it, International Tool, or ITL Industries Ltd., as the company is now known.

Up until about two years ago we still had to request our own particular pharmacist to whom we go for our prescription needs, that solid prescription drugs be put in the child-proof containers. Since the last couple of years he automatically put every solid prescription drug in a childproof container.

We have heard how it is adaptable to the pills that aren't just prescription drugs, but to the ASA market as well.

I think the Legislature and the Minister of Health might like to know that on Dec. 27 last—and this is in direct reference to the second speaker on the subject—I sat with Mr. Peter Hedgewick, the president of International Tool, the company whose engineers designed the one for solid drugs and whose company manufactures those containers. In his office he displayed to me all of the different containers, primarily those containing liquids, that have already been developed and are childproof in terms of containing those liquids.

In his office at that time one saw the childproof container adapted to containers of all substances—a metal container, a plastic container and glass container.

The metal containers contained both solid lye, for example, and the second one contained a highly-volatile liquid sample which, if there was going to be any leakage, would be the container from which you would expect leakage. There was, with that particular setting and that particular model, at least, absolutely no leakage.

There were seven or eight different sizes and shapes of plastic containers, all of them containing liquid, all of them adapted with the Palm-N-Turn type bottle cap and none of those leaked. In addition, there were various sizes and shapes of glass containers, all containing liquids, all with the child-proof Palm-N-Turn cap on it and none of them leaked.

I expressed some cynicism that he had picked; of course, only those manufactured items which could be displayed and would not leak. Mr. Hedgewick assured me—and I would take his word for it—that these were representative samples, and that bottles could be made which were perfectly capable of containing liquids, as well as solids, and were suitable for both solid prescription drugs and liquid prescription drugs, and for general use throughout the entire industry in terms of any material, solvents, or otherwise, liquid or solids, which could poison children.

I won't go through the facts presented by the first couple of speakers and mentioned again by the third, of the obvious success that there has been in the areas where these have been tried. It is time that laws were brought in in Ontario which said to the pharmacists that they must package all of their solid and liquid prescription drugs in these containers.

I would say that the first step that we should be taking here in Ontario is legislation requiring this. For things apart from prescription drugs, particularly liquids for industrial use, floor cleaners, bleaches and this type of thing, it will probably necessarily be more complicated.

And I view this legislation for prescription drugs as simply a first step which must very soon be extended to cover any substance in liquid or solid form, in any kind of container because we have the technology to do it—I have seen that technology as short a time ago as last Dec. 27. This as well must be brought into law in the Province of Ontario.

I can't speak more highly of the interest and the driving spirit that emanated from the Windsor control centre and Dr. Breault in insisting that some way be found to contain liquid and solid materials potentially poisonous to children. I can't more highly praise the engineers of ITL Industries Ltd., who have, in point of fact, in a rather short time, developed exactly what was required to meet the need.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oxford.

Mr. H. C. Parrott (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak about this bill, and perhaps for two reasons. First of all, it seems to me there is a spirit of co-operation on this particular occasion that I haven't seen here before. It is a pleasure indeed because of that. Maybe there is a new day in politics dawning.

Secondly, it presents to me the opportunity to speak about preventing the ills of society. I hope I will have an opportunity

on many occasions to speak about preventive medicine, or any form of prevention.

I cannot endorse the concept of the hon. member for Wentworth that this is the problem, if you will, of government. It is a concern of government, yes, but I think that he overstated it rather markedly.

Nevertheless, in spite of that I would like to endorse the two bills that are presented here tonight. As previously stated, it is not likely that a new member can add a great deal to what has been said, not only now, but in Hansard of 1969—I think the date was March 24. But there are a couple of points I would like to make.

First of all, I think we all recognize that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link and here is a link that can be strengthened. I doubt if both of these bills if presented and accepted would have an immediate success. There would not be a great reduction in the illnesses of our society or the deaths, but certainly there would be a marked reduction, and this is the point. There would be a very marked reduction and, therefore, it is a step in the right direction. What we require is a combined educational and preventive programme.

My concerns, therefore, are about two things—one, the carelessness of adults and here education has to become of paramount importance. To give the media some due respect, I think they have frequently placed excellent ads illustrating the harm that can occur from drugs that are carelessly left around the home. I think we should give them due credit. I think we should also expect repetition in this particular area. The labels on containers should be continually updated to provide that information.

The second concern—and I think I have some knowledge of this particular area—is the natural inquisitiveness of children, particularly at the age of which we speak. I think we need this bill and we need much more.

One of the things that we need more of, in my opinion, is research into liquid containers. I would like to suggest to the House that perhaps in this year when we're offering challenges to our youth a $1,000 reward, if you would, would be a very worthwhile incentive to the student or the group of students in Youth Action who came up with the very best container. This may not be the final one, but I think it would be an excellent project to see what the young people of this province could promote in a very short period of time.

As previously stated, we need to do a lot more in the educational field. If at all possible may I bring this home to the members of this House. I've had three particular personal experiences that I would like to outline very briefly. One, I sat with friends as they sat the night through after their child had died from an overdose of drugs; an occasion never to be forgotten. If others of this House would share with me in that experience, I'm sure that they too would attempt to endorse a bill that would see this particular harm to society eliminated.

Changing from that rather serious note, in my own personal household my child mistook an Ex-Lax box for a chocolate bar. Now we weren't particularly worried that night but we were busy!

Again, we come to that last portion of the concern, and that is where these things are not possible to control. Too often we want to put the onus on someone else when it should be on ourselves. I think of a patient who had swallowed Gillet's lye. Now this was a young child and the responsibility was at home and the parents were acutely aware of that, much to their sorrow. Nevertheless, everything that happens is not preventable, and for us to think that one bill would change the total problem would be naive.

Nevertheless, I think we are being less than honest if we don't take steps, and as soon as possible, to bring in legislation that will assist in this rather significant problem. I was going to read from Hansard a little of the statement that the previous speaker from Nipissing quoted when he quoted the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) on his stand taken in March, 1969. But in the hope of letting the last speaker on this bill have his day, I will not. Suffice it to say it was quite obvious that the present Minister of Health does, in fact, endorse this type of legislation. I share with the other speakers in this House the hope that such legislation must and will be coming to our attention in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support Bills 13 and 23 as have all members who have spoken before me.

It's unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that we come into this House and speak on private members' bills time and time again. We repeat the same bills year after year, and year after year we get the complete support of the government; yet those same members who are in the government don't use their influence to

convince their colleagues of the merit of the bill and have the minister introduce legislation to overcome the problem.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Let's have a vote today. Let's have a vote on it today.

Mr. B. Newman: If the children are being poisoned in this Province of Ontario as a result of the non-use of child-resistant containers, we have no one else to blame but the members in the Conservative government for not forcing their own Minister of Health to Act. For four years now we have spoken in the House on this bill and we have gone nowhere.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): That's right.

Mr. B. Newman: It is simply an exercise in futility. We have really wasted one hour's time on an important item such as the life and death of so many children in the province and throughout the world. Were the Province of Ontario to make mandatory the use of the child-resistant container, then you can rest assured that the United States and other jurisdictions that sometimes look toward Ontario, would adopt the principle.

We have the technology in the province now, as has been pointed out by one of the previous speakers, to not only make child resistant containers for solids but also for liquids. So there's really no need for a $1,000 reward. The member for Oxford mentioned a $1,000 reward; I think he would probably be better off providing the pharmacists in the city of Woodstock and in his own riding with sufficient child-resistant containers so they would come along and use them and perhaps prevent one or two accidential poisonings in his own riding.

Mr. Speaker, it's kind of strange that the present Minister of Health, in talking about similar legislation in 1969, spoke so highly of the need for child-resistant containers, spoke in favour of the bill that was up for discussion that day; now that he has assumed the portfolio, he hasn't acted. Maybe we are a little too impatient. Maybe we can foresee that in this sitting of the Legislature the self-same minister who made those worthwhile comments back in 1969 will now implement his own suggestion.

Bills 13 and 23, Mr. Speaker, are a forward step. They may not go far enough, but they are at least a step forward. One little step that may save the life of some youngster in the Province of Ontario.

Now one of the members mentioned that education could be an answer to the problem or an assist in the answer. However, statistics show that the incidence of poisons and death from poisons decreases from the years one to six—it keeps decreasing as the youngster becomes a little more knowledgeable—and then it is by far more serious in the teenage and the post-teenage group, those who should know enough not to come along and get involved in the imbibing of liquids that could have a harmful effect and could be poisonous.

Now one of the things we always look upon when we talk about child-resistant containers is the dollar and cent point of view. We figure we are imposing on the druggists, or the pharmacy industry, a cost that is going to be substantial and in turn is going to be passed on to the purchaser of the prescription. From my understanding, the difference between the use of a glass bottle and the plastic or the child-resistant container, is only approximately one cent. Now I don't know whether that is accurate or not, but I assume that the information provided to me was fairly accurate. Even if it were substantially more than that, 100 per cent more, that would be only two cents. I don't think the druggist is going to add $1 on the prescription simply because he uses a child-resistant container. I think that they are too honourable a profession to come along at any time and be accused of not wanting to co-operate.

Today happened to be a sort of a Windsor day in the Legislature. We not only talked of poison control starting in the city of Windsor—because it was in 1962 that it did start there—but we also mentioned that the founder of all of this, a Dr. Henri Breault, a very honourable medical practitioner in the community, sacrificed a lot of time and effort to try to educate his own profession as well as the pharmacists and governments to adopt the type of programme he suggested.

Likewise, the container was developed in the city of Windsor, and the member for Windsor West made mention of Peter Hedgewick. I happen to know the young man because I sort of grew up with the fellow and I knew of his ingenuity. Now, not only do we have now the Palm-N'-Turn safety container but we also have a Medisafe container that is used in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I could keep talking fairly well indefinitely. I could read editorials that have tried to emphasize and point out to the government the benefits of the use of a child-resistant container. However, for the sake

of time, Mr. Speaker, I will only suggest to you and to the members on the governing side that they apply all of the pressures that they can on the Minister of Health, so that in this sitting of the Legislature we have introduced legislation that will require all types of prescription drugs at least to be placed in childproof containers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 27, 1972

Industrial milk marketing study in Ontario, statement by Mr. Stewart ... 563

Trip to Cuba, statement by Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence ... 573

Trip to Cuba, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Good, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Breithaupt ... 573

Requisition policy for government planes, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Roy ... 577

Rescinding of forgivable loan to Northern Electric Co., question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 580

Barrie bypass and municipal consultation, questions of Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Lewis ... 580

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 581

Facilities for handicapped in Bronte Creek Park, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Good ... 582

Soliciting of funds by drug prevention group, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Singer ... 583

Mini-Queen's Park for Thunder Bay, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Foulds, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Stokes ... 583

Loss of health benefits by those under training, question of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. B. Newman 584

Northern Ontario Development Corp. legislation, question of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Stokes ... 584

Freeze on nursing home construction, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deacon, Mr. Good 584

Presenting reports, Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation, Agricultural Research Institute, Research Foundation, Mr. Yaremko ... 585

Historical Parks, bill respecting, Mr. Bernier, first reading ... 585

Establishment of Regional Transportation Authorities, bill to provide for, Mrs. Scrivener first reading ... 585

Occupational Safety Act, bill intituled, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 585

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne: Mr. Spence, Mr. Nie, Mr. Ferrier ... 586

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to ... 600

Public Health Act, bills to amend, on second reading, Mr. Deans, Mr. Leluk, Mr. R. Smith, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Parrott, Mr. B. Newman ... 600

Recess, 6 o'clock ... 610

No. 17



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, March 27, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I, first of all, extend to the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Reuter) my sincere congratulations on his election as this body's leader. As a student and teacher of history I can only feel that the quality of the deliberations of a parliament depends in large measure on the strength and justice which the person occupying that chair is called upon to deliver.

We look to him, sir, to be fair and impartial, both of which qualities he has amply demonstrated since his election on December 13. In fact, I may say that I had the great honour to speak for the Speaker in his riding during the contest last fall and I know very well the high regard in which he is held by the people of Waterloo South.

I may go further to say that I would hope at some point in this four-year term we will, as has often been discussed at Ottawa and in this chamber, seriously consider the matter of a permanent Speakership, I fail to see why we should prolong the system whereby a man is called upon to be impartial and without partisan feelings and still be called upon adequately to represent his constituency and every four years seek re-election.

I have observed that it is a tradition in this House, sir, in one's maiden address to extol the virtues of one's predecessor and to describe the constituency where electors have conferred on me the honour of being their member of this legislative assembly.

As for my distinguished predecessor, I think that the name of Stanley J. Randall will long be remembered in this House, indeed in this province and in this nation. While I realize that he had many detractors, I think this is the fate which befalls any man who makes a sincere effort to make a positive contribution to our government and to our society. Some of you may take issue with some of the policies enunciated by Stanley Randall in his years as Minister of Trade and Development, but let no one question the guiding spirit which led this man to develop in Ontario the largest and best-run public housing corporation in the Dominion, the man who unselfishly gave of himself to build Ontario's economy, and, yes, the man who guided the development of the Ontario Science Centre, Ontario Place, and our outstanding pavilions at Expo 67 and Osaka.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): What happened to Harbour City?

Mr. Timbrell: I should say, Mr. Speaker, that when I, too, am finished in the public forum, which I hope won't be for many years, I would hope to be remembered as one who took stands and followed them through. It is for these reasons that Stanley Randall is well remembered in this House and in my constituency.

Turning to my riding of Don Mills, I suppose I should, first of all, say that it is one constituency which as much as any in Metropolitan Toronto represents a cross-section of our society. From the older areas of East York around Main Street, where, I suppose, the average house sits on about a 30-ft. lot, to the minimum two-acre holdings in the Post Road district of North York, it poses every conceivable problem and concern about urban life that this body will have to confront in the next four years.

Before going on, I should apologize to the hon. members of this House if I do not comment on the poor roads in Algoma-Manitoulin or the need for marketing legislation in Middlesex South. Let me assure them it is not from indifference or lack of concern that I will not pass comment, but rather from a lack of knowledge about these and other areas. However, I depend on them to educate me, if they will, between now and 1975 and, believe me, I will be listening.

Speaking again of my constituency, may I take this opportunity to outline for the members some of the concerns, to which I alluded previously, held by my electors. Both of the boroughs of East York and North York are relatively young municipalities, East York having been incorporated in 1924 and North York two years earlier on July 18, 1922. The difference between them lies in the fact that while East York has been completely developed for many years, North York has literally blossomed in only the last 15 or 20 years. Prior to that, except for Willowdale, Weston and Downsview, it was mostly farmland. The variances and the timing of developments in these two municipalities lie at the root of the different concerns held in the two areas of my constituency.

In East York, the overriding fear held by all is that with the ever-increasing demand for housing in Metropolitan Toronto, large chunks of the borough will fall to the Teperman hammers, to be replaced by colossal shiny and high structures, housing thousands who owe no allegiance to East York, whose many extra cars will accentuate an already serious traffic situation in that municipality.

East Yorkers truly love their municipality. There is a spirit and dedication which you will be hard-pressed to unearth in any other part of Metro except perhaps the Beaches area, represented by my friend from Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle), which after all is only separated from East York by invisible boundary lines. They love their area so much, ladies and gentlemen, that they want to keep it the way it is.

By contrast, the northern end of my riding, which falls in the borough of North York, is 20 years or more behind East York in the development of this unusual loyalty—but it will come; it is coming. I suppose that areas like Don Mills, Victoria Village and Flemingdon Park represent typical suburbia, with the large manicured lawns and the towering apartment and office buildings. Even here, though, there is the fear of what new developments will bring.

Flemingdon Park, for example, is an area which I believe is well known to many members of this House. An area of less than two square miles, it will by 1975 have 25,000 inhabitants, all of whom will be housed in either highrise apartment buildings or in the 524 OHC-owned townhouses. You can appreciate then, Mr. Speaker, the severe problems encountered in the schools that serve this area, in providing adequate recreation outlets and in coping with the emotional problems encountered by so many of the people who live in this area in what we choose to call "cliff dwellings."

Another example is the intersection of Don Mills Rd. and Eglinton Ave., the busiest intersection in the whole of North America. Through it pass daily thousands of people on their way to what we affectionately call "the decaying core of Toronto."

Thousands more travel to and from the two million square feet of office space that lie within a one-mile radius of this intersection. I should point out that in the whole of the borough of North York, an area of 70 square miles, there are four million square feet of office space.

This then serves to illustrate why we fear continuation of the type of developments, residential and industrial, with which we have become all too familiar, when we already have half of the office and service space in the borough of North York in a one-mile radius out of 70 square miles.

If the needs of my constituents are to be met we must have several things, including (a) GO Transit service through Don Mills to the north and to the northeast; (b) an early start on the proposed Eglinton Ave. subway; (c) increased incentives for business to locate outside of Metro and thereby help to relieve some of the very real pressures we face to build higher and higher in greater and greater densities; and (d) a rapid transit line, perhaps a monorail system, following the course of the Don Valley Parkway to relieve this artery.

On that point, Mr. Speaker, I should say that as the member for Don Mills I will fight with every available scrap of energy the proposals presently being discussed at Metro to widen the parkway to eight lanes. It would be an absolute waste of public funds and in no way meets the needs that we and other areas of northeast Metropolitan Toronto have.

I was pleased to see the passage last year of the Act to amend the Highway Improvement Act, whereby substantially increased grants would be available to Metro to build rapid transit systems. The onus is now on the municipality to take advantage of this golden opportunity. But I hasten to point out that if the rapid transit systems are to work to optimum capacity, they must be served by a much improved system of other forms of public transit on the surface. To this end it is my fervent hope that this government will extend similar financial support for surface transit as it has for rapid transit.

Many of my constituents, sir, are retired or semi-retired and live on fixed incomes, particularly in the borough of East York where many families have been there 30, 40 and 50 years. It was of them that I thought when I heard the Treasurer's announcement about the discontinuation of the tax rebates in favour of a system of tax deductions for property taxes or rents. These are the people who need the help most and these are the people who will get the most help under this system.

I hope we can expect further initiatives from this administration to encourage Ottawa to allow deductions for repairs, mortgage interest and items of this type.

If I may at this point comment on two existing pieces of legislation which particularly affect the Flemingdon Park area of my constituency and Crescent Town, another very large apartment rental and condominium development, I'd like to comment on the Landlord and Tenant Act and the Condominium Act.

Since the most recent amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act took effect on January 1, 1970, it has been the experience of many landlords that rent has been harder to collect and evictions for arrears much more difficult to obtain. This problem, I grant them, is a serious one. I know of one example where at the middle of October, 1970, $67,000 was due and payable to a landlord from just three apartment buildings in the Don Mills area.

This becomes exasperating to the point that some landlords have now adopted the practice of cutting off hydro service from delinquent tenants. How stupid, how barbaric, in an age when hydro is absolutely vital, as much so as heat in winter, which they cannot remove. I would suggest to my colleagues on the Treasury benches that this simply should not be allowed and the Act should be amended accordingly. I personally know of one attempted suicide which resulted when the landlord cut off the hydro to a woman's apartment to force her to pay up or get out. The average daily cost of supplying hydro to this apartment was 30 cents—he was only going to cut it off for one day as a warning—and the woman almost lost her life.

As regards the Condominium Act, may I say that an obligatory standard agreement of purchase and sale would seem to be well in order. Most of the public are as yet sceptical about condominiums, not the least reason for which is the fact that as markets slump more salesmen use unethical tactics to entice prospective purchasers. This is complicated further by two facts.

First, condominiums are sold generally directly through the builders' agents rather than real estate agencies, and are therefore outside of the authority of disciplinary bodies of the real estate boards but, I grant, not outside the authority of this assembly.

Secondly, and as the legal counsel present well know, a suit for verbal misrepresentation which is usually the way they are misled, is very difficult to pursue and, in fact, can take several years to resolve in the courts.

While I recognize that there is also a very great need for public education both about condominiums and contractual agreements and that the concept of caveat emptor is inherent in the free enterprise system, should we not take steps to protect the buyer against unprofessional ethics and, let's be realistic, against himself at times.

There is also the matter of monthly rent paid by purchasers after occupancy but prior to registration of the condominium corporation. I fail to see why, when so many of the developers' mortgages are guaranteed by this government and large financial institutions and Ottawa, thereby ensuring full return on their investments, they cannot apply rent paid prior to registration against the individual's mortgage commitments or add these moneys as credits to the downpayment.

Shortly after my election on Oct. 21, I was approached by a constituent to accompany her on a visit to the Ontario Hospital School in Orillia. Before making this trip I also learned of a programme in behaviour modification being conducted by a Dr. Weisman of Queen's University at the Rideau Regional Hospital School in Smiths Falls.

In January, I visited both of these institutions. May I, Mr. Speaker, relate to you some of my observations, those of an admitted layman, I grant you.

The following are contents of two memoranda I wrote to myself following each visit. The first was following my visit to the hospital school at Orillia.

I visited this institution with Mrs. Yvonne Young, a constituent, and Mr. Charles Vickers, from the Association for the Mentally Retarded. I was impressed with the quality of the staff, particularly the chief administrator, Mr. Wilson. However, there is not enough staff. There are only 850 to 900 on three shifts to care for close to 2,000 patients. The rest of the staff, which totals

over 1,200, is engaged in maintenance of the building, cleaning staff,, etc. Therefore, considering that at any one time there would not be more than perhaps 300 present to deal with close to 2,000 patients, the ratio between staff and patient would seem to be too high.

The buildings for the most part are in poor repair. I should add at that point, Mr. Speaker, that going through the building back in January, and I bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Snow) who, I hope, will see this tomorrow, there were several locations where repairs were being made to the buildings. They had been started as long as a year or six months ago, half finished and then never completed by the Department of Public Works.

Further, since the buildings can reasonably accommodate only 1,400 patients, there are obviously serious conditions of overcrowding. On inspection, it becomes obvious that new buildings are badly needed and very soon. Several of the buildings are very old, of outdated construction, including the wide use of timber. It is not unreasonable to fear, considering the condition of the buildings, considering the lack of sufficient staff at Orillia, that if a fire ever started in that facility many lives would be lost.

Several situations where the provincial works department has started a renovation or repair programme and left these unfinished were shown to me. I think an explanation is in order as to why the department takes so long and is so lackadaisical in its approach.

I was shown various elements of the programme, starting with the education unit, which is run by the Department of Education. I was taken through the dormitories and activity rooms in the area for the group known as the "educables." As members of the House may know, they basically fall into three categories—the educables, the trainables and those who they are happy to get toilet-trained and leave it at that.

It is obvious that the staff are making the best possible use of the facilities and materials that they have. They have tried innovations, such as bunk beds which they have manufactured themselves—since they could not get them from the department—carpeting, toys, drapes, etc., to make the surroundings more pleasant for their charges.

The one thing that stuck out in my mind in this area was the deplorably depersonalized setup of the washrooms where you might find half a dozen toilets along a wall with no partitions, and washbasins along the opposite wall. I could accept this perhaps in the boys' washroom and take a spartan attitude—well, that is OK. But it is unacceptable, totally unacceptable in the girls' washroom. This becomes even more disgusting when you find the same type of setup in the girls' washroom.

Following this—and I know some members of this House have visited Orillia so they will know what I am talking about—I was taken to the area known as "O" cottage. It is in this area that one finds women of all ages who are untrainable, uneducable, violent, and all in all very difficult to handle.

It was in this area that I saw many things which are difficult to describe, let alone talk about. For instance, a lady of 78 who had been there since 1904 and for whom this was her only world; twin sisters aged perhaps 14 or 15 who have no future but that institution, or similar institution; a room perhaps 20 ft. sq. at the end of the corridor, in which behind locked doors, were about 20 girls and women between the ages of 10 and perhaps 40 to 50 who were being kept there for their own safety and also to keep them away from less violent patients.

The lady staff member who was in that room had obviously been there for hours. If there were more staff, it is reasonable to suppose that she would not have to stay here for more than an hour or two. For that matter, she should not be made to stay there an unduly long period of time since the atmosphere is one which cannot help but affect one's own mental state of health.

All in all, I found the staff to be most co-operative, most efficient, most sincere and dedicated to their patients. The buildings are deplorable. The population of the institution is at least 50 per cent too high.

I find it hard—at least from my memoranda which, granted, were written the day I came back—to understand why, in a province with the prosperity of ours, whose government spends between $4 and $5 billion a year, we cannot, with all due haste, eliminate such overcrowded, understaffed, institutions in our jurisdiction.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Timbrell: My purpose in going to Smiths Falls initially was to see the programme being operated by Dr. Weisman of Queen's University, which involves behav-

ioural modification. I will speak more on this later on.

I met initially with Mr. Halpin, the administrator of the hospital, and Dr. Richardson, who is chief psychologist. In my discussions with these gentlemen we discussed such problems as need for more staff, the fact that the hospital is overcrowded, relations between the hospital and the immediate community, relations between the hospital and parents of residents, and the need for small regional centres for the retarded—particularly for northern Ontario.

It was shocking to note that this hospital, while it has a rated capacity of 1,100 compared to 1,400 at Orillia, also has 2,000 residents. Further, the catchment area for this hospital is far too large in that it includes 27 counties in southeastern and northeastern Ontario, extending all the way from the Quebec border to James Bay.

I had occasion to tour the education unit of the school and, in particular, to visit many of the classrooms with the principal, Mr. Darou.

Following this, I went to see Dr. Weisman's programme. He has 12 or 13 young people between the ages of 9 and 12, all of whom, when they first came to the ward eight months ago, were extremely difficult to handle. In fact, they were all prone to inflict injury on themselves, such as banging heads against doors, or whatever, even to the point of skull fractures, bleeding and other injuries. A further problem was their inability to cope with one another, to live together.

Since that time, he has worked on a thorough programme of behavioural modification which involves—and I must admit somewhat to my dismay, but with the written consent of parents—electric shock. Dr. Richardson indicated to me afterwards that he does not completely accept Dr. Weisman's techniques, but he has allowed him the leeway that he has because he is getting results.

In short, this was a very hurried visit, lasting only about three hours, but it was obvious that like the Orillia regional school this is a very dedicated staff with far too many patients and far too few colleagues. I purposely did not read the Williston report until after my excursions so as to approach the problem as objectively as possible.

May I say that I am encouraged by the remarks in His Honour's address as they pertain to the expansion of training programmes into home communities. I should further say that I know my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), will make every possible effort to alleviate these disgusting conditions of overcrowding.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The member spoiled his speech right there. He expects too much from them.

Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have greater faith in my colleagues than that.

Mr. Martel: They promised a hospital in the north in 1959.

Mr. Timbrell: Two other points came through loud and clear from Mr. Williston's report, namely, that our procedures for following up and giving assistance and guidance to discharged patients are seriously lacking in effectiveness. This situation will become all the more serious as the techniques improve and more are allowed to go home, back into normal communities. Improved techniques of treatment and education will make it possible for more and more retarded persons to return to their homes and lead relatively normal, productive lives.

This, in turn, leads to the second point I referred to before. As Williston points out, the public attitude toward retardation has varied widely since the governments on this continent first accepted their responsibilities in this area. At present, there exists an incredible ignorance, albeit moderated by sincere sympathy, on the part of the public about the causes of retardation, the types of retardation and the vast potentials of many of those who are so afflicted. How can we expect governments to have enlightened views when so many of our constituents still refuse to recognize the problem for what it is and would rather refuse to admit these people to their share of what we choose to call "the good life."

It is my fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, that the public will recognize that it, too, has a responsibility in this area and will accept it with the same vigour and determination used to belittle the physical and mental shortcomings of their peers. In this regard, I look to the young people of this province, whom I had the pleasure to teach for three years at Don Mills Junior High School, to lead the way in what you may want to call a new renaissance of public attitude.

There are many other areas I would like to comment on, sir, but in four years I am sure there will be ample opportunity to do so. I should, though, before summing up, respond to a point made—it is now, almost two weeks ago—by the hon. member for

Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). This concerns, of course, the matter of holding two elected positions at one time.

The hon. member has managed to cloud the issue with his totally unnecessary, venomous attack on my colleague from Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett). One can only assume that the member for Ottawa Centre, who also serves as an alderman on Ottawa city council, has for several years been frustrated by the proven administrative and legislative capabilities of my friend from Ottawa South and is, therefore, unable to match these

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Timbrell: He has chosen to stretch this to the limit by using his prerogatives as a member of this House, showing us why he failed to make a dent on that city council.

Nevertheless, the issue in question is twofold: Is there a conflict of interest involved when one occupies a seat in this House as well as an elected municipal position and, secondly, how should vacancies on municipal councils be dealt with?

On the first point, let me say that I fail to see a conflict of interest. Indeed, it can be most beneficial both to this House and to the council to have a member who can relay to the municipality the feelings of this government and, in turn, speak out in this assembly on the very real concerns and problems facing municipalities in these hectic times.

There is, however, a serious conflict of time involved. With the sitting of this House and its committees becoming longer and longer every year and the resultant work both here and in the constituency consuming more and more time, it is nigh unto impossible adequately to fulfil the additional responsibilities as a municipal councillor. What to do? I made it abundantly clear last fall during my election campaign that I do not accept the present provisions of the Municipal Act and other related statutes as they pertain to vacancies on municipal councils. Responsible government is not, as T. C. Haliburton wrote, "responsible nonsense."

The principle of holding by-elections to fill vacancies in this House and other parliamentary bodies has been the law since before this assembly existed. Let me tell you that the ward which I represent has over 17,000 electors. How does this compare to ridings in which by-elections have recently been held? I will read a few of them to you. These are provincial ridings where there have been by-elections since 1960:

Simcoe Centre, September, 1960—19,000 votes polled; cost $23,000.

The riding of Eglinton, January, 1962—25,400 votes polled; $41,900 cost.

The riding of Nipissing—24,800 votes polled, $30,000 cost.

The cost for these ridings does not include printing; although sufficient supplies, I am told, are ordered for a general election so that there is enough left over for by-elections. The average cost of all these—I think there are about 14, that is in an 11-year period—was about $28,000. The average number of eligible voters was 27,000 and the average number of votes cast was just over 18,000—about two-thirds.

You can see when you compare my municipal ward of 17,000 voters, or any other ward you want to pick out of Metropolitan Toronto, or any other jurisdiction of the province, that the typical municipal jurisdiction then would have as many electors, or, in many cases more, than most of these constituencies that have had by-elections since 1960.

What about the arguments that municipal by-elections would be too costly? Well, I reject this out of hand. The costs involved are not unreasonable. More than that, and more importantly, what price do you put on a parliamentary democracy?

I will just relate a story. The hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) will know it well. He should know it. There is a little club in this Parliament. We have not met yet, but there are four members of North York council who have ended up here—the hon. member for Yorkview, the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer), my hon. colleague the Attorney General from York Mills (Mr. Bales) and myself. So we must get together on that one.

About a year and a half ago one of our controllers died in the borough of North York. Not only because of the Municipal Act, but also because of the Metropolitan Act—which requires that a member of metro council be replaced within 15 days; and I think that is unreasonable—we filled that vacancy with an alderman.

That left vacant Ward 4, borough of North York, riding of Downsview. What to do? At that time I put a motion to council that the seat be left vacant until this government was petitioned to change the Act to require a by-election. Instead, I was overruled and we went ahead with it. And what did we do? Well, we went ahead and we appointed a fellow—not that it matters, but he is a Liberal—we appointed a fellow who

had been defeated in the election before for board of control. More than that, the ratepayers were polled and they sent us their choice—another Liberal; so I could not win either way. But they sent us their choice and he was turned down. Why? Pure patronage. The fact that this fellow had been on council —I should not say patronage—

Mr. Martel: Oh, that is a good word. Keep it.

Mr. Timbrell: Oh, well, we will use it for want of a better one.

But this fellow had sat on council for five years, so put him back. It does not matter if people want this other fellow; put him in. Now, that has got to be done away with. Give the choice back to the people.

I recognize that the situation in my municipality and Ottawa changes dramatically once you get into the rural areas; larger jurisdictions electing people to council. But nonetheless, I urge my government to bring in revisions embodying the principle of by-elections to fill municipal vacancies. For my own part I shall retain my seat on North York council at least until September 1, after which date, since this is an election year, this council would not be obliged to name a successor.

I look forward to the next four years, Mr. Speaker, as a period in which we can expect great expansion in our economy with, I hope, sir, a continuation of this administration's concern for the well-being of our citizens within policies and programmes designed to help people help themselves. And I may say that as a member of the caucus, and as a member of this House, I see my first responsibility to be toward the riding of Don Mills. And I shall continue, as I tried to tonight, to outline my concerns and those of my constituents.

We were elected in 1971 on our past performance. Whether we are re-elected in 1975 or 1976 will depend on how well we use the heavy mandate laid on us by the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, as the environmental critic for this party, I usually concern myself with the ill-effects of pollution on the health of the people of Ontario. Tonight, however, I wish to speak on a different but a related subject, the ill-effects of drugs and malnutrition on the health of the people of Ontario. I am not going to discuss marijuana, heroin or any of the other illegal drugs. I wish to confine my remarks to one area, the field of nutrition, with special reference to legal drugs and vitamins, a topic rarely if ever discussed in this Legislature.

An hon. member: With interest!

Mr. Burr: This whole speech flows from a March 9 newspaper headline, a Canadian Press dispatch: "Ottawa Plans Curbs on Child Vitamin Ads." The news item then described these curbs as follows:

> The guidelines, according to one government official, will rule out such tactics as suggesting that children urge their parents to buy specific products; movie stars, athletes and other personalities endorsing the products in specific ways; and offering free giveaways in connection with the purchase of the product.

If this reported action by the federal government is directed merely against questionable or objectionable advertising techniques few will object, Mr. Speaker.

But if this is the case, why are the proposed guidelines to be applied only to the one product, vitamins? Why not to the many other products that are endorsed by personalities, accompanied by prizes and sold to parents through child pressure? Is this merely a Canadian version of the United States Food and Drug Administration's ill-advised attack on the so-called health food industry as a publicity substitute for its failure to protect the American public from harmful and ineffective drugs, and from harmful and unnecessary additives in foods?

According to advertisements quoted in an article in McCall's magazine of September, 1971, there is one type of advertising that should certainly be eliminated. This is the drug advertising produced in the medical journals by public relations and advertising experts to persuade physicians to peddle to their patients various mood-altering drugs that may cause serious illness and sometimes death.

> Such ads, a growing number of concerned psychiatrists point out, deceive doctors into prescribing powerful, dangerous drugs for persons who are not mentally or emotionally in need of them. The anxieties and dissatisfactions for which the mind-dulling drugs are being ordered, accuses Dr. Robert Seidenberg, clinical professor of psychiatry at New York State University in Syracuse, are not symptoms of illness

but signs of poor adjustment to real life situations.

"Drug manufacturers," he says, "callously twist dissatisfactions of living into symptoms of disabling mental illness that they claim will respond to powerful chemicals. No one realized how successfully drug producers had brainwashed physicians with their ads until a recent survey revealed that more than 45 million women had been swallowing tranquillizers on their doctors' orders."

Dr. Henry L. Leonard, associate professor of medical sociology at San Francisco's University of California medical centre observes:

While abuse of drugs by young people has received the attention of the mass media the more significant issue, that of the ever-increasing use of legally prescribed drugs, has gone relatively unnoticed.

Dr. Leonard has demanded that drug companies stop their false advertising campaigns before irreparable damage is done.

McCall's article sums up the effects of what it calls "legal pill-popping" as prolonged illness, even death.

The powerful chemicals damage kidneys and liver, destroy blood cells, injure brain tissue and nerve endings, affect eyesight and profoundly depress blood pressure. Women taking the drugs often lose interest in sex. Men may become impotent. Some psychoactive drugs are life-threatening when taken with other medication or with alcohol. Some are hazardous if used with certain foods, such as cheese. Although the ad's fine print lists such dangers, the warning seldom gets through to the patient.

Science News reports a University of Florida study of the legal drug habits of 75 patients.

Of these, 43 per cent were receiving prescriptions from two or more physicians; one patient was exposed to more than 28 chemicals every month.

The clinical studies and medical literature are bringing to light more and more instances of the synergistic effects of drugs. For example, aspirin can breach the mucous lining of the stomach and produce bleeding. When alcohol is consumed along with aspirin, the effect of the aspirin in this respect is considerably greater, with a consequent increase in the aspirin's damaging effect.

Because of these interactions of drugs, the United States Food and Drug Administration has proposed, but not yet insisted, that fixed drug combinations be banned unless each ingredient contributes to the total effectiveness of the medication, unless each ingredient contributes to the prevention of drug abuse, and unless each ingredient diminishes the side effects by being in combination.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of action a government agency should be vigorously promoting, protecting the public against the abuse and misuse of all drugs, legal or otherwise. Government action against helpless vitamin manufacturers should not serve as a smoke screen to conceal government inaction against the powerful drug industry, which has turned our civilization into a drug oriented culture.

In Nutrition Today, July/August 1971, page 24, two diabetes experts make this observation:

We are just beginning to realize that it is almost impossible to give two drugs at the same time without altering the action of one or both, and no one yet knows what effect foods have on drug actions.

Many people believe that diseases are in large part the result of malnutrition. They say that many diseases are caused by improper nutrition and can be prevented by proper nutrition, and unless they are irreversible they can be cured by proper nutrition. Scurvy is an obvious example.

In the field of mental health a new approach to the treatment of schizophrenia has been developed. In 1968 Professor Linus Pauling, a Nobel Prize winner, called this orthomolecular psychiatry. Orthomolecular psychiatry in layman's language means treating what appears to be a mental illness by providing the best possible concentrations of substances normally present in the body. This is a matter then of discovering the patient's biochemical abnormality and rectifying it.

Hoffer and Osmond were probably the first to discover—they are doctors in Saskatchewan—and to report that three grams of just one vitamin, vitamin B-3, added to normal diets of schizophrenics doubled the recovery rate, halved the re-hospitalization rate and virtually eliminated suicides in the group being treated.

After surveying 112 articles in the literature on this subject, Hawkins, Bortin and Runyon stated in October, 1970:

Although there are numerous studies reporting negative results with all the treatments for schizophrenia commonly used in psychiatry—psychotropic drugs,

shock treatment, etc.—thus far there have been no negative reports anywhere in the literature about this particular method.

That is the vitamin B-3 method.

In the last few years, in addition to using large doses of vitamin B-3, clinicians have been adding high doses of vitamin C. This is based on studies which indicate that schizophrenics can take up to 40 grams per day of ascorbic acid before it spills over in the urine, and they apparently need larger daily doses than normals.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Is that right?

Mr. Burr: In orthomolecular therapy it is assumed that schizophrenia is a group of illnesses with different biochemical variations, and that as each biochemical abnormality is identified and corrected, an increasing percentage of patients will recover.

For example, abnormal carbohydrate metabolism has been corrected by the use of sugar-free diets. High doses of thyroid have greatly improved and in some instances cured other patients. Apparently schizophrenic patients can be divided into high histamine and low histamine groups. These two groups respond differently to megavitamin therapy.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where did the member get that stuff?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Come on now. The Throne Speech!

Mr. Burr: Most psychiatrists who use the orthomolecular therapy regard schizophrenia as a group of diseases in which various biochemical abnormalities alter the molecular operation of the mind in such a way as to result in perceptual distortions. These perceptual distortions are basic to the illness and demonstrable in every case.

The course of an illness, its severity and its response to treatment can be monitored by three tests, one of them being the organic integrity test, OIT. These tests are more accurate than clinical diagnosis and they are invaluable in monitoring the extent of the patient's recovery. From certain limited experiences, I suspect that some perceptually handicapped children may suffer from some degree of vitamin deficiency.

Mr. Speaker, what is our Department of Health doing in this whole field of mental health? Are we sticking stubbornly to procedures that depend heavily and often unsuccessfully on various kinds of drugs? Or are we adopting the orthomolecular therapeutic approach which puts the emphasis on megavitamin therapy according to the requirements indicated for each different patient?

A year ago Ontario was doing nothing in this very promising field. Has it made any move since then? Since I prepared these remarks I've come across a study by the United States Department of Agriculture in collaboration with the land grant colleges. Together they produced a report entitled "An Evaluation of Research in the United States on Human Nutrition—Report No. 2."

The conclusion reached is that proper nutrition has an important long-term, preventive effect on the following ailments: Mental illness, alcoholism, obesity, allergies, ulcers, arthritis, cancer, heart and vasculatory disease, respiratory and infectious disease, blindness, kidney and urinary disease, infant mortality and premature aging.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Does the member say he can cure all those?

Mr. Burr: Pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One can cure all those with this ortho business?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Orthonovum!

Mr. Burr: No, I'll just repeat it. The Department of Agriculture and the land grant colleges produced this report on the evaluation of—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): The member must be careful. He is treading on very dangerous ground here.

Mr. Burr: —research in the United States on human nutrition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In the land grant colleges, right!

Mr. Burr: On human nutrition! The conclusion they reached was that proper nutrition would prevent all of those illnesses that I've just listed.

The report contains the necessary documentation to back up the conclusions reached. The report stresses repeatedly that wrong nutrition is important as a cause of chronic disease over a long term. Human beings must have proper nutrition over a long period to enjoy the maximum health benefits. Yet our society, obsessed by drugs of all kinds has the answer to every form of physical, mental and emotional discomfort, has placed the seal of approval on any drug, so long as its pushers

have a strong lobby promoting it in legislatures and the news and advertising media.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): And plenty of samples for the doctors.

Mr. Burr: For example the cigarette industry, which knowingly destroys the health of large numbers of our people, receives little or no discouragement by government, except in British Columbia. The alcohol industry, which knowingly destroys not only the physical health but also the social environment of large numbers of our people, now operates without any fear of opposition. The drug manufacturers, in the United States at least, work very closely with the Food and Drug Administration—so closely that there is a well worn path from the FDA to the executive suites of the drug companies along which government decision-makers frequently retire to well paying private jobs.

Mr. V. D. Singer (Downsview): Oh, welcome back.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How was the water down there?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Want a lesson?

Mr. Burr: For many people it is a drug-dominated society.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Essex-Kent): Come back on Air Canada?

Mr. Burr: It is distressing, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government's chief interests in vitamins at the moment—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the Premier have the blower turned on all afternoon. He is going to get his tomorrow.

Mr. Burr: —is the elimination of some of the sales psychology from the advertising. In itself this is commendable, but negative.

Mr. Singer: The Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) was in great trouble this afternoon.

Mr. Burr: Why don't the health departments, federal and provincial, counter the drug ads' saturation of physicians' offices? Why don't they counter with information from the latest medical journals concerning the importance of vitamins in preserving health and preventing disease?

For example in the treatment of arthritis—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Out of the sugar cane!

Mr. Singer: They call him Fidel, not Castro. Everybody calls him Fidel.

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The member for Sandwich-Riverside has the floor.

Mr. Ruston: Yes. We are sorry.

Mr. Shulman: We are all so pleased to see the Prime Minister back from his skiing vacation.

Mr. Ruston: Yes that is right; by Air Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I did it on my doctor's orders.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East) What? Take the plane?

Mr. Young: That is a better answer than we got this afternoon.

Mr. Shulman: Who is the Premier going to get to replace the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development now that he has destroyed himself?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for High Park volunteering?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, I am available.

Mr. Singer: The Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has a big grin on.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He likes to see his boss back.

Mr. Ruston: When does the Minister of Agriculture go along?

Mr. Burr: Oh, is it my turn Mr. Speaker?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The member can get in for a minute or two.

Mr. Burr: Would it be proper for me to issue a statement on my recent visit to Spain?

Mr. Martel: Was it in a Lands and Forests plane?

Mr. Shulman: Did the member work in the cane fields?

Mr. Young: What did the member discover about the Spanish farmer?

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): How many days did you have there?

Mr. Burr: I had nine days.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): A lot of bull too!

Mr. Shulman: Did they have any sugar cane there to cut?

Mr. Burr: Yes, but I didn't touch it. I never touched the sugar.

For example, Mr. Speaker, if I can remember what I was giving an example of—

Mr. Ruston: Take it as read; that will be all right.

Mr. Burr: I would be willing just to give it to Hansard.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Go from the beginning so the Prime Minister can hear it.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Premier who has just come in I will start at the beginning of my previous paragraph.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Tell him about the orthonovum. That was better.

Mr. Burr: Orthomolecular.

Mr. Shulman: Oh pardon me.

Mr. Burr: I was asking, Mr. Speaker, why don't the health departments, federal and provincial, counter the drug advertisements that are saturating the physicians' offices with information from the latest medical journals concerning the importance of vitamins in preserving health and preventing disease?

For example, in the treatment of arthritis it is generally agreed that the best drug to control the pain is aspirin. Although aspirin does not cure the condition, it can do much to alleviate the pain. Unfortunately, regular use of aspirin depletes the body's supply of vitamin C in blood plasma and platelets. Because aspirin causes 60 per cent or 70 per cent of all people to bleed internally in small amounts, a vitamin C supplement is important to aspirin users. But how many of them know? In fact, how many physicians know this?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is a good question.

Mr. Gaunt: Does Morty know?

Mr. Shulman: I just learned it.

Mr. Gaunt: We have to remember he was a coroner.

Mr. Burr: He knows it now. Sixty per cent to 70 per cent of the people, Bob—I mean, hon. member for Brant.

Mr. Singer: Just plain Bob, yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Just plain Fidel.

Mr. Gaunt: Just plain sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: I have another rhetorical question here, Mr. Speaker. How many cigarette smokers know that one cigarette depletes their body of the amount of vitamin C obtained from one orange?

Mr. Singer: How many?

Mr. Burr: Not very many. Cigarette smokers, therefore, badly need vitamin C supplement.

Mr. Ruston: What about tomato juice?

Mr. Foulds: Eat an orange with every cigarette.

Mr. Burr: As my learned colleague beside me has suggested, eat one orange with every cigarette. I think that would cure the cigarette habit fairly soon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What do you do for cigars—how many oranges?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: The departments of health should be telling the cigarette smokers this and telling them how much they should use. Instead of a statement on a cigarette carton warning in fine print that the user may be damaging his health, why not have a government warning telling him how he may mitigate the damage by taking a certain amount of vitamin C as a supplement? Incidentally, the information on the carton might tell him how much carbon monoxide each cigarette will add to his bloodstream if smoked in a confined area—his automobile for instance.

An hon. member: In a cellophane bag.

Mr. Singer: Smoke it outside.

Mr. Ruston: In a telephone booth.

Mr. Burr: Is the Leader of the Opposition a glue sniffer?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Burr: Our health departments could do a great deal more to promote health. They

could, for example, reprint in paperback form the book written by Weston A. Price who toured the earth in the hope of finding out what produced—

An hon. member: Along with the Premier!

Mr. Burr: —healthy teeth and learned that proper diet produced not only healthy teeth but also healthy bodies.

Before I leave the subject of vitamin C may I refer to the journal of the American Dietetic Association as far back as May, 1954, in which a survey of 131 children with rheumatic fever was reported. All 131 had been eating less food rich in vitamin C than a controlled group of healthy children.

According to Geriatrics of the same year, volume 9, four grams of vitamin C a day helps elderly patients with chronic arthritis. They felt less pain, they had better appetites and once more they enjoyed a sense of well-being.

The government of Ontario is confronted with an almost $2 billion a year bill for ill health. Much of this is paid to physicians, most of whom could be said to earn much of their pay by writing out drug prescriptions.

If the government is to cut these costs and at the same time improve the health of our people, it must go on the offensive. It must tell people which foods and drinks are harmful, or at the best worthless—

Mr. J. R. Rhodes (Sault Ste. Marie): Imported brandy.

Mr. Burr: —and useless in the building and maintaining of health, both physical and mental.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who believes that children brought up on a diet mainly of candy, cola, cigarettes, coffee, worthless cereals and potato chips will develop into perfectly health adults, has a great disappointment in store for him.

Mr. Singer: Oh, dear!

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): It is boring.

Mr. Burr: Yet, Mr. Speaker, thousands of mothers are doing just this. These mothers provide this diet not out of malice but out of ignorance of what inexpensive foods are nutritious.

Dr. Robert Bingham, a California specialist in rheumatism and arthritis, told the 1967 seminar of the American Nutrition Society that it is apparent to any specialist in bone disorders that nutrition plays a major role. And I quote him:

> Diseases of the bones and joints, which are due to deficiencies in a single nutritional factor, are numerous. They include scurvy, caused by a vitamin C deficiency; osteoporosis, caused by a lack of protein and calcium; neuropathy, caused by vitamin B complex deficiency. Degenerative joint disease is due to a combination of nutritional deficiencies.

Dr. Ian Prior, a New Zealand cardiologist who has led a group of scientists studying the diets of Maori populations at various degrees of so-called civilization, reaches this conclusion regarding the nutrition of civilized man: "The quality and quantity of food, our consumption of sugar and salt to name but two items, must be restudied."

To sum up, Mr. Speaker, governments should realize that the idea that physical and mental health depend on proper nutrition is widely held among scientists in the various fields of health. Governments have a duty and a great opportunity to promote and build health in this province and in this country. It is my hope, that our new Minister of Health in Ontario (Mr. Potter) will not become primarily an administrator but will remember his days as an active physician when the well-being of his patients was his main concern.

It is my hope also that administrative problems, presented for example by nursing homes, hospital grants, physicians' fees, denturists, etc., will not take so much of his time and energy that he has no time to think of the splendid opportunity he has been given to lead the people of the province to think positively about health through proper nutrition rather than negatively through a reliance on drugs.

I should like to throw out the suggestion that the Department of Health is a misnomer, that it would be better described at the present time as the Department of Illness, with mental, emotional and physical branches. I should like to suggest further that we do need a genuine Department of Health, which might be called the Department of Good Health, and which would be concerned with all the positive aspects, with everything that is conducive to a sound mind and a sound body.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I should like to extend to you my personal congratulations on your election to the often difficult position as Speaker of this House. May you enjoy this office in good health.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The member didn't touch on breakfast cereals at all.

Mr. Burr: Oh, I forgot.

An hon. member: Adjourn!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mr. J. M. Turner (Peterborough): Well, Mr. Speaker, I must add to the observations of the other speakers in the House and extend to you my personal congratulations on your appointment. You have indeed a difficult task to fulfill and I know you will do it fairly and to the best of your ability.

Also at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend congratulations to the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) for the positive and responsible programmes he has set forth for the benefit of the people of Ontario. This party and this government have demonstrated in a very clear and responsible manner their concern for the people of Ontario; all this, Mr. Speaker, in very sharp contrast to some other members in this House.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Did the Premier write that for him?

Mr. Turner: While this government has demonstrated leadership and responsibility in setting out the priorities for the benefit of the people of Ontario, there are those members in this House, Mr. Speaker, who are still questioning where they have been.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): We know where they have been.

Mr. Turner: I don't think so. We are talking about the member.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am both proud and humble to be representing the people of Peterborough in this House and in this government; very humble indeed. As a former member of municipal government, unlike my colleague I am pleased to see the Prime Minister is going to introduce legislation to prohibit an individual holding more than one elected public office. However, like my colleague on the right, I do not agree with the manner of replacement as now defined in the Municipal Act.

I am also pleased to see the Prime Minister plans to introduce legislation to clarify conflict of interest. Unfortunately, in the past many people have found themselves to be in the position of conflict quite innocently, apparently not being actually aware that they were in conflict.

Mr. Speaker, my concern is mainly for the people of Peterborough riding. I would like to direct the attention of the government at this time to items which are of very direct and very real concern to the people of Peterborough riding.

With regard to the city of Peterborough, the Peterborough area and the Kawartha Lakes area, the designation has been for a recreational potential under the Toronto-centred region plan. What this recreational potential really means is difficult to ascertain. First of all, we need to know the broad implications for the region as have been elaborated in the plan. We must also recognize that within the framework on designation, more detailed sub-plans and sub-policies may be elaborated in order to implement localized development programmes. This localized development need not be in direct contradiction to the overall plan.

In the Peterborough area, we have an urban centre of fairly substantial proportions with established industries and established urban framework. Surrounding the city of Peterborough we have the area that is commonly recognized for its recreational potential but in addition to that, we have other development potential such as agriculture and forestry.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that those who are familiar with the city of Peterborough and the surrounding area would question why we are not in agreement with our designation. We look south immediately to the Port Hope/Cobourg area and the Lake Ontario shoreline. We find this represents industrial development and identifies the city of Peterborough with the linear lakeshore development as defined in the plan. Also, we identify ourselves with the southwest tendency following Highway 115 as access and Highway 7A which identifies the city of Peterborough with the city of Toronto. We must appreciate whether or not Peterborough is to remain as a periphery area and is not to develop; or, if the city of Peterborough is to develop, to what extent and in what respect.

With regard to development, there must be an appreciation of the existing background and the existing potential and an appreciation of what the regional setting is for the city of Peterborough itself. With regard to the city, it must certainly be recognized that Peterborough has its own development potential and can similarly service and serve the adjoining recreational and development

area. It also must be appreciated that Peterborough serves more than the corporation. It provides employment for a large regional setting and also serves a large regional commercial and service market. Changes in Peterborough's base have repercussions throughout the region.

It can also provide the potential recreational area for the city of Toronto and the surrounding Metro area. However, this recreational potential should not be subservient to identifying the role of Peterborough. More importantly, we must recognize just where Peterborough might fit into the provincial scheme, since, as can be recognized from the Toronto-centred region plan, Peterborough is at the fringe of apparently some area to the east and some area farther to the north.

In terms of development access, it appears as if an appreciable access is oriented north-south connecting Port Hope, Peterborough, and the northern areas.

One of the items that was mentioned by a staff member of the regional development branch when he was present in Peterborough, was that this area might eventually have to look to Lake Ontario for its water supply. And this would seem to be highly unlikely, and it should certainly be indicated what the basis was for determining this. It appears as if it was premised upon the recent emotional upsurge concerning pollution in the Kawarthas. However, the emotional aspects certainly can be met by a simple statement that efforts are being made to correct first pollution problems, or possible problems, and that we must always aim at preservation of our water resources.

And in this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would be very remiss if I did not say that, with the help of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, the city of Peterborough is extending its sewage treatment plant and will probably end up with one of the best, if not the best, in the Province of Ontario. So we very definitely are not in agreement with that former statement.

A term was used in the text that Peterborough should be prepared for moderate growth. No indication is given as to what is implied by moderate. At the present time an official plan is being prepared which predicts a population of 90,000 by 1991, and this results in approximately a 2 per cent forecast in annual growth rate.

The growth rate predicted for the city is less than the provincial average and less than the growth rate of the previous 10 to 15 years, which approached 2.5 per cent. Some indicators over the last five years have indicated a growth rate of 1 to 1.5 per cent annually. However, it has been determined that the city can readily accommodate a growth rate of two per cent until 1991 within the present boundaries and using the present resources and technology.

And just while we are on the subject of growth, I think our growth rate has been somewhat erroneous in the fact that the growth in the city of Peterborough has come about mainly by annexation. It is a fictitious growth rate that we are showing at the present time.

As comments emerge with regard to the water supply, there is also the matter of waste disposal. Peterborough has an active programme of waste disposal, both sanitary and solid waste, and it is assumed that this programme will be maintained and improved, which is presently being done, Mr. Speaker. "Improve" does not mean that there is a deficiency at the present time, but rather that efforts will be made to increase the present system with changing technology and with changing demands made upon the system. One of the assumptions made in the report was that the only proper place for waste disposal was Lake Ontario. And hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we are not approaching this situation so simply that we are prepared to accept another Lake Erie.

It appears as if an assumption was made that a waste disposal programme must be based upon the capacity of the receiving waters, and upon the assumption that the level of technology associated with waste disposal will remain as at present—which we all know is utter nonsense. With regard to these points, it is assumed that limitations in the future will not exist for the city and the surrounding area.

The city of Peterborough currently has a very strong industrial base. This base has been predicated upon major industries such as Canadian General Electric, Quakers Oats, General Time, Outboard Marine, and many others. They are of a major nature both internationally and nationally. These industries also have a long history in the city of Peterborough and are considered very stable. As a result of these industries, the labour force presents a broad scope for the establishment of future industries.

With the recognition of the existing strong industrial base, there is an absolute necessity to encourage the development of supporting service industries. And these industries will provide the backup to and a com-

plementary balance of industrial development.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at this point, it is interesting to note that over the last several years Peterborough city has actually lost more industry than it has gained. Job opportunities for our highly trained and highly skilled labour force, and for the many young people entering the job market in ever-increasing numbers each year, are virtually non-existent. Our young people are having to leave their homes and their places of secondary and post-secondary education to seek employment in the larger metropolitan areas of Ontario where greater opportunities seem to exist, thereby negating one of the stated objectives of the Toronto-centred region plan.

We in Peterborough do not accept the argument that increased industrial growth will further aggravate the problems of pollution, not in the light of modern technology relating to waste disposal.

It is also recognized that there will be a further emphasis upon the establishment of service industries such as tourism, medical facilities, educational facilities, recreational facilities and others. These service industries are assuming a greater importance upon the further increase of the population and the demands made by the population. These industries will provide an increasing proportion or percentage of the labour force, but they do depend upon a firm primary base.

A service industry of major importance within the last few years is education. In keeping with decentralization of major facilities from major centres and providing a central focus for the Peterborough area, the educational facilities provide a major input into the area in terms of service facilities. However, these educational facilities should develop simultaneously with a strengthening of the urban base.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that had it not been for the establishment of Trent University and Sir Sanford Fleming College in Peterborough, the city would indeed be in a much more serious position than it is today.

The urban base in the past has been primary manufacturing industries. However, one might consider this base to be broadened slightly to increase its definition to other naturally occurring resources which people may be prepared to utilize – and not necessarily within the manufacturing process. This pertains to the recreational and tourist industries. It is every bit as important to maintain and conserve this resource base in order to obtain the maximum output.

Within the recreational designation for this area, thinking must go beyond cottage development. We must be looking at the development of resort activities, and these resort activities should be promoted for year-round operation. We should also look at the further expansion of major parks and camping and trailer areas for those who are travelling through the area.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the industrial and commercial aspects of the city of Peterborough could and should be developed along the parallel course with our natural and beautiful resort areas. But the priority should be placed on commercial and industrial development, which would continue to employ our highly skilled people; at the same time, our natural resource areas could be developed to provide the recreational facilities not only for our own people but also for the ever-increasing numbers of people who are discovering the beauties of the Kawartha Lakes region.

In terms of transportation and supporting services maximum co-ordination is required among the adjacent political areas. Whether this integration can be achieved by co-operation or by an upper level, such as the province, it will most likely result in further regional administration. In addition to the proposed regional administration, it would also be incumbent upon the province to provide the guidelines and the potential for developing and maximizing transportation, service and utility corridors that could provide maximum benefit for the population.

Consideration of financing is of major importance when considering the relationship between the industrial base and the provision of a full complement of urban physical and social services. Full appreciation must be made of what constitutes an adequate urban or community base and the total relationship between each community and the surrounding area.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if Peterborough is to retain its rightful role in the province we must share in the incentive programme that other communities are sharing in the province, in order to stimulate growth and to stimulate the expansion of existing industries. And at the same time we cannot overlook the recreational potential and also point out that incentives are going to have to be provided to develop this area to its full potential.

These, then, Mr. Speaker, are some of the concerns of the people of Peterborough riding, and I would draw the attention of the government to these matters for its consideration. I wish to thank you for your time. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments this evening to again place before the government some of the concerns that I think are the concerns of the people of my riding—certainly the concerns that I personally feel, in some instances.

Before doing so, I want to once again congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker — choice, rather than appointment. I did so earlier. There is no reason to feel other than that you will make an excellent Speaker and that while we may not always agree I am sure that the disagreements we have will be friendly and that you will win, as always.

I want to quickly go through a number of things that have bothered me for a number of years—matters that I have raised with the government before, that I have directed to particular ministers for their consideration—before dealing with one major topic.

I want first of all to suggest to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) that there are a few things around the Hamilton area that he might well turn his attention to. They are matters that I have raised with him a number of times in the past and if he would deal with them now I promise not to raise them again.

One is the Stoney Creek traffic circle. It has long been a promise that this traffic circle was to be eliminated and replaced by some more suitable and adequate means of access from Highway 20 to the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The T. B. McQuestion traffic circle?

Mr. Deans: That's the one. The hazardous nature of this traffic circle has been shown over the years. The number of accidents, deaths, and near-deaths that have occurred there have created a good deal of concern for many of the people in my riding and many of the people in Hamilton as a whole.

I would like very much to see something more concrete than the suggestions that have been coming forth in the last 12 months. People are beginning to wonder whether, in fact, they are not being put off again, as they have been over the past 10 years.

If the government could see its ways to talking with the CNR about the right of way and their railroad and relocating them in some suitable fashion, maybe we could have that hazard eliminated—perhaps not before this coming summer traffic, but certainly before the summer of 1973. We might then be able to make full use of what could well be a good recreational area at Confederation Park, an area that many of the citizens of Hamilton and the surrounding area would like to go to but can't get at, because the traffic circle is so congested.

I also raised with the Minister of Transportation and Communications during the month of October some problems with Highway 6. This highway has been hazardous for a number of years. It has been checked, rechecked and checked over again, promises have been made, suggestions have come forth, but little action. I've grown to expect little action, but nevertheless it doesn't mean that I'm going to stop trying.

If, in fact, someone in the Department of Transportation and Communications highway division could find it in his heart to nip out to Highway 6 and make the appropriate changes, those of us who live in the area and those of us who travel the highway would be eternally grateful. If they could just go out that way some nice day, take a look at it, sort out the bumps, sort out the curves, we might in fact find that that highway, too, would become less of a death trap and we may not have the kind of hazardous driving conditions that the people who live in the area face every day.

Other matters—small to most but nevertheless significant to the people who live in the area—we have asked about. A simple thing: Could we please have a sign at the corner of Highway 53 and Highway 56 to indicate that the town, the village if you like, of Binbrook is on Highway 56? Just a little sign—it doesn't have to be very big—that would be fine. A small sign just to show the people who drive along Highway 20 and Highway 53 that when they are looking for Binbrook they know to turn either left or right depending on which direction they are travelling.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): How big is Binbrook?

An hon. member: How big is Binbrook?

Mr. Deans: In fact, I will tell the government what I will do. I will even make the sign myself if they will let me put it up.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): How big is Binbrook? He wants to know.

Mr. Deans: How big is Binbrook? Well, it is not very big but it is big enough that the people who live there want a sign. And it is not too much to ask.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I asked the member the population

Mr. Deans: I will tell the Premier better than that. They vote Conservative. I suggest to him if he wants their votes next time around—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): I think the Premier will agree they deserve a sign.

Mr. Deans: They deserve a sign. Mark you, 500 of them don't vote Conservative; just over 500, but that is okay.

Mr. Lawlor: It is getting larger all the time.

Mr. Deans: And if the government does not put a sign up there in the next four years, there will be 700 or 800 who won't vote Conservative! I'll see to that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): He knows where it is and the Premier does not!

Mr. Deans: It might even help the Conservative candidate find the place, who knows!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member can tell his colleague behind him I know where it is but I don't think the hon. member can tell me exactly how many people are there.

Mr. Deans: No, I can't tell the Premier exactly because I haven't asked. There is a sufficient number to justify a sign to indicate its existence in the province.

The other matter is perhaps a little more serious. There had been talk and still is talk of the widening of Highway 8 in Winona. Highway 8 in Winona is perhaps one of the most scenic areas of my riding, particularly in that section of the riding. It would be a shame to widen that highway in spite of the fact that it may create an odd bottleneck. It would be a shame to tear out the 100-year-old trees that line it, to cut in extensively to the properties along it—many of them farming properties—when in fact we have the Queen Elizabeth Way not a stone's throw away with service roads there—

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): That's a long throw!

Mr. Deans: Well, you have to be able to throw your stones fairly far. Nevertheless, a stone's throw.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, you have to have quite an arm.

Mr. Deans: Well, it is not that far. In fact, Highay 8 is one of the joyful places to go on a weekend. It is pleasant to drive; it is even pleasant to go out there and walk along the edge if you don't get killed. Will the government try to do the best it can to preserve it for us? We like it the way it is and, after all, surely one of the purposes of the whole thing is to meet the needs of the people and the people in that area would like it left that way.

Which leads me to something else in that particular area and that is that for a long time I have suggested to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) — he'll remember well because he too talked about it before he became a minister—the need to preserve the fruit lands of the peninsula.

I am not going to dwell on it this evening because I know that during the estimates of the Department of Agriculture I will have ample opportunity to discuss it.

I do want to say to the minister that I am even more worried now than I was a year ago. I was more worried a year ago than I was the preceding year. Every year that passes sees more and more of the fruit land of the peninsula being eaten up by developers and speculators. We see less and less of the land being put to the use for which it is obviously best suited.

I suggest to the government, to the Minister of Agriculture, and to the other appropriate ministers that it is time to come up with a programme of preserving that part of the peninsula that is unique. The kind of desecration and destruction that has taken place would not be permitted in any other jurisdiction. Other parts of the world protect areas that are as bountiful as the area that I am talking about.

I think it would serve this province well and those people who are yet to come to this province and the generations that are yet to come if we were to take some positive steps to preserve the fruit belt in the peninsula, to ensure that in two ways we are preserving it—one, for its beauty, and secondly, for the viability of the fruit growing industry of the peninsula.

It is evident to me and I think to most people that with every year that we cut into that fruit belt, we are reducing the competitiveness of this nation with other nations in the area of fruit growing. Every year we reduce the numbers of acres that are in production, we find ourselves more and more at the mercy of the imported fruit. We find ourselves more and more at the mercy of the fruit growers of other nations who, in fact, at some point in the not-too-distant future, will be able to set the price, and we will have no lever to use against it. We will have no home-grown product, we will find ourselves in a situation where we will be unable to compete and we will—

An hon. member: Not in Essex county.

Mr. Deans: No, Essex county is not just quite as good. And we will find ourselves at some point not too far away from now, paying considerably more than we now pay for a product that we were once able to grow ourselves and let go to pot, simply because of neglect.

The other matter that concerns me is that in most of the townships, and I think this is true even in Essex county, they have a lot of difficulty in maintaining the roads and the highway. The costs of maintenance of roads and highways is, in general terms, much greater than the townships can bear. The people cannot afford the kinds of taxes that would be necessary, because it's sparsely populated.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Especially when the department of highways gives back 65 miles of provincial highway.

Mr. Deans: Yes, this is true. Because of the sparse population you find that the people of the area just can't afford the kinds of taxes that are required in order to maintain those highways and secondary roads and, in fact, the roads become in a state of disrepair. They're widely used. They're used throughout the province by people whether they live in those townships or not.

I think that there is an obligation on the provincial government to find a way to provide an additional subsidy, or perhaps even to take over the entire cost of much of the highway in the rural communities in order that they're not forced to carry this additional burden.

There was also the matter of the winter works programme I had brought to my attention by the Township of Saltfleet. They had undertaken a winter works programme and it was well on its way. Then they discovered that they were unable to receive any additional funds from the Province of Ontario. They were forced to lay off quite a number of their employees who had been hired for the purpose.

It seems to me that the programme, instead of meeting the objectives for which it was intended, in fact provided a stimulus which enabled the townships to get involved —only to find that there wasn't going to be the financial resources to finish it. And we're in worse shape now than we were when we started.

Now I can recall my colleague from Windsor raising the matter with the minister and asking him if, in fact, he would make some additional funds available. He said no.

I suggest that if the government undertakes winter works programmes again that it does it much earlier in the year and that it involves the townships and towns and cities in such a way as to enable them to plan properly so that they can take full advantage of the money it has available, and tell them in the first instance how much it's going to be. Don't let them get into grandiose programmes of development or building only to find out that, in fact, the government is not going to make the money available to them at any event, and they're going to end up not being able to provide the employment that they anticipated providing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: Another matter which has been of concern to me and which was raised during the week immediately prior to the recess, is the matter of the development of airports. I've raised in this House previously the matter of the development of the Mount Hope airport in the Hamilton area. I was told at the time that I raised it that it wasn't a provincial matter, that it was really a matter for the federal government and that really this wasn't the place to talk about it. Well, okay. I accepted that in those days. I was a little more naive. I didn't realize that the only time it was proper for the province to talk about something was when it got advantage from it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right.

Mr. Deans: Well, now I know—so we're going to talk about it tonight. It seems that the government in Ontario is prepared to see the federal government embark on a $25-million expansion programme for Mount Hope airport; approximately something like that, in the initial instance.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Yes, that's right.

Mr. Deans: Twenty-five million dollars! I suggest that not enough thought has been given to the effects of the development of that airport. I suggest that, in fact, although the airport exists at the present moment, were it to be redesigned it would be hazardous to the entire area. I suggest that if we were to start from scratch and there was no airport there, no one in his right mind would build an airport there.

I suggest that the Department of Municipal Affairs in consultation with the municipality, should have tried to determine whether we needed an airport – and assuming that we do; I'm prepared to make that assumption–then to decide the best possible location for the airport, notwithstanding what's existing. And then to proceed from that point to build it so that it could be properly zoned, so that access to and from, whether by air or land, could be from any direction and so that, in fact, the airport would serve the next 25 or 30 years. Now Mount Hope, if it is developed in the way that is being proposed, will only serve to do this. Without any discussion, it will determine that Hamilton's boundary will be Highway 53 or perhaps No. 20 road in Glanford, which is only a mile. It will decide, from what I can see, that there will be no development in Ancaster or in Binbrook.

I want to point out that the area of Binbrook I am talking about is an area where this particular government has purchased land to build part of what it called at one point a satellite city–God knows what it's called now, but at one point it was called a satellite city.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's part of the land bank.

Mr. Deans: Part of the land bank, right.

It doesn't make sense to talk about providing an east-west runway. So that those members who don't know the area can get the picture, Hamilton is to the north of the airport and stretches for a considerable distance on either side–but it is to the north of the airport. It can then only grow approximately 2½ miles in a southerly direction. Much of the land is already serviceable – some of it is owned by Ontario Housing Corporation, some privately – and some is in the process of being serviced now.

There is not likely to be much more than 10 years, at the very outside 15 years, of development available there if it were all residential. If the runways are east and west as proposed, then they run toward Ancaster township and Binbrook township. It means that both of those townships will be frozen as far as development is concerned. Either that or this government is not going to care about the noise and disruption that comes from aircraft travelling over residential areas and it is going to put a tremendous burden on the people of those areas.

I suggest, as I have done a number of times, that if we need an airport, then for goodness' sake spend the money now to purchase the land that is much cheaper and more accessible and build an airport that will last.

An hon. member: Where?

Mr. Deans: I suggest on the Binbrook-Grimsby town line, approximately. It gives access over the escarpment to the lake; it gives access to the south; it gives access to the east; and it gives limited but nevertheless a little access to the west. There is very little in the way of residential or farming development; the land in general is of a lower quality, according to the land inventory that was undertaken about a year and a half ago, and the land is definitely much cheaper to acquire. If the government was smart, it would move in if it wants an airport and build it there from scratch.

There are other matters concerning the airport that they are proposing to build. I want to ask some questions about it, and perhaps at some point some minister might be able to put on the record the answers to the questions.

First of all, I want to know if this airport is built and the resulting commercial and light industrial development takes place that they suggest will take place around it, who then is going to pay to put in the sewage disposal facilities required by it? Who is going to pay for the additional pumping stations required to get water to it, because there is no water there now? How do they intend to put in connecting links in terms of highway construction, to Highway 6, or Highway 403?

How do they propose to move those people who travel from, let's assume, northern Ontario down to this regional airport in Hamilton over to Pickering to catch a connecting flight to France or perhaps to some part of the North American continent? What kinds of transportation have they in mind for that movement of traffic? And if this airport is so good for the Hamilton area, what kind of dollar flow can we expect into the

Hamilton area that will offset the tremendous increase in taxes that we will have to bear in order to provide those services if the Province of Ontario doesn't intend to pay for them?

The province has said it doesn't intend to pay for them, and if it doesn't intend to pay for them, then say it very clearly and say it now. Don't wait until after the airport is built. Don't wait until after all the work is done and the money is expended before you tell the city that it is going to have to bear the cost of all of these additional services. Tell us now what share you are going to pay, so that we then, too, can plan the way in which the city of Hamilton might have to debenture the costs that it will have to absorb.

The whole matter of the development of airports, I suspect, in planning terms is beyond the capability of this government, because it has never shown any ability to plan. It has never shown any ability to understand the concerns and the needs of the people. It has never shown the ability to recognize that there is a limit beyond which people cannot go in terms of paying municipal taxes. If you are going to further burden the people of the area with taxes in order to provide services in order that you can develop some kind of an airport in that location, forget it, because there will be an uprising. People will not tolerate it.

I ask you, for goodness sake, if you are proposing to build something, lay it out before us, let's see it. Let's find out what it is you intend to do and then let us, the people, make the decision as to whether or not we can afford it, because if we've got to pay the bill, then surely to goodness we should have some say in what kind of development it is going to be. It's a simple thing. It's not very difficult. It is a lot simpler to do it that way than to complete your plans and put it into operation and then have all of the uprising that occurs among people and the disruption and the heartache. Tell us now what you intend and, after you have told us, then we'll tell you whether or not we want it.

Anyhow, as I say to you, if the airport is necessary—and I will concede to you that it may be—to meet the needs of the growing region, then do two things for me. Tell me what you plan to do with it and, secondly, tell me why it ought to be located there and if you have decided that Hamilton shall grow no more, because that's the effect of any decision that you are making in that regard.

I want now to turn to an entirely different matter, I want to read to you a letter I received in regard to the changes to the Nursing Home Act, because it is of concern to a number of people in my riding and I suspect of concern to a number of people in other ridings. It is not very long, and I'll read the letter. I won't tell you where it's from but I'll provide it for the minister who is involved.

Dear Sir:

Attached you will find an audited statement of my cost per patient per day. These figures do not include any return on investments. As of Feb. 1, 1972, we received an average of $12.30 per day per patient. As of April 1, 1972, we anticipated under the new extended care programme a maximum of $13.30 per patient per day.

This maximum only applies if the government keep our beds full with the proper mix of patients to utilize the private and semi-private rooms allowed under the new extended care plan. If, for example, we were furnished patients who were unable to pay extra for private or semi-private rooms the above maximum rate could drop below $13.00 per day per patient. As of April 1, 1972, my wages will jump from $6.90 per day per patient to $8.17 per day per patient. This will make my cost per patient per day $13.10.

We cannot understand how the government thinks we can stay in business with the above rates. If the provincial Health Department of Ontario had rules and regulations they are now planning, the capital investment needed to comply would force us out of business.

At our year end, Aug. 31, 1971, we showed a return on our investment of nine per cent. We feel this is a fair return. As you know, bonds average eight per cent. Good mortgages average 8 to 12 per cent and good funds average 10 to 14 per cent. If the provincial government regulations in a nursing home, 30 beds and under, would

(1) make the professional nursing staff realistic;

(2) allow the nursing home to set their rates for the addition of a private or semi-private room;

And he adds as a note: "We must stay competitive or we would not have patients. This doesn't cost the government."

(3) guarantee to keep our beds full in the extended care part of the programme;

And then again he has a footnote, "They require us to keep 75 per cent of our beds for extended care. They cannot have it both ways."

(4) continue with the 1966 health regulations as amended to Dec. 31, 1971, until at least the end of 1972;

(5) increase the extended care standard rate to $14.50 per day and

(6) increase the intermediate care standard rate to $12.50 per day.

If the above suggestions are considered we feel we can stay in business. If not, there will be 230 small nursing homes in Ontario—30 beds and under, with over 4,500 patients—out of business by the end of 1972. To replace these beds it is a minimum cost of $7,000 per bed or a total of over $31.5 million.

We would appreciate any help you can give us on this problem.

And then he goes on to say that I can use the information at my discretion.

I want to read from an audited statement because you can get a letter and a letter may or may not be accurate. But he sent me along the audited statement by his auditor and it's signed and it's accurate. It goes on to say:

Dear Sir:

A review of your financial records appears to indicate the following costs for the financial periods ended in 1971 and your anticipated cost for the next 12 months.

In the year ending Aug. 31, 1971, wages were $6.80 [this is on a per-patient basis], food $1.06; drugs 37 cents; overhead $2.82; for a total of $11.05.

For the four months ended Dec. 31, 1971, wages went up 10 cents to $6.90 at two; food was $1.36—it went up 30 cents—drugs at 35 cents were down; overhead $3.22; for a total of $11.83. Projected for the year ending Dec. 31, 1972, wages $8.78; food $1.60; drugs 35 cents; overhead $3.46; for a total of $14.19. These are based on per patient per day.

Wages include the salary to the proprietor and spouse in the amount of $1.63 per patient-day in both periods and in the projection.

Now there is another part if I can just turn to it for a moment. As a result of these figures, I received then another letter. It says:

Attached are my cost figures per patient-day. You will note I have four columns showing the rise in costs from Dec. 1, 1971 to Dec. 31, 1972. There is no doubt in my mind that our miscellaneous expenses are low, and are somewhat higher at present.

At the present time we are giving 2½ hours per day to each patient of nursing care. As a small nursing home we hope to continue this service. We do, however, object to the new provincial regulation of adding twice as much registered nursing time and three times as much registered nursing assistant time. This would not only add to our cost but place this small nursing home in the position of giving more registered nursing service than the large nursing home.

And he goes on to explain how it breaks down, as I read before.

But he points out that the figures that I read—the $11.03 for the period through to Dec. 1, 1971; the $11.71 for the period Feb. 1, 1972; the $13.02 for the period April 4, 1972; and the projection to the end of the year of $14, do not include any return on investment. He points out that as of Feb. 1, 1972, patient average was $12.30 per day, as of April 1, 1972, the anticipated cost will be $13.30 a day, and if the province asks for 75 per cent of the beds to be maintained for extended care then they must guarantee that there will be an income from that 75 per cent or the costs will be so high that they will be unable to maintain the operation.

He says in the final analysis that he feels that what's being suggested will not prove to be adequate, that in fact the proposals that have been put forward will force many of the smaller nursing homes to close. These are the ones where there is, perhaps, a closer relationship between the patient—or whatever you want to call the person who is there—the patient and the staff and the owner. The owner is a part of the day-to-day operation, whose concern for the patients and whose concern for the operation is evidenced by the amount of work that they have to put into it every single day, year in and year out, 52 weeks a year. He says that in fact he doesn't see how he could possibly continue if the costs that have been suggested by the minister are maintained.

It seems to me as I look around the province and I see what we pay for in-hospital care, running now something like $70 a day, and I see what the federal government are proposing to give to old age pensioners under

this idiotic programme of bringing people out of prison and placing them with old age pensioners—$10 a day for room and board. Surely then it's not too much to ask that people who are providing this very necessary service, who have been doing it conscientiously for a number of years, who have a large investment, who are not gouging—and I think the record would prove that they have never been gouging—are entitled to at least $15 a day.

Surely it is not too much to say that when an elderly person is in a nursing home, being properly taken care of, receiving medication, being looked after and receiving more nursing hours per day than the average person in any general hospital, it is not unreasonable that the people who are operating that home on their behalf should receive $15 a day. I ask the minister to consider it.

My understanding of his pilot project, the one that he is very proud of and justifiably so in Belleville, was that it cost a considerable amount more than $15 a day per patient to operate. In fact, that was on a basis where there were no taxes being paid. In many of the cases that we talk of, in the general hospital cases and many of the other cases of providing hospital services, it is done in such a way that the municipality is involved and there are no tax problems for the people who are running it.

These people are paying taxes every day. They are paying municipal taxes and those municipal taxes have to be paid for out of the amount that they receive on a per patient basis. I make the plea on behalf of the many people who have provided this service for years and done it conscientiously and well that we pay them an amount adequate to enable them not only to break even, not only to see a small return on their investment, but in a manner that will enable them to put more into the project, more into the home, so that at some point they can improve the facilities

They can bring them up to standard; they can bring them up to a standard that we will all be proud of—those that aren't already up to that standard. We can improve that standard as years go by but a man certainly can't do it if he is getting no return on his investment. I suggest that what's being proposed is not nearly adequate.

I want to turn for a few moments to another matter that has concerned me for a long time and with which I feel quite comfortable at this point because I have spoken about it before. Unfortunately, like most things that I speak about in this House, I don't often see results but nevertheless it doesn't stop me from trying again.

I want to talk to you about the problem of being poor—a problem that a lot of people in this House I suspect may well have forgotten about; a problem that even in my short period here I am beginning to forget about myself. I sometimes wonder how many of the people in this House, ministers and all, can actually remember ever being poor; can remember what it was like to try to make ends meet on a wage or a salary or an allotment or allowance that was totally inadequate. There is a great percentage of people in this province and right across this country who face this every day.

There are people right across this province who are living on wages and incomes far below what a person would normally be expected to live on; in fact, far below what it takes even to reach what is commonly called the poverty level. How a person lives below the poverty level God only knows but apparently in this province hundreds of thousands of people do.

It is about time that we in this Legislature started to recognize our responsibilities. It is about time that we started to understand what the purpose of this whole exercise is. About a year ago I remember a debate in this House in which we decided to rebate $125 million to the machinery manufacturers. I can well remember that debate. It took hours and hours and was repetitive. But, nevertheless, it was a debate in which I think we pretty clearly defined where we all stood.

On the one hand, we had the government which was strong in its position that it was correct to give back $125 million of taxpayers' money to people who manufactured machines, to those people who, in fact, didn't manufacture in this land, who didn't produce jobs in this province, who didn't produce jobs in this country, to people who produced jobs in other parts of the world, and whom we were subsidizing.

At the time, the Prime Minister said that some day in the not-too-distant future he would be prepared to stand up in this House and he would be prepared to tell us how many jobs that $125 million produced. At the time, I doubted it, and today I am sure that the Prime Minister has no more idea of how many jobs that produced than I have. I suspect that he will never be able to prove, not one time in this House will he be

able to prove, a single job that came from that $125 million.

It was very nice to do that kind of a thing just before an election. But we have had enough. We are now faced with a deficit position in this province; we are faced with a debt in this province. It is time that this government reintroduced that tax and recovered some of that money from the corporate sector that rightfully belongs to the people of the Province of Ontario, and that it abandon whatever plans it has for tomorrow of introducing additional taxes on the taxpayers of this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: What I was going to say to you tonight has a direct bearing on that, because tomorrow, I suspect, we will see a great many people, all of the people of this province, carrying an additional tax burden.

But I want to talk to you of what it is like to try to live on the kinds of incomes that many people have. I don't know if you are aware of what the average incomes are in the Province of Ontario, but the average family income in the Province of Ontario at this point is—this is total family income, not individual—$9,793. The sort of medium income is $8,994. But 32 per cent of the people in the Province of Ontario, 32 per cent of the families, earn less than $7,000. In terms of individual incomes, of unattached individuals, 31.4 per cent of the individuals in the Province of Ontario earn under $2,000 a year; 33.1 per cent of the unattached individuals in the Province of Ontario earn between $2,000 and $5,000 per year and 28.4 per cent of the people in the Province of Ontario earn between $5,000 and $10,000.

In terms of family incomes, 17.8 per cent earn under $5,000 a year. That means that nearly 18 per cent of the families in the Province of Ontario have an income of less than $5,000 a year; 14.2 per cent have an income of less than $7,000 a year and, in fact, 27 per cent have an income of less than $10,000 a year.

Some people might say, "Well, that is not a bad income." Let's face it, for some, maybe $5,000 a year for a family sounds okay. But I took a little while and I looked up to see how a family spends its income and what does it do with this money that it gets. I discovered some interesting things, and I will tell you about them. A family earning between $4,000 and $4,999 a year spends $5,112.10 a year. I am sorry, the average family size varies. What I am saying is that the average family in the province, earning between $4,000 and $5,000, has to spend almost $200 more than its income in any given year. That means they have to go into debt or they have to do without. One might wonder how they spend it, what they do with their money. They spend $1,209.60 on food; they spend $858.80 on shelter; they spend $230.06 on other household operations; and so on. I could list them all, but I don't intend to. But I want to go back to the shelter item, because I want to focus on that for a moment.

A family of approximately four, earning almost $5,000 a year, has to spend $858 for shelter. If such families live in Hamilton, and quite a number of them do, I sometimes wonder where they get this accommodation. I picked up a paper a couple of weeks ago—the rents do not alter that much in two weeks—and I saw that a two-bedroom apartment, which is the minimum they could live in, rents for $140 a month. That is $1,680 a year or twice as much as this family is supposed to be able to spend on its rent.

How do we expect that this family is going to be able to survive in this economy on that kind of an income if in fact it is unable to find one of the three essential things of life—shelter—and can't pay for it on the amount that is generally considered to be the amount allocated for shelter purposes? How can we possibly expect a family earning $5,000 a year to pay these exorbitant rates?

Okay, you say to me, "They don't have to pay those rates. If they can't afford it, they can live some place else." But where do they go to find this other accommodation? There is no other accommodation. They either pay that rent or they don't live there.

They can't go to Ontario Housing Corp., because they have some beautiful programmes, such as the Home Ownership Made Easy programme, where they have got to pay $230 a month to get a house; or the rent-geared-to-income programme, where they pay about 28 per cent of their income. Perhaps they go to the Hamilton Housing Authority, where there is a waiting list of some 1,500 families. Maybe, if they are senior citizens, they will apply at the Senior Citizen Housing Authority, where there is a waiting list of some 500 or 600 families. We are not even beginning to meet the needs.

How does this government expect people to be able to live in this province of affluence on $5,00O a year and pay this kind of exorbitant rent? How do they expect we are going to be able to develop any kind of responsive

society? And what do they think the function of this whole place is? Surely to goodness the purpose of our being here is to try to provide a better life for people. Surely that is the primary purpose. Surely we are here to try to find out what the needs of people are and then to move as swiftly as possible to try to provide for those needs.

When we look around, we find the Ontario Housing Corp. is moving in very rapidly to the building of houses, but this kind of people can't afford them. OHC is not moving rapidly into the field of building houses for rent; one won't find very many houses for rent being built by OHC in Hamilton. Perhaps my colleague from Hamilton West will agree with me that, in proportion to the need, the number of houses being built in the Hamilton area for rental purposes is atrociously small, and in fact the need is not even reflected in the 1,500 families who are waiting for accommodation. There are untold numbers, 3,000, 4,000, 5,000, 6,000, perhaps 10,000 additional families who are not on that waiting list because they know there is no purpose in being on the waiting list. They know even if they were on it they would be so far back. There is no attempt being made to meet the need and there is no purpose in getting your name in because by the time they get around to you it will be senior citizen accommodation you'll need.

This is the problem. Instead of trying to meet what are the obvious needs in the areas where they exist, we devote all of our time and energies to finding programmes to give money away to corporations. The government gives this $125 million on the one hand; if they had spent that $125 million building housing for people who needed it we could have made a dent in the housing problem.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: If they had spent even half of the money they have given away in EIO loans to building houses for people who needed them we could have started to make an impression on the great lists of people who require housing. But they don't do those things. Why is it they feel this compelling need to hand out the taxpayers' money—and by the way these people at the $5,000 level are paying taxes—why is it that they feel this compelling need to hand out the taxpayers' money to the very people who don't need it?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They are the big welfare recipients.

Mr. Deans: Why can't we put it where it's required? Why can't we, just for one year, put some of the money the government dribbles away to corporate enterprises and endeavours into meeting the needs of people?

Let's build a maximum number. So if they have two or three houses sitting empty; then we would be able to bring the rents down a little bit. Maybe then some of the private developers will be forced to meet the competition. Maybe then we won't be faced with the situation where people are being gouged left, right and centre with rent increases. Maybe then we will be able to have people go out and find not only suitable but adequate accommodation at a price they can afford.

For goodness sake make use of the land that has been assembled! I spoke earlier, in talking of the airport, about land on Hamilton Mountain and Saltfleet Mountain that's sitting there. Why doesn't the government put some money into servicing that land now? Why don't they spend some of the money that they use for all of these fancy showplaces—like Ontario Place or like the Science Centre—why don't they spend some of this money in putting in some of the primary services to the areas of land that we now own in the Province of Ontario; open it up and put in some housing; provide employment on the one hand and provide adequate accommodation for people on the other?

Mr. Lawlor: Why don't they?

Mr. Deans: And why don't they set the rents at a level that people can afford to pay?

Let's get away from this nonsense of 25 per cent of earnings. Let's try to provide some incentive for these people. Let's provide accommodation that people can go into and live in and still save, so that some day they might be able to go to a house of their own.

What's the point of taking from a person to such an extent that he is unable to put a penny away to save a downpayment, the $5,000 or $6,000 required in every instance? What's the point of taking every penny away from them and then at some point, when his income gets to $7,000 or $8,000 saying: "Well now, you earn too much. We can't let you live in our accommodation. You've got to find something else". And he is forced into the open market at $200 a month!

I suggest to the government their priorities are so far out—maybe they are good enough to win elections or maybe that's where the money comes from—but in actual fact the priorities of this government in meeting the legitimate needs of the people of this prov-

ince are far out of date and very much in need of rethinking.

I suspect that under the present administration, looking around and considering the thinking ministers and the ones who don't think, that in fact there isn't really sufficient concern in the cabinet.

Mr. Lawlor: The Minister of Public Works is one of the non-thinkers.

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Public Works): Where do I fail?

Mr. Deans: There isn't sufficient concern to see the kinds of changes required, to see the action that is necessary and to take it.

When you look at the kinds of income the people have, it makes sense that we should move in the directions that we can move in.

So the government doesn't want to have price review boards; so they don't want the guarantee that costs won't escalate to such an extent. Okay! But we can make some impact in housing, so for goodness sake use the abilities and the opportunities that we have, use the land and the money that's available; embark on a programme that will provide employment and housing.

It's a good step. It's a step the government could take. It's a step that would be applauded throughout this province.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: Now there are other things, and I want to deal with them quickly.

I have for a long time wondered why it is this government refuses to provide any incentive whatsover for people on mothers' allowances. I have been really concerned about some of the atrocious things that happen to young women with families who are forced onto mother's allowance.

I wonder if members have ever thought through the whole mother's allowance piece from beginning to end. Not only is what they get inadequate in the first instance but mother's allowance in itself is a disgusting way to deal with people. To begin with it is only available for a certain length of time. A mother only gets it as long as her children live at home. At some point, regardless of what skills she may have had in her younger days, regardless of how much ambition she may have had, regardless of her desires to provide for herself, the programme is geared in such a way as to ensure that those skills become redundant, that her initiative gets destroyed, and her opportunity for standing on her own two feet is completely abolished.

I had an instance, and I will deal with it as it is, of a nurse whose husband had died or left or did something, I don't recall exactly, but who would like to have worked to supplement the family income. Not only to supplement the family income but to have worked because she recognized that 10 or perhaps 15 years from now her family will have grown up and she will no longer qualify for mother's allowance. She will then be in a position where she will have to do one of two things —three things perhaps. She will either have to remarry, find a job or go on welfare. Those are the only things available to her.

If she doesn't remarry the chances of her finding a job that will provide her with an income in excess of what she gets on welfare, because by that time her skills will be so out of date that she won't be able to go back into nursing, are almost non-existent. She will eventually I predict and so does she, end up on general welfare.

Why is it that we can't have a programme that will encourage people who are eager to provide something for themselves to go out and do it? Why can't we say to people like those who have a skill, who want to go and work, "Okay, you can supplement your income up to $5,000"? Why can't we say that we will provide the floor below which they won't fall, but anything between that floor and $5,000 that they can earn they can keep? Starting at that level, we will start to deduct.

Surely it makes sense to enable them, to encourage them first of all to maintain their salable skill; secondly, to maintain their self-respect, and third, to put themselves in a position that, at the point when their family leaves, they are self-sufficient. As long as the government continues the programme that allows them to earn only $28 a month, as long as the government continues a programme that says that anything they earn over and above that will be deducted dollar for dollar, the government is not going to have those people out in the marketplace looking for work—and many of them could find it.

They can't even take part-time jobs. She couldn't even take a job as a receptionist in a doctor's office because she would have to work more than the allotted number of hours. She wouldn't earn as much in that job as she would get on mother's allowance but by the same token she would earn more than the allowable amount—considerably more. The end result would be that her family would suffer because she wouldn't be home and she

would in fact not have any more money to spend.

I suggest to the government that its programmes are so wrong. It seems to have a fixation on handouts. It seems to think all it has got to do when somebody is in need is dish out money. That is not how one deals with people. It is the government's problem with the Workmen's Compensation Board; it's the problem with the welfare system; it's the problem in the mother's allowance programme. It's the problem all the way down the line, that whenever a person is in need, instead of trying to assess what their need is and match the programme to fit it, the government hands out a few dollars. Not enough to keep them—just enough to keep them alive. For goodness' sake, start now to revamp the programmes that affect the people of this province. Start now to upgrade the Workmen's Compensation Board. And about that I could talk for hours—and I intend to on Wednesday. I have never seen such a degrading, useless endeavour as the Workmen's Compensation Board. I have never seen such an anti-people place—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): I don't believe the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: —as the Workmen's Compensation Board. Why is it that we fabricate some ridiculous thing called medical disability and calculate a person's ability to earn based on some stupid thing called their degree of medical disability? How do you determine how ill a man is, or how much he can perform?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): "Okay for light duty".

Mr. Deans: How can you tell? What is light work? What's modified work—and where do you get it?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, where do you get it?

Mr. Deans: Where do you get it? What do you say when a doctor says "Sure, you're ready to go back to light work". When he says that, the doctor assumes there's a floor-sweeping job available. Or he assumes, when he says that, there's a desk job available. He doesn't seem to understand that you either produce or you don't work. And if the man turns up—

Mr. Renwick: "Psychic overlay" is another one.

Mr. Deans: That's another one. Right! "Psychic overlay." But the man turns up at the door of the factory and he says "Look, the doctor says I'm ready for light work." The factory says "I'm sorry, but we don't have any light work." What then does he do?

Mr. Gilbertson: They do in a lot of places —a lot of light work.

Mr. Deans: What then does he do?

Mr. Foulds: Become a Tory backbencher.

Mr. Deans: Well, that may be the truth.

Mr. Gilbertson: What's wrong with that? It is better than being an NDP.

Mr. Deans: What kind of system is it, to see a person go from this situation?

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): A lot better.

Mr. Deans: You have a man who is injured on the job. His position in society is maintained. He gets his workmen's compensation cheque and he goes out and he buys and his neighbours look upon him as a great guy. Workmen's compensation is okay.

One day his doctor says to him: "Well Joe, you're 50 per cent better, you're not really ready to work, but you're 50 per cent better than you were. You can go back to doing something.

He doesn't know what. He doesn't even know what he did. He doesn't even know what his job entailed. He sends his report into the compensation board. The compensation board look at it and they say, aha, reduce him to 50 per cent. So that's 50 per cent of 75 per cent.

He gets his 50 per cent. He can't meet his bills. He can't pay them because his rent, as I said to you, is $165 a month. He has to pay for food, he's got to pay his creditors. So he goes to the welfare office. He has to get some additional help. They can't give him any, because his 50 per cent is more than he'll get on welfare, but it's not as much as he should be getting and he's not fit to return to work. Right?

So, gradually his status goes down. He goes back to his doctor. His doctor says: "Well, you're getting a little better, now we'll cut you to 25 per cent." So now he gets 25 per cent of 75 per cent. And back he goes to the welfare office.

By this point he no longer is paying his bills, he's getting notes from his creditors, he's getting the bailiff at the door and he wonders: "How am I going to make it?" His status in

society is dropping, he's beginning to feel really pressured.

He goes to the welfare. They say: "Okay, we'll give you a hand." So they give him a little bit. He gets this for a month. The doctor now says to him: "Now you're ready for modified employment. That means you don't get any compensation."

And he goes down and asks for his job. There is no job. He then goes to welfare; he gets his welfare cheque. But all of a sudden he's gone from a position of being on workmen's compensation to being a guy on welfare. And you know what that means in society, what it means to him personally, to his family, to his friends. It's a kind of reduction in status; it indicates his inability to maintain his standard—all because he went to work and did his job and got hurt. It's time for a review of the workmen's compensation system. It's got to be based on loss of earnings. If a man's working and he's injured, he should receive full compensation until he's fit to return to work—not to some modified work, but to the work that he was doing before.

Mr. Foulds: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deans: And until that comes about, there is no equity in that system and there is no way any man can rightfully tell whether he's receiving what he ought to be getting. He has to be able to understand the doctor's reports, but the doctor doesn't let him see them, and neither does the board, and he has a hell of a time trying to fight his case.

Mr. Gilbertson: Has the member got the perfect solution?

Mr. Deans: And I suggest that you—yes, I just gave it to the member, he is not listening. You are paid a compensation based on the loss of earnings, not on some silly thing called "medical disability" that cannot be understood by anyone, not even the doctor.

Anyhow, I say to you that I have gone on much longer than I anticipated. I suggest though, that there are a number of areas in the Province of Ontario that require restructuring, and I think that they fall mainly in the area of services to people.

If this government could do one thing and one thing only, it surely could find a way, first—since the Minister of Social and Family Services (Mr. Brunelle) is here; I didn't see him—to revamp the mothers' allowance programmes, so that those people are given an opportunity to produce something, so that they are given a chance to go out and to earn, I suggest up to a level of $5,000 total, including the allowance. That is not an extravagant amount.

Secondly, you should start to deal with the needs of people in terms of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Finally, as I said, you have to undertake to build housing for people in this province in order that we can begin to combat the kinds of price increases that we have seen in the last few years. Let me tell you, just what it costs to buy a house, in case any of you have forgotten and I suspect a lot have.

Do you know that in Toronto, in order to buy a house today, the average price is $29,350? Do you know that it costs on an average $6,649 for the downpayment? Do you know that the principal and interest average cost is $2,502 a year, that the average taxes are $564? Do you know what it costs a person to buy a house?

Surely there are ways to provide accommodations for people that they can afford. The average person in the province cannot afford that. The average person in the province cannot, out of his income, whether it be family or single, cannot afford to save the down payment, to make the payments, to buy the accommodations that are now available.

You may say to me, "People are doing it." People are going into debt to such an extent and the only people who are benefiting are the money-lenders. For goodness' sake, do not shore up the money-lenders of the Province of Ontario. Don't let your government be used to back the people who use money as their source of making money. Let us for goodness' sake take a stand in favour of people and try to meet their needs as they exist. Let us try to act as if we were really working on their behalf. Thank you.

Mr. Stokes: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I shall give a three-hour oration in 10 minutes. I might have to go slightly over that. After all, Mr. Speaker, some of the best debates in this House, in my memory, occurred at 3 o'clock in the morning. There is no reason, us all rested and sanguine and having been on various trips to various places in the world—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Come on now, don't tempt them—don't tempt them.

Mr. Lawlor: I think that they may lean back and put up with it for a while.

Mr. Speaker, you have been over-congratulated. I fear that you may become puffed up and proud in the overlay and as a result of that, being the last speaker except for the wind-up speakers on the Throne Debate, I shall cease and desist from fawning, much as one needs your help on occasion.

I would turn my attention to that most sadly neglected man, of all the people in this House. There is someone who sits quietly, day after day—unlike the Speaker—who has to bear the heat of the season, the long, laborious speeches, and who has never a chance to reply, and that is the Sergeant-at-Arms. I congratulate the Sergeant-at-Arms, if I may, on your new appointment. I think you are carrying out your duties sagaciously and well.

You haven't been called upon as yet to perform any very high services. We no doubt on future occasions will give you that opportunity—as a matter of fact, I somewhat look forward to it.

While I can rejoice in your function and whatnot, I can commiserate with you because to be caught in such a situation and under these circumstances is something that you will learn to rue and regret, I can assure you, the long hours go by and the prolix speakers, such as myself, continue to orate on and on.

Mr. J. P. MacBeth (York West): The member for Lakeshore can remedy that.

Mr. Lawlor: There is no remedy for it.

Mr. Speaker, sometime last fall when the House was initiating its proceedings I put down on paper a few facts which I felt would be of value. You know, I rise tonight with no great sense of urgency, no overwhelming necessity to speak. As a matter of fact, the contagion, the air of the House, is not as I find in this new parliament, particularly conducive to that end. I think there is a pretty pervasive cynicism on the part of the government party. I find the very fact that the cabinet over there, the executive council, abnegated this chamber on the occasion of my leader's standing up to speak was a disreputable act. It shows total contempt or cynicism of the government of the present time.

As was pointed out to me earlier tonight, your attitude at the present time is one of condign arrogance, you don't give a damn what you are doing. You go off on trips and say, "Oh, let them bluster and blow. We're in office for four years." You will sit there, ignore, be absent from the chamber, pay no attention, be obtuse for 3½ years. You'll come along in the last six months, turn on the heat, pour out some legislation and then spend five or six million bucks to get yourselves re-elected again.

That is the temper of democracy in the Province of Ontario this day and age. I think it is thoroughly despicable. I think that the long rows of absentees we have to contend with day after day bespeaks this government party's whole attitude, its miasma, its neglect and its irresponsibility. In any case—

Mr. Renwick: And you'll pay the price four years from now.

Mr. Lawlor: —as I said last fall in a more benign mood, last fall I thought I would be of assistance to the new members of the House coming into the Legislature, and so I wrote out a series of nostrums coming from on high, called "Tips to budding legislators", I thought, for the purposes of posterity, if nothing else, sometime my son may sit in this House and actually be in the government, actually rule the roost. He may turn to the old man's words and say: "Well, by George, you know, there was some recondite sense in all this". So to the hope chest, to the yellow and the sere leaf and to my budding son, I dedicate this epistle. Ah! Your maiden speech. Make it maidenly, short, modest, chaste, sweet, winsome, graceful, like a coming-out party or a debauched debutante ball, or like a primitive initiation rite, somewhat as described by the unknown Canadian, R. St. Barbe Baker, in his masterly—

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): In costume.

Mr. Lawlor: —"African Drums," the puberty ceremonial among the Wazee tribe of Kenya, or augustly and austerely, like the ancient entrance into the mystery cult, say the Elensinian, with its strange sounds and masked formulae sacred to the mysteries. After all, what modern man most lacks is a sense of the mysterious in existence.

Make it short. State the animating heart of your existence. It will be the one and only time but, particularly, the press is likely to listen and your lifeblood and learning should go into it. I noticed—and my heart grows sad in the context—that for all the good speeches that were made by the

new members coming into this House that there was precious little exposure in the press.

The member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) spoke well. Did he get very much coverage? The member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) spoke well. Did he get any coverage? Just what's going on in this province? It seems to me that a kind of fundamental disease is rampant, not only from the point of view of the government itself in its attitudes and role vis à vis ourselves, having been cast into ignominy, no longer being a threat. Well, we are a threat, and we will continue to be that. As the crescendo mounts and as the government's internal illness causes it to blunder and make mistakes—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): The member said that the last time before the election.

Mr. Lawlor: Just as happened this afternoon in front of us in a very overt form; in this context just watch the change in temper.

Mr. Havrot: If it had not been for the member we would have lost out.

Mr. Lawlor: However, we do not want to warn the government about our ascendancy and our rise to it; it would only put them on their mettle again, and those vast coffers, which we find so unpalatable, would roll themselves out. So far be it from me to warn the government what really is going to happen in the next few years of this House.

But I do regret the obtuseness, the indifference, the turning aside of the press in the province; the fact that they appear here for one hour a day at question period.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The member has got to be joking.

Mr. Lawlor: I mean it is a pleasant thing to work two hours a day, to hang your hat on some kind of the more overt and stupid statements made, to turn the thing on some kind of froth that arises at that particular time in the House and ignore all the rest as though it did not exist.

I say many members, as I have listened to them in the past few days—and the Conservatives are very lucky in a number of people they have acquired, let me tell you; I will not mention names, but some of them are high quality people. There may be some kind of eternal youth, you know, they may even be able to rejuvenate themselves from the hinterlands, here and there.

But these people, as I say, have not been given much credence or role, and I think it is most regrettable. I remember my old friend, whom I regret not having here—not regret to the extent of not wishing to have his seat in our camp—my old friend from Sudbury, Elmer Sopha, speaking on the press the last time he stood up in this House and saying, you remember, that after the question period the exodus from the House was as a spectacle of water buffalo. If there was a little child who stood in the doorway, he would be trampled to death? And it is perfectly true!

This is not carrying out functions; this is not giving a representative view of the total life of this House, of what is said and the extremely valuable things that are enunciated by many members on all sides.

Mr. Speaker: We have reached the hour of adjournment. Perhaps the hon. member could find a spot to move adjournment.

Mr. Lawlor: Well I must take a ruling from you, Mr. Speaker. I am very far from finished on the first page, and I return to the House leader as to what he intends to do in this context.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would be inclined to ask the hon. member to adjourn the debate.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Well Mr. Speaker, before the debate is adjourned, my understanding of the motion this afternoon was that only the windup speakers would be speaking on the day to be determined by mutual consent. How, then, do we deal with the matter of the member for Lakeshore completing his contribution to the Throne debate.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): And others; and many others who may wish to enter the debate!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with my understanding, the hon. member for Lakeshore might well conclude his address tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Deans: Well Mr. Speaker, speaking to that point of order, that of course would be in contradiction of the rules of the House. The rules of the House state quite clearly that the Throne debate must cease on the day immediately preceding the sessional day on which the budget is introduced. Now the motion today would have permitted us to have the windup on another day, but certainly we could not as a result of that motion, within

the rules of the House, continue with this debate tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Unless by mutual consent; and certainly the House leader agrees.

Mr. Deans: Unless by mutual consent!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much for his suggestion because it is my humble opinion that the rule to which the hon. member referred has been breached now and that the conclusion of that speech tomorrow would be no further breach of the rule than exists. However, I am disposed to say to the hon. member that if he wants to conclude this evening, I have no compunction about sitting here—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No. Mutual consent for tomorrow, but not tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Well the standing order as it applies to rule 25 would provide that the debate and the motion for an address and reply to the Speech from the Throne shall terminate not later than the sessional day next preceding the day upon which the budget is presented. The motion does state that the votes will be taken on a sitting day to be mutually arranged subsequent to today's sitting. The actual motion was:

> Ordered that notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 25, the speakers concluding the Throne debate for the three parties will speak and the vote will be taken on a sitting day to be mutually arranged subsequent to today's sitting.

That is notwithstanding the provisions of rule 25. The Throne debate is to terminate on a day to be mutually arranged. I would think that the debate can proceed beyond today until we get the three windup speakers.

In the absence of any orders to the contrary, though, the hour for adjournment has arrived and I would ask that we do have a motion to adjourn the debate. The hon. member has every right to proceed with his debate at the next opportunity.

Mr. Lawlor moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, can the House leader indicate whether or not we will be doing any second readings tomorrow or will we be continuing with this debate?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to conclude the debate tomorrow with the hon. member for Lakeshore and to proceed with item No. 10 on the order paper, second reading.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): In that order?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, just before we do carry it, I take it that now you have extended the Throne Debate to tomorrow, it will run its course short of the windup speakers. If that takes the afternoon, it takes the afternoon. Is that it?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: May I have—would the member repeat that, please?

Mr. Lewis: I am just saying that now the House leader has extended the Throne debate until tomorrow, it simply runs its course, short of the windup speakers, which may conceivably occupy more time than the member for Lakeshore?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Beyond that which I have understood today, I would say that would be a correct assumption.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, March 27, 1972

Resumption of the debate on the speech from the Throne, Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Burr, Mr. Turner, Mr. Deans, Mr. Lawlor 615

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Lawlor, agreed to 644

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 644

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 18

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 28, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are to have as guests with us today in the east gallery students from Ecole Secondaire, Sturgeon Falls, and Chelmsford Valley District Composite School, Chelmsford, and in the west gallery students from Brampton Centennial Secondary School, Brampton.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, before any statements by the ministry, I would like to introduce to the members of the House, Stephen Layton who, as Timmy for 1972, represents more than 14,500 crippled children in Ontario. Stephen has been given an even bigger job to do than his many predecessors over the years. Not only does he head, Mr. Speaker, the Easter Seal campaign, but he has the responsibility for publicizing the 50th anniversary of the Ontario Society for Crippled Children.

Stephen is 13 years of age and is from Mount Elgin. He is a grade 8 student. His favourite subject at Mount Elgin public school is reading and he has a very real interest in music. His ambition is to become a professional musician and he plays the Spanish guitar. He also is a fan of the Toronto Maple Leaf hockey team, Mr. Speaker, which until very recently required a certain act of faith.

I am sure the hon. members will join me in wishing Timmy every success in making this year's Easter Seal campaign the most successful in Ontario history. Mr. Speaker, Timmy for '72, Stephen Layton, who is seated under your gallery, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

USE OF GOVERNMENT PLANE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: In view of the Minister of Lands and Forests' (Mr. Bernier) statement yesterday that government planes are used only on government business, can the Premier either assure us that the plane he used over the last week was on government business, or that he is going to pay the shot?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to assure the Leader of the Opposition on either count. I heard about the great interest that had developed in my absence and, of course, I read with interest the discussions "of a very constructive nature" that went on in this Legislature yesterday afternon related to a somewhat similar subject.

Mr. Speaker, I have been giving this matter some considerable thought and perhaps will have some observations to make later on this week. It is a matter of policy, a policy that has been part of government policy, not only here but in other jurisdictions, I would think for a number of years. I would be quite prepared, Mr. Speaker, to answer any specific questions that the Leader of the Opposition migh have with respect to the use of the Twin Otter to take myself, five children, my wife Kathleen, a security man, and a gentleman who came with me so that we could sort out a few problems en route, but I would have to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the Premier leave Thor at home?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —observe—and I was just going to make this observation—that because of the escalated value that the Leader of the Opposition has attached to the favourite dog in our household we couldn't find sufficient insurance to look after the $2 million value that has been placed upon him. As a result he stayed at home.

I might further report, Mr. Speaker, that the snow conditions were very good.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could I ask the Premier if, as his Minister of Lands and Forests said, the federal government compels the use of these planes only for government business, how it is that from time to time the Conservative Party has used these planes and has apparently paid money back to the Treasurer of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the licensing regulations. I do know that the plane has been used over a period of years on occasion when it has been necessary to go to a particular party function, where the party has reimbursed the Department of Lands and Forests for its use. As it relates to licence and insurance, Mr. Speaker, I really am not competent to comment on that.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, could the Premier advise us as to whether or not he was sufficiently satisfied with the test flight he made in the British plane, the B-H 125 which, I understand, costs about $1 million, and whether or not he feels that Ontario's air fleet should be expanded by adding one of these jets? The Premier will recall that he flew to Montreal on an invitational trip on Feb. 13. That was the day he addressed the Canadian Club there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I found it a very useful demonstration run. If I were asked to express a non-professional opinion at this moment, I think there would be some merit in a province of this size, doing the business that is done within Ontario, perhaps to have a plane of that kind available for its purposes.

I must also say to you, Mr. Speaker, I think there is some merit in considering the Falcon as well. I just checked the number of aircraft available, the various makes and models, of our federal colleagues. Recognizing, of course, their larger jurisdiction and the need for 707s to carry on the trans-Atlantic efforts, nonetheless perhaps Ontario has reached the point—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Now that we are getting into international diplomacy, the government may need something.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, certainly. I don't think there is any question, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario has a certain responsibility beyond its own borders. But to answer very specifically, Mr. Speaker, I found the B-H 125, which is a different version of the one used by the Quebec government—I believe it now has two—to be very useful. It may make sense for this province at some point in time, perhaps fairly soon, to consider the acquisition of some form of speedier transportation.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, on that—

Mr. Speaker: The member for High Park was up on supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely, not to break the train of thought on this, I should be allowed to finish.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Does the Premier not find it inconsistent to spend money like this on a skiing trip for himself and his family while he is finding it necessary to cut the pay given to the men who work in this building by some 40 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to get involved in a somewhat lengthy discussion. I think there are certain basic issues here. It is perhaps conceivable that I will have some observations to make later on in the week, because it is a matter that I want to consider very carefully. I would perhaps plant one thought with the member for High Park. I have been in this position now for a little more than a year. While I don't expect he will ever experience this particular position—in fact, I would be so bold as to predict that he never will—I can only observe, and I say this as objectively as I can, that the responsibilities of this office, no matter who may be presently within this office, are really 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 12 months of the year. While one can experience some very pleasant situations with one's family—which I did in Stowe, incidentally—it is also I think very relevant to add that at no time during that period of time was I out of communication with the province of Ontario, the government, my colleagues, because the responsibility does not cease, as one is attempting to negotiate the trails on Mount Stowe or anywhere else.

Mr. Shulman: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister find it necessary to have a private plane for his holiday trips in order to stay in touch? Does Air Canada not supply sufficiently reliable service?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I do have to make this observation, that in visiting Stowe, Vt.—and I can't comment for all geographical locations—from the last information I have, I think it is very doubtful that Air Canada has, as part of its agreement with the federal agency in the United States, access to the Burlington airport. I think if one were to check it out carefully, Mr. Speaker, you

might find that Mohawk does, perhaps some other airlines do, but very frankly I don't think Air Canada does.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was asked; so I had to tell him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question of the Premier: In view of his statement that the Conservative Party has used the plane and reimbursed the Department of Lands and Forests, is there any chance that the other parties in this House might use these planes as well and make their contribution to the department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that is highly unlikely, and I want to make this very clear.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): We had an idea the Premier would say that.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): We couldn't afford it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would have to say—so that there is no misunderstanding by the member for Ottawa East who, I know, wants to learn about these things with accuracy—that if he wants to learn with accuracy perhaps he should pay more attention to what is said here and less attention to what is said sometimes from his own front benches. The party itself does not use the aircraft. There have been occasions when the leader of the party—who on reflection, is also the head of government in this province—and on occasion ministers, who have two-fold responsibilities to represent the party and the government have utilized government aircraft. There is no question about this, and the government has been compensated for their use.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What does the Premier mean "they have"? He means "I have."

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly I have—to Sarnia.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to ask the Premier if he wouldn't heed the advice of his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, to anybody in southern Ontario including cabinet ministers, that if they want to take winter vacations maybe they should consider very seriously the thought of going to northern Ontario, into Thunder country, where the skiing conditions are excellent, even better than in Stowe, and the possibilities of close liaison with his office would be much more reliable.

Mr. R. Nixon: The hills are a little steeper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not only would I consider it, being something of a non-skier, I would have to say to the hon. member there are occasions, operating in the democratic system as we all do in this Legislature—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, indeed!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that I do take some advice from those who are more directly involved. Within our own household we had some discussion as to geographic location. They decided that it might be wise at least to see how our neighbours lived in certain areas—

Mr. Stokes: Is there any place you would rather be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and the determination was made that we go to Stowe.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): As Leslie Frost would say, the Leader of the Opposition at home wanted to go elsewhere.

Mr. Reid: I thought the Premier would want to go to Cuba.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, I personally would be delighted to try my athletic prowess on the hills in the Thunder Bay area; in fact, this has been suggested to me by the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) on more than one occasion. I hope that sometime in the future I will be able to take him up on this very kind invitation.

I might also report to the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that in my stay in the State of Vermont it was a very pleasant experience for me to meet a very substantial number of Ontario citizens, to find that they shared many of the common interests—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): They were the ones who didn't go to Cuba.

Mr. MacDonald: So did the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Singer: Cutting sugar cane.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and even to find out that there were a number from ridings of members opposite. I have to report to them without naming them specifically; they spoke very highly of them even though they perhaps didn't support them politically in the process.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a further question pertaining to air travel. This is really a request for clarification on the Premier's statement in a speech, I believe, yesterday in which he implied that he was not prepared to argue with anyone as to the necessity of a new airport in the Metropolitan Toronto area—it may or may not be necessary—but that he was accepting the responsibility for the location. Is that a fair assessment of what he said to a group yesterday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will try to recall for the Leader of the Opposition exactly what I said and I am subject to correction.

I believe that I said that the determination as to the need for a second airport within this general area was a decision made, and I think very properly so, by the federal government. Mr. Speaker, it was stated by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) here, that the province did have some input as to its general location but the ultimate responsibility as far as specific location, of course, is that of the federal government. This province was interested in having it located east of Metropolitan Toronto to be in keeping with the Toronto-centred region. This, without any question, was the province's contribution to the determination that was made.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary; as a matter of fact, two questions: Under those circumstances would it be possible to make public the technical data and reports that led the government to recommend the Pickering site? Secondly, is he prepared to hold out any hope to those who are opposed to that site that, in fact, their opposition might be successful in a similar way, for example, that the opposition to the Spadina Expressway was successful when it mounted to a certain level?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to this really is self-evident. Certainly the technical material as it related to the airport site selection would be a matter that the Leader of the Opposition might wish to discuss wih the federal Minister of Transport. I frankly don't know whether he would make this information available.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be really improper and unfair of me as head of the government here to hold out any false expectations to the people in Pickering and the general area to indicate that if there was sufficient protest there would be a change of policy on the part of this government. Quite obviously, the basic consideration has to be that of the federal authority as it relates to the airport location. I would not, Mr. Speaker, want to mislead anybody by suggesting if there is sufficient opposition we are going to change our minds. This to me, Mr. Speaker, would be quite improper.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is not making a 51 per cent promise!

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I am not making a 51 per cent promise.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is just one further matter to conclude it as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker. Is the Premier implying that the technical data is in fact a shared responsibility and that there were no studies carried out specifically on behalf of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were certain technical studies carried out by the province, but the studies related to the actual airport site or facility are the basic responsibility of the federal government. As regards any material from them, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition would have to discuss this with the federal Miniser of Transport.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier makes none of these studies public?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier, if in fact he doesn't want to hold out any false hopes, how does he resolve what seems to me to be a peculiar problem, namely the open and very direct conflict between the policy of his government as enunciated by the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) and the minister's own Parliamentary Assistant, the member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman), who is quite concertedly attempting to arouse opposition to the location of the airport and to ensure that the policy decision be reversed? Isn't that an odd inconsistency?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, one great thing about this party is that we have sufficient flexibility within us to see that points of view are not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One thing about this party, Mr. Speaker, is that none of us has the problem of waffling in the process, and if I can offer any gratuitous advice to the leader of the New Democratic Party in the Province of Ontario, he would do his father a great service if he can resolve that before the next federal election.

Mr. Lewis: Believe me, we are trying.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know you are—and I wish you luck.

Mr. Lewis: Thanks very much. I will accept that, gratuitously or otherwise.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, to give a very brief answer, the answer is no.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: What does the Prime Minister —or the Premier, sorry—what does the Premier understand to be the group from which Prime Minister Trudeau will accept 51 per cent as sufficient opposition for cancelling? What group is he referring to, as the Premier understands it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have never taken the position of attempting to interpret points of view expressed by the first minister of Canada. In this particular instance I have had no communication from him, either formal or informal, and for me to attempt to explain to the hon. member what is meant by 51 per cent, what geographic area it covers, whether it is Pickering, Metropolitan Toronto, Ontario or Canada, Mr. Speaker, I would not presume to do this. So I can't answer the question for the hon. member.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: In conjunction with the airport development that is going to take place in the Province of Ontario, is the province prepared to pay the full shot for any development, road, sewer, treatment plants that are required in order to meet the commitment that the federal government has made in the Hamilton area to develop the Hamilton airport?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this will be a matter that will obviously be discussed with the province. There is no formal undertaking or commitment at this point and of course we are not familiar yet with what details, or what planning by the federal government has gone into this project. At such time, we would be delighted to comment but I cannot help the hon. member at this point.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

PRE-BUDGET BRIEFING

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier: What are the reasons for the Premier's refusal to permit the financial critics of the opposition parties to sit in on the briefing which I presume is taking place today in the closed session prior to the budget?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it has been a matter of tradition and practice as much as anything else. While I fully appreciate that in Ottawa the financial critics are given the material in advance, I also understand it is not the practice there to have senior staff and others available to comment and to answer questions as it relates to this. I could be subject to correction on this, but I don't believe that is the case. So our practice here is not necessarily similar. The leader of the New Democratic Party did communicate his request to me. I indicated that the policy was that opposition critics were not to be part of the briefing session. I have discussed this with the Treasurer. The Treasurer has undertaken—and would be delighted—to meet with the opposition critics because there will be ample opportunity prior to their own contributions here in the House; and to have his personnel available to answer any specific questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: He won't meet with us on CFTO tonight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I fully appreciate—

An hon. member: He cannot do anything about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the prime purpose is for the opposition critics to be able to comment on CFTO, I assume that the leader, or at least the critic for the New Democratic Party, won't be commenting on

the CBC; I assume that. I must also observe that we had no request, as I recall it, from the official opposition in this Legislature—

Mr. MacDonald: They are not in the fight, the Premier knows that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am not the one to observe whether they are in the fight or whether they are not, but we did not—

Mr. Singer: What fight is it that the hon. member for York South is in? I thought they got rid of him a while ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Downsview and the member for York South can have their exchange perhaps outside the House, the answer is that it has not been the practice; I am quite prepared to consider this as a possibility for the next budget. Certainly as of today the opportunity will not be there—

Interjection by hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —but the Treasurer, I am sure, would be delighted to explain any of the intricacies, or have his staff explain them, well before the hon. members have the occasion to make—

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't the Premier give it to one of his—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —their constructive contribution here in the Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Since, for the Prime Minister's information, in Ottawa the financial critics for the opposition parties and their research staff—one member at least—are permitted to be locked up along with the media incommunicado; does the Prime Minister really have less confidence, even less confidence in the financial critics of the opposition than he does in the media?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have really very great confidence in the opposition critics to deal with the budget in a very positive, constructive way; and they will have every opportunity to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Why doesn't the Premier act on that assumption?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Surely their contribution must be here on the floor of this Legislature. This is where they want to make their contribution.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh no, no!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Surely this must be the case because I hear and I read articles by the member for York South about the desire to have this a more meaningful place and yet here he is today observing that the real reason he wants to get into the lockup this afternoon is so he can contribute to television rather than to the members of this Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not a thing except let us be consistent and let's not contradict one another as the hon. member has done in this particular position.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And, Mr. Speaker, the answer is still no.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): It's better than talking to yourself.

Mr. Stokes: A waffler par excellence.

Mr. MacDonald: A dissembler; not a waffler!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Very contradictory.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Premier's reference to consistency, and to be consistent would he undertake that the Treasurer will, in fact, stay away from the television cameras and the radio stations, and radio microphones this evening as a consequence of his respect for the House?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer is going to make his contribution on the floor of this Legislature at 8:01 tonight. And that is the time and the appropriate place to do it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: And after?

Mr. Lewis: Well, we will have a definitive and perceptive comment ready at 8:15, but we would have liked to see it in advance.

EMPLOYMENT SITUATION FOR CASUAL WORKERS

Mr. Lewis: Now, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Did he approve of the decision of his colleague, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Snow), to force the

so-called temporary tradesmen working for the government over several years, to make a decision to enter permanent employ as of April 1, 1972?

And if he did, how does he reconcile that with the fact that under the Industrial Standards Act, the minimum wage approved for the trade of plumbing and steamfitting for example, is $5.25 an hour, and that under the government's edict men and women will receive much less than that, which his own department approved?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member to his two-part question. The first part, of course, I did not have to approve. The decisions were made by my colleague, the Minister of Public Works. Now, with reference to the salaries quoted, I think if my hon. friend would look on appendix number two, concerning these people, he will find that they come under the exception rules, where there is an exception for people engaged in maintenance repair and minor installations, alterations, incidental to maintenance. So these people come within that group; that classification.

Mr. Lewis: Well, by way of supplementary: Surely the minister recognizes that in the correspondence which was exchanged with the workmen and the union, the government conceded that they did as much construction as they did maintenance, and that in fact they fall firmly within the purview of the Industrial Standards Act. Why does he allow his Act to be abused by one of his colleagues for all the work people affected?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this has not come to my attention as yet.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary question: Does the minister really think it is fair and reasonable that some 70 people, some of whom have worked for this government for as long as 26 years, many over 20 years, should be found in a position where their services are no longer going to be required after April 1, and the government finds itself unable or unwilling to make adequate arrangements for people who have worked for it for that length of time?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that I would be happy to talk about to some of my colleagues at a later date.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, I raised this matter in the Legislature 10 days ago.

Mr. Lewis: The member for High Park raised it two weeks ago.

Mr. Singer: The member for York Mills (Mr. Bales) said it was done and finished; surely on the 11th hour of the separation of these persons from government employment somebody should have done something. Does the minister not have any concern about the future livelihood of 70 employees with this length of good service given to the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: In reply, Mr. Speaker, I have just as much concern as the hon. member opposite. I can only restate what I said earlier—they come within the regulation as it is now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Would the minister consider delaying the forcing of these workers into this scheme by April 1 until the injunction that has been entered is heard on April 5 and whatever follows from that takes place?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I can only take this into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary? The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Yes, please. Is the minister aware that when a group of these employees went to one of his officials to complain that they had large families and many children and wouldn't be able to live on the new salaries the reply was: "Who told you to have so many children?" Does the minister agree with this sentiment?

Mr. MacDonald: That is a tough one, is it not?

Mr. Lewis: That is quite a department the minister has.

An hon. member: The Department of Labour.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister going to answer? No? All right.

COST OF LAND FOR WCB BUILDING

Mr. Lewis: Another question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: On the assumption that the minister has now informed himself of the various activities of the Workmen's Compensation Board, can he explain to me how it is that Imperial Oil Ltd. is purchasing

almost 5,000 sq. ft. of land for the erection of a major 12- or 13-storey office building no more than a few hundred feet from the intended site of the new Workmen's Compensation Board building, and that the Workmen's Compensation Board is paying $100 a square foot and that Imperial Oil Limited is paying $40 a square foot for almost the adjacent real estate? Can he explain to me how that is possible?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, no, I am not in a position to give the member a clear explanation at this time and I think this question should be asked before the standing committee on resources development this week.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, because I assume that there are some questions which the minister might answer and not refer to the board, will he then attempt to find out why it is that perhaps $1.25 million, based on the intended square footage, in excess of another going rate is being paid by the Workmen's Compensation Board in this extraordinary arrangement they have with Fidinam, Ontario?

Imperial Oil is buying from the parking authority. It is all now just recently public knowledge. How is the discrepancy explained?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be glad to get the information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: No further questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth North.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: I realize he is not here this afternoon, but however—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may not direct a question to a minister who is not present.

Mr. Ewen: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: He could not get an answer anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has a reply to a question asked previously.

ELIGIBILITY FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, on March 3, the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) asked the following question:

> In view of the fact that the board of the Sudbury Housing Authority has issued instructions to its staff that no one outside the city limits of the city of Sudbury is to be considered for either senior citizen housing or otherwise, would the minister look into this matter? Would he bring to the boards attention in Sudbury that, first, I think it is discriminatory and, second, because the province and the federal government pay the bill for this, all residents in that area should be entitled to a house based on needs.

Sir, the Ontario Housing developments in any municipality are constructed to meet the needs of that municipality as determined by a survey of its residents which is made at the request of council. By the terms of the agreement between the municipality and the senior levels of government under which Ontario Housing is built, the municipality assumes responsibility for 7½ per cent of the operating deficit each year. Because of this financial commitment, most municipalities stipulate that some period of residency is required before an application for Ontario Housing can be considered. The city of Sudbury has not made this stipulation but there is a severe shortage of adequate housing there at present.

At March 1, 1972, the Sudbury Housing Authority had 2,303 applications outstanding for family housing and 564 outstanding for senior citizen housing. The Sudbury Housing Authority has indicated that, notwithstanding the situation, it will accept applications from outside the city of Sudbury for consideration when the current shortage has been relieved.

For the information of the hon. member and other members of this House, the total Ontario Housing Corp. programme in Sudbury presently stands at 2,099 units, 885 of which are already under management. About 557, made up of 205 family units and 352 senior citizen units, are currently under construction while another 657 family and senior citizen units are in the pre-construction stage.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Trade and Development also has the answer to a previous question.

RESCINDING OF FORGIVABLE LOAN TO NORTHERN ELECTRIC CO.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the leader of the New Democratic Party asked whether the government is considering assuming, in whole or in part, the forgivable loan granted to Northern Electric Co. in

Kingston in consideration of its apparent inability to meet the employment undertaking made when the loan was first granted.

The answer to the question is no. There have been delays in the company reaching its employment objectives because of the depressed market conditions in the United States. The company is confident it will reach its objectives in the reasonably near future. The loan is not due for consideration for forgiveness until February, 1973, at which time the employment picture will be thoroughly reviewed.

I have a question here, sir, that was put to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) by the member for Thunder Bay on March 27. Will I provide that answer now?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member for Thunder Bay is satisfied to receive the answer in this manner, it is quite in order.

NORTHERN ONTARIO DEVELOPMENT CORP. LEGISLATION

Hon. Mr. White: The question put to the superminister for Resources Development, using the hon. member's phraseology, was: When will the legislation which provides for the operation of the Northern Ontario Development Corp., which has been in operation for 1½ years, be proclaimed?"

The answer is that because of an oversight a proclamation giving royal assent to the Northern Ontario Development Corp. was not issued. The matter is presently in the process of being remedied.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

DEATH OF CLAUDE GERVAIS

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Solicitor General-designate, which I am asking at the request of Mr. Elmer Sopha, a former member of this House.

Is the deputy chief of police of Sudbury exempted from the traffic laws of this province? If not, in view of the considerable evidence involving the death of Claude Gervais on Feb. 8, what influence was exerted within the police department to prevent charges being laid?

Mr. Roy: A tough one, eh?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of the incident. I will inform myself of the matter and make a report to the House. However, I say this: In accepting the question, I do not accept the innuendoes implied by the hon. member when he uses the word "influence." I do not accept that part of his question.

Mr. Deans: The minister has prejudged the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister had better get the facts.

Mr. Deans: Why doesn't he get the facts first?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member is the last member who is interested in facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Lewis: The innuendo was clearly that of the former member for Sudbury; it was not that of my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

JUDGE ROSS INQUIRY

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Has the minitser been in touch with Judge Ross lately and if so, when is the report expected?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I assume my hon. friend is referring to the Judge Ross inquiry report. I understand the report is likely to go to the printers next week.

Mr. Gaunt: Will it be released shortly thereafter?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I don't know how long it will take to get it printed. It is to go to the printers, I understand, hopefully next week.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

HYDRO DEVELOPMENT ON MADAWASKA RIVER

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Prime Minister. Perhaps I could direct the question to the vice-chairman of Hydro, but I feel this is a top rank decision.

Mr. Lewis: Well, so much for the vice-chairman of Hydro. Who is the vice-chairman of Hydro?

Mr. Yakabuski: In view of the fact that the proposed hydro-electric development on the Madawaska River at Arnprior is unique, in that rather than destroy the environment, it will restore, improve and enhance it—

Mr. Deans: Question!

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Question.

Mr. Yakabuski: —when will the government give approval to the project?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's observations of course, are very valid.

Mr. MacDonald: Out of order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Observations on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are never out of order! Certainly I will endeavour to get the information for the hon. member as soon as possible. There is no question that part of the consideration of Ontario Hydro related to this project is not just the cost per kilowatt that is involved, but also the environmental improvements that we think can be created. Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavour to get this information to the hon. member as soon as I can.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Isn't that the same development that was announced in Pembroke by the chairman of Ontario Hydro, October last?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is asking—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): It will be a little while before the election!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, is the Leader of the Opposition asking me or the hon. member for Renfrew South? I am not sure; he was looking that way—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It seemed like a very good idea last October when George Gathercole—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no question it was a good idea then. It is probably still a good idea now.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Renfrew South needed help then too.

Mr. MacDonald: It is like the bridge to St. Joe's Island. It has been due for 30 years.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course, the part that was somewhat contradictory was that the announcement was made by the chairman of Ontario Hydro in October. Certainly I had no part in that announcement.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary?

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may ask a supplementary.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't believe the Leader of the Opposition is correct.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Our Speaker has integrity. Everything over there is not in order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Does the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Gibson) have a supplementary? All right, the hon. member for Ottawa East is next.

POST-AUDIT FUNCTIONS OF PROVINCIAL AUDITOR

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer. I understand that under the amendments to the Audit Act and the Financial Administration Act proclaimed in September, 1971, the Provincial Auditor can now assume post-audit functions to certain departments named from time to time by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I wonder if the minister would advise the House if any department has been named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Economics and Municipal Affairs): No, none has as yet. I expect to be recommending to my colleagues tomorrow that the office of the Provincial Auditor and two other departments of government will start their own pre-audit effective Apr. 1.

Mr. Singer: Pre-audit or post-audit?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, the departments will be doing in effect their own pre-audit and the auditor will be doing the post-audit of those three departments starting Apr. 1.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister advise which departments he has in mind?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am just going to recommend them to my colleagues so I think perhaps we might wait for that little gem of information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did the minister say it was starting with the auditor himself?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The auditor himself.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. Singer: That is good. That is a real advance. That is going to turn up a lot of things. The auditor is certainly going to have great criticism of the way he runs his department.

Mr. MacDonald: That is more freedom than they give to the auditor in Ottawa!

Mr. Singer: Isn't that something.

FARM TAX REBATE

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Is it true that there are eight townships in the Province of Ontario where the farmers have not received their farm tax rebate yet? If so, when will these cheques be in those farmers' hands?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this is news to me. I will look into this matter and report back to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I thought they had all been paid long ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Of course, the reason undoubtedly would be, if there have been delays, that the clerks haven't supplied the department with all the necessary information.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): My question, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware that the amendments to the Industrial Safety Act, given royal assent July 9, 1971, have not yet been proclaimed? Is he also aware that there are several labour-management arbitration cases that revolve around the Industrial Safety Act? Could he explain why the bill is not yet in force?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, as far as I can recollect, I think we were waiting for a reply from the Registrar of Regulations. As far as I know they should be through very soon.

Mr. Gisborn: Will the minister expedite the regulations being brought down as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: We would be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

GERTLER REPORT

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. When is the government going to release the part of the Gertler report which has been kept secret, and which has caused a great deal of alarm among the planning boards of the Beaver Valley and the Grey and Bruce area to the extent that they have resigned, thinking that this report is going to be implemented by the government rather than by the local planning boards?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those parts of the Gertler report which were not released recommended specific acquisitions, as I recall it, by the government. I don't think those specific acquisitions or the recommendations for those specific acquisitions would necessarily ever be made public, and I don't think it would be in the public interest to do so. To my knowledge there were no other parts of the Gertler report which have not been made public.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Will the minister assure us then that other than parts showing which land should be acquired or bought by government, nothing else was withheld from the original printed report?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not to my knowledge, but I would be glad to refresh my memory and get back to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

BROOKER TRADE BINDERY

Mr. Bounsall: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Will the minister now be willing to get directly involved in

trying to settle the strike at Brooker Trade Bindery? This strike is a legal one since last December, as you know, in which the bindery company is managing to keep non-union labour employed almost to capacity on the production of the government publication "Accommodations Guide" from the Department of Industry and Tourism.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of our people have been closely in touch with the parties involved. I will be glad to call some of them in tomorrow and find out exactly where we stand at the present time.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary.

Mr. Gisborn: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member for Hamilton East on a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: No. I think it was probably the same. I will defer to my colleague.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. member for Hamilon East on a supplementary.

Mr. Gisborn: Does the minister not think that he could correct the situation by temporarily cancelling the order with that company for the government business?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, it is not as easy as the hon. member would perhaps want me to understand. I remember I was Minister of Tourism when the order was given. It's given through two other companies and I can imagine the problem. There's a deadline to be met if we want these publications to be distributed in other countries and other provinces. So I imagine there are problems there. But I will be glad to take it up with the proper minister now.

Mr. Gisborn: Better check which one.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Is there not another problem inherent when, in a legitimate strike which has observed all the requirements of the Ontario Labour Relations Act, the government in effect supports a strike-bound plant by supplying the management with orders which keep the plant going with strike-breakers? Does that not run counter to the spirit of the legislation?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the order wasn't given to the Brooker bindery company, it was given to another firm, as the member is probably aware.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

HYDRO TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR IN PICKERING AIRPORT AREA

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. Could the Premier advise us as to what steps, if any, he is going to take in relation to the representations made to him yesterday by those persons petitioning, with the support of a 5,000-signature petition, against the plans of Hydro to establish a high-voltage transmisison corridor 143 miles long and 610 ft. wide cutting through the area designated for the new international airport at Pickering?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I informed the delegation which was in yesterday, the government quite obviously will assess its presentation to us. I pointed out some of the very real practical problems. Hydro is faced with certain time situations which have to be met. But I did say to the group which was in yesterday that we would take a look at its representations.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, is the Premier prepared to have any public hearings or public inquiries to explore this matter further?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can say no more than I have already and what I said to the group yesterday—that is, that we will consider their representations. I have nothing further to comment at this time.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that on Thursday next the House will meet at 10 a.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Shulman: Can we know how long we are going to sit Thursday, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I wouldn't like to give a commitment, but I would think we would sit possibly until the conclusion of the matter of business that is before the House on that day.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, surely the understanding was that we were going to sit Friday's hours on

Thursday. If the House leader would indicate what work he wants to get through, then he might have some justification for all of a sudden saying he is going to keep us here until later on Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No, I really have no intention of doing that, but I will negotiate and see precisely what I can do and, if that is the desire, we will use that as an objective.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. I don't know whether I am speaking to a point of order or the motion. There is a motion and I presume debate is in order. If necessary, we can have a vote. This is no way to—

Mr. Speaker: I had carried the motion, but there was a point of order. The hon. member may speak on the point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I rise on the point of order. Why is the House leader now toying with the House? The arrangements, which were made and clearly entered into in good faith by the whips, were that for whatever reasons, to facilitate members, we would sit from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. on Thursday. Is the House leader implying that we will sit longer than that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It could be, but I really haven't had a report from the whips. I think this is probably what I must do in the course of the afternoon, and I will be as fair in regard to the negotiations that have taken place as I can.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

NURSING HOMES ACT

Mr. Paterson moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Nursing Homes Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, the intent of this bill is to prevent the issuance of nursing home licences to persons who are not Canadian citizens or to corporations that are not Canadian-controlled.

CHILD WELFARE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Child Welfare Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill prevents children leaving the province for adoption unless adoption opportunities have been exhausted in Ontario and the adopting home meets Ontario standards. The purpose of this bill is to prevent, for example, the sending of children to Peru, as was done by one of our agencies recently.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Last evening, Mr. Speaker, as we adjourned, I was in the throes of congratulations, as you recall, not you but the new Sergeant-at-Arms, to whom, for very good reasons, Mr. Speaker accedes.

At that time I was reading into the record a number of commentaries that I had to make with respect to the general deportment, qualifications and future growth of members of the Legislature, particularly the new members. I had called it: "Tips to Budding Legislators." Since I got lost in the ways of the press and other matters in the course of it, I will recommence.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: I am talking about their maiden speech. I say: Ah, your maiden speech! Make it maidenly, short, modest, chaste, sweet, winsome, graceful like a coming-out party or a debauched debutante's ball. Or like a primitive initiation rite, somewhat as described by that unknown Canadian, R. St. Barbe Baker in his masterly "Africa Drums." the puberty ceremonial among the Wazee tribes of Kenya.

Or, augustly and even austerely, like the ancient entrance into one of the mystery cults, say the Eleusinian, with its strange sounds and masked formulae sacred to the mysteries. After all, what modern man most lacks is a sense of the mysterious in existence.

Make it short, state the animating heart of your existence, it will be the one and only time anyone, particularly the press—and as we

came out last night, not even they, particularly—is going to listen, and your lifeblood and learning ought to go into it.

It becomes a sort of secondary summit of your life. I don't know what the first would be, but the first maiden speech may be a sort of secondary summit, who knows? It is the enunciation of a credo and a kind of call from this particular plateau to which you have so invidiously climbed. And I think I put the emphasis on the "individiously in the case of an awful lot of the new members.

If you have no particular learning, or philosophy, or poetic gifts or interests in Bartok, or E. M. Forster, or even philately, then risk everything and launch out into your favourite platform theme. You have here hit rock bottom. You are ready to proclaim what lies closest to the bone, honed and honeyed by innumerable repetitions at table and cocktail parties, and it should flow well and easily without thought, burbling and both moved and moving through its felt importance.

If all else fails, and it no doubt will, then speak about politics. Tell the people, through the vehicle of the House, about those hours and years spent in studying and thinking about the deep motivations of a whole people; your call to public service. Avoid by a superhuman act of self-discipline, if you can—but do not unduly strain yourself—a homily on the virtues or iniquities of the free enterprise system, or the terrors or high destiny of socialism.

This alluring theme, by the way, is a pitfall for tyros and may compromise your total future career. It may tongue-tie you, particularly the government members, in the next piece of legislation introduced by the government and perhaps for ever.

Some members, as far as I can find out, never make a maiden speech, largely because they never make any speeches. This may be the course of greater sagacity. It tends to be quite disarming to your enemies who in the next election tend to nitpick over the several times you might have nodded, or said something truthful but obtuse or unpalatable. Taciturnity in all societies has always been mistaken for wisdom.

Nor do you need to rise nervously or in any way hesitant or embarrassed, for you ought to remember that in the last analysis very few or no one really cares what you say or do not say. Do not build it up in your own mind or think your remarks, however earth-shaking, will shake anything. Think of them rather as flowers flung to an oratorical summer or a rose defended by thorns.

Finally, take as much advantage of the situation as you can or dare, since it is the only time you will probably speak uninterrupted. In future the best thing about your speech will be someone else's interjections.

Do not seek to bore us into enlightenment. A deliberate policy of the humdrum and the obvious, when you are bursting with suppressed revelations, has not proved too efficacious in the past in conveying any special message.

Your next main lesson, and this will run against your grain, is to assiduously study how to avoid attendance in the House. We suffer no roll calls and the older members can be of considerable help, as is being proved gradually, in devising nice schemes ranging from constituents' problems to acedia, to find good reasons for your absence. Do not believe them; attend and, however trying, try to listen because after sufficient time your long-held prejudices will begin to erode or be more deeply confirmed and you will emerge a bigger or at least a more sophisticated human being, knowing of men and affairs.

If you are a member of the government with a large majority you must struggle with yourself not to belittle the others, however homunculi they may be; not to grow lofty and arrogant however devious and vile may be their obvious motives; not to become vapid, self-satisfied and somnolent. You might become a cabinet minister, and in any event you must strive to regard the cabinet as the largely infallible human beings they actually are.

Remember you were elected with high ideals and some social purpose to sustain and amend the commonweal. While you may advance your station and be loved for your conformity, your desires must lie elsewhere.

If you are in the opposition, for heaven's sake oppose. It matters not particularly that your critique is well-reasoned and trenchantly argued, your task is to catch the beggars out—to pillory and if possible abuse them with whatever weapons under the rules you can wield.

Except, in the odd case, for the cabinet, your task is far more demanding than that of the fellows opposite. You must prepare yourself day after day for renewed and unending battle without the promise of any tangible fruit. You may plant a pomegranate, you may only fetch forth a pistachio.

An intensive study of the rules will be most helpful to you. Except for the Clerk, Rod Lewis, no one, including the Speaker, knows much about them. And the tendency

is to make them up as the situations arise. Watch Eddie Sargent closely—

Mr. Speaker: I must point out to the hon. member that we permit both English and French, but I am not sure of that dialect.

Mr. Lawlor: I wrote this a long time ago —before you learned them all, Mr. Speaker.

Watch Eddie Sargent closely in order to learn how to ignore or evade them, and read the erstwhile George Ben to find out how new ones are invented.

The Speaker should be scrutinized, as you would a judge seized of a charge of manslaughter against you. He can and should become your friend. By a little wooing, the right word of deference on occasion, you may just be recognized ahead of the other popping questioners for that question which will make you immortal back home where it really counts. It is far easier and more to the point to ask a single pregnant question than to give a dozen speeches however brilliant.

The main problem for beginners is to catch the tone or perspective of the House and the press. You must be made to realize from the first that your notions of what is relevant, valuable, or important are completely subjective, privately tinged and neither here nor there over against what your peers or betters are prepared to pay attention to. You must quickly learn to catch the bird on the wing, the surface or edge of the moving daily event; or be consigned to oblivion, the one fate to be dreaded and avoided at any cost by all politicians.

Lastly, the Ontario Legislature is said to be the most exclusive club in the province, with its unwritten code of manners, its privileges and its somewhat wayward functions. Certainly, possibly excluding the millionaires' club on Bloor St., no one can outrank us in the effort it took to get us into the place or to stay there.

Within the House you may speak freely, possibly for the first time in your life, about the numerous hostile factions and niggling people who have refused to recognize your merits or have opposed you from before your birth—and this without any fear of libel. Nor can your several creditors, people you owe money to, have you arrested or molested during a session or for a period of 20 days prior to or after a session. This is something, in the case of some members, very well worth remembering.

Of course, the possibility of an impeachment always awaits you. But when all else fails, one path to notoriety and a modest public acclaim remains; that is to get yourself named by the Speaker and led in high dudgeon out of the chamber by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

This slightly senile and somewhat pretentious place nevertheless holds at its core, in miniature, the semblance and concretion of the bittersweet of life. High and petty passions are equally honoured. People make fools of themselves. A man of sincerity but little common sense defends a lost cause for the wrong reasons. Someone's personal unhappiness seeps through the crevices of his talk. The sense of mortality and endless change both inspires and degrades us.

Since most of us are not artists, even as orators, we do not normally live in all these deepening intensities and a certain dreariness hangs about the wainscoting. But sometimes the eruptions in high good humour over a point well made will hearten you, while the more volcanic moments will simply display the spleen of cretins.

Such is my message to the new members. Now for the old.

I have a few words to say about the election campaign. The election campaign, I think Mr. Speaker will agree with me, was wholly without lies; but the half-truths were terribly numerous. As a matter of fact, it is an experience to be endured and never to be gone through a dozen times or even twice.

It is unbelievable that for all the work we do in this House, those of us who take a major role in criticizing, assessing and extrapolating legislation; it means nothing—as I found out in the course of the campaign. All the work one does, all the numerous references and associations one makes, all the benign speeches such as they are, as I say, come to very little at the end of the day. But the little things that are of some central import, and particularly of a local kind, are twisted without any possibility of comeback in the course of those 35 to 40 days in which the human condition goes through a form of iniquity.

I rise to say that the manner in which it is conducted—the degree of calumny and the twisting of motives—is something that goes thoroughly against my grain. I find this an inherent defect in democracy which brings it into disrepute. This is a pervasive feature of the way in which elections are conducted, certainly in Ontario which I know best and possibly in the country at large. I think that should be pointed out and regretted openly.

If elections cannot be conducted on a higher spirit and without the animadversions, discourtesies and lies that permeate them, then the whole institution is bound eventually to fail. This as one of the things that brought it into severe disrepute during the 1930s in the European countries.

I want to turn to local issues, Mr. Speaker, since it is the inheritance of this House that one speaks about them in this Throne Speech debate. There are two matters in my riding; they concern the placing of an incinerator at the heart of my riding. It is precisely one of those units designed to burn waste and garbage, which is an outmoded concept as things are at this time.

Our future generations will look back upon us as vandals and wasters of substance for building these incinerators. To burn up good clothing, to burn up woods and fibres, to burn up newspapers, to use the method of fire contaminates the air to an excessive degree and is one of the chief causes of the air pollution in Toronto.

To use incineration as a method of disposing of waste instead of recycling that waste, instead of reusing over and over the vital materials which are the inheritance to the earth which future generations will need badly as they become exhausted in the forms of new material, cries out in vengeance.

This is what is going forward with the the Environment (Mr. Kerr). I am shortly going into consultation with the new minister with the hope for a revamped and revised concept as to how waste disposal may be conducted, not only here in Ontario but in the North American continent.

But I am particularly concerned about the heart of my riding where a $25 million unit is mooted—more than mooted, it is to be installed. We have made representations against it and have fought valiantly before the Ontario Municipal Board. And I say to those members who are similarly afflicted, thank God for the Ontario Municipal Board. It is the last refuge of the citizen. It is the only place where you can get an objective and decent hearing where all the facts are laid out.

I take issue with the municipal council who, by and large, have affirmed this incinerator, almost sneaking it through behind the backs of the citizenry. But they have now been put in their place by the hearings that we had before that board for nine days last summer. Then the whole matter was placed in suspension by Mr. Kennedy and will be coming on for a further review, I think probably some time this summer.

The other matter is that I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Snow) and the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), to give good consideration to placing a juvenile and family court facility somewhere in Lakeshore. The people out there are sufficiently numerous in population now, and the distances into the heart of the city to Jarvis St., where this court is held, are so great, and Jarvis St. itself is so overloaded with cases, that a certain dispersal of family and juvenile court facilities would certainly be in order. I think there are adequate grounds in the Lakeshore for the installation of such facility, and I make a particular plea to the minister in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, my intention originally had been to speak on the problems of poverty in Ontario, but I think it is more properly reserved for a budget debate. In place of that, I would review for a few moments with you a little political philosophy of what we are about, what we are seeking to do, what the differences between us are, how they—I wouldn't say that they might be obviated—but in any case may be better understood.

This is little enough done in this assembly and little enough done by people like myself. We are so bedded down with the explicit and with the concrete and the day-to-day minutiae of business, particular bills and particular pieces of business, that we do not often allow ourselves to range as to what is happening in the world and what is happening in our Commonwealth, and with our forms of government and what we are seeking to do.

It seems to me that the New Democratic Party is improperly understood when we are pilloried as having any totalitarian or communist tendencies at all, which one of my opponents during the election campaign—the Liberal, by the way—insistently brought as a charge against me. I find that to be the most irritating and irresponsible position of all, but it invariably creeps into the discussion.

We on this side of the House and in this party are very much concerned to preserve a mixed economy. It is not the prerogative of the Conservatives or the Liberals to say that a market system in the economy has validity. We recognize that validity. It is a question of the nature and extent of the mix; and I think that the party in power concedes that, by and large, except that their mix is both disruptive

and diminutive and approached in a grudging spirit.

It is not necessary that a mixed economy be promoted necessarily by the profit motive—and I will speak about it in a moment. There are other ways in which to gauge the extent of supply and demand. The Czechoslovakian experience under Oskar Lange was to find that the weight would fall on the theory of inventories—as to when inventories became depleted or were not picked up—and that would give an indication of the market position and consumer demand.

However, leaving that aside and accepting the laissez-faire concept of a free market within a profit-motive concept, we do have very severe reservations about the intent, purpose and effect on the community of the profit motive. If the profit motive is the only motive that stimulates society and moves thee, then it seems to me a rather negligible one, and one that degrades and demeans the human condition. It has a role to play like any other thing, but when it covers the whole sky as it does under our present dispensation, as I say too many other motivations get left aside.

This goes with the theory of competition too. At the present time in our society two great forces are working against competitive theory. One of them of course is the whole educational system. As we develop at the present time, and as the Hall-Dennis report has just pointed out, the theory of co-operation, of persuasion, of comity and amity, and the teaching of children to understand and take a position in the community with others not to override, not go into competitive stances, percolates through the system. That is one of the reasons why I suspect the Hall-Dennis report has not received very much acclaim over there or been brought fundamentally into being.

Nevertheless, the whole educational system must be that way, because the only environment in which learning can take place must be in an air of co-operation and a mutual feeling and not in terms of overreaching, and not in terms—as our society has done for so long—of engendering attitudes of mind and the psychopathological condition arising out of aggression, out of fear of the other, out of personal isolation, and out of a deep feeling of violence against the other.

We breed competitive—and therefore aggression-minded—mentalities, people who override the other. And the proliferation of mental illness in our society, as I see it, arises precisely from this general approach to the economic sphere.

And it is ongoing and deepening. Those people who live in states of individualism, overreaching and dominance of the other human being, are dwarfed and dwarfing human beings, and in our vision of society—the New Democratic vision, or the democratic-socialist one—we could not eliminate it, but we could certainly place it under a shadow.

And that particular form of education, that particular form of address to the world, one of the jungle and one of aggression, would and must be transcended and overcome. The whole thrust of society, as I see it, ought to be precisely to devise those economic and other instruments, social and political, which precisely would be designed to thwart aggression, to diminish violence and to take away the sense of separation of person from person, which is the alienating and deeply disturbing element in our contemporary times.

I think one of the basic drives, and one of the most positive among young people, as it is emerging from the extensive literature that is coming forward now, is precisely to adopt that moral stance, to say that this society is riddled with immorality in terms of our attitude to other human beings and that this must be fundamentally reoriented. That is an ultimate purpose and the drive and the reason why we exist as the New Democratic Party, to make that possible and to give the push that would bring that about.

In the last few days, and in the old days with the Treasurer of Ontario as he then was (Mr. MacNaughton) and with his new, younger surely, perhaps more splenetic, no less acerb facsimile, sitting in the office of the Treasury (Mr. McKeough)—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Facsimile! I've heard everything now.

Mr. Lawlor: —you hear a constant wailing and a gnashing of teeth over there talking about the power of government, the power, the fear, of the growth of government, of which they are the chief beneficiaries and under whose auspices the thing continues to grow.

We in the New Democratic Party do not fundamentally fear the growth of government. We think that the government is not a neutral force or an inimical force, but that it can be and ought to be and very often is, even under Conservative auspices, a beneficent force, valuable for and to promote the public realm. The fault lies in the starvation in the public area—whatever the

MacNaughtons of this world may say, Mr. Speaker, the free enterprise system is proving itself deficient with respect to the problem, say of unemployment. In my riding—it was said the other day—they are going to be introducing an automated gasoline service station. The role of automation is going on apace and as it does so more and more people are going to be worthless.

The process has already started. It started a good 15 to 20 years ago. Men who reach 50 years of age, or even younger now, once let go, no matter how astute they may be, however qualified, once they lose their jobs at that end of the age scale are in dreadful plight. Many of them can never be hired again.

These men may hold the highest executive positions in the land, but one dismissed or losing office, they will never be restored. I know many, many like that who are deeply disgruntled and disillusioned with our present system of society, precisely because they have been considered supernumerary and let go. That has been going on and is increasing, and the age is beginning to come down now from 50 to 45, and it will continue to grow as the requisite labour force to do the toilsome work of the world restricts itself and diminishes.

On the other side of the fence, we admittedly—it has now become an admission of this House, although it wasn't three years ago—we admittedly extend the age for education, so that if we can keep them in school until they are 30 and off the labour market, there are great benefits to be gained. We thought, too, in the race with the Russians, that higher education, scientific training would place us in a position that would keep us in predominance, in ascendancy.

We have found out that the higher education is not all that beneficial in that particular way. You can see a turning of the worm in the Wright committee, seeking to pull back in the area of higher education, to retreat and retrench on this particular principle.

Nevertheless, the bulk of young people are going to be kept in educational institutions as custodial care cases in order to offset the impact that it otherwise would have on an economy that cannot forfend against unemployment on this scale and has no solution to it.

The solution to it exists, I suggest to you, precisely along the lines that the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) laid down in this House the other day with respect to youth employment next summer. He can't find adequate outlets for youth employment, however much he begs and how many posters go up on the Ruddy signs.

The fact of the matter is he is absorbing them into governmental operations of one kind or another which has a humanitarian and salutory function. He is going to have young people work with the police; he is going to have them work in correctional institutions.

In other words, he is going to get them into social service work. And that is precisely the work of the future.

And who is going to get them into social service work? The free enterprise system? I am afraid not! By definition it is not concerned with such things.

Why, we sat in the select committee having to do with corporation law. We were investigating the trust companies, seeking to restructure the law having to do with the formal organization. And a gentleman—one of the chief spokesmen—said they were in business and they weren't, as trust companies, concerned about social implications. They were not a charitable institution.

Well that is precisely what they are not; and it is precisely what they ought to be. It is precisely—not in the whole range of their activities—but it should certainly be a dimension of their thought. It should certainly dawn upon them that they have wider responsibilities than simply to their own shareholders and to their own depositors.

And that dawning sense of a wider responsibility and a greater social cohesion; and a sense that we must put ourselves out a little bit in order to accommodate many people who are disenfranchised and underprivileged, etc.; and to work in a general helpful way to ameliorate the common weal; has not yet, by and large, percolated through the business community, and stands as one reason for the present position in which it holds itself. And stands as one of the reasons why the hon. members—that is the government of this province—is so obtuse; because it too is possessed of a fundamentally business mentality.

It seems to me the free enterprise system as it presently exists, is defective in terms of this business of promoting competition—competition meaning the overreaching of the other fellow; is defective in moral grounds on the basis of the profit motive; is defective because it is a system that relies upon war. Really it does, in the last analysis. It relies upon war and continued agression in a far more overt and final form

than is usually practised, in the dens of Bay Street, to keep itself in operation.

I think Nixon of the United States knows that; and I think that Franklin Roosevelt learned it as the way of pulling the United States out of the Depression. He had to really revert to a war footing. Surely that is a condemnation of the system if the only way in which you can keep the grease in the wheels and the wheels turning, is that you must turn to defence, to the manufacture of wasted materials; materials which have no function to enhance human life, but simply to destroy.

If the whole system is arrogated around that central purpose, then it is hardly justified in itself and is irrational. This is part of it. And the only way in which they seek to expand employment at the present time is social involvement—true in brush fire wars; but nevertheless there would be an intent and a motivation to keep these things alive in this particular way. It seems that they put it on another ground—the vaunted ground of a certain freedom.

The real problem is that the government has a completely false notion of what freedom is all about. For the government it seems to me that freedom is basically a form of anarchy—corporations may do what they like. Business concerns must not be trespassed upon—they may do what they like. We must not have any interference in the economic function—let them do what they like.

Somehow, by everybody doing what they like, it is supposed to come out at the end in the very best way.

The fact is that within the government's own knowledge and experience, it shouldn't enfranchise anarchy and lawlessness. On the contrary law can enfranchise; law can liberate people.

A simple case of course is obviously the traffic laws. If the government didn't have them, if it had laissez-faire—or the Tory theory of freedom— you simply wouldn't be able to drive. But because the law comes in and brings a controlling force into the situation, human beings are free to move in a way that will not interfere with the best interests of each. In this way it is the basic notion that the law, and therefore the government, have a beneficient function to perform—and only through the function of, say, long-term economic planning, only through the concept of using the government even in order to decentralize; and certainly decentralization has enormous value.

When I look at the Workmen's Compensation Board these days, I would think that that might be an area where the government would relinquish its authority and power and turn it back to the hands of the trade unions on one side and the manufacturers and the private industries on the other—working in amalgam. It has been done in Sweden under the same auspices and it has worked extremely well.

There are numerous areas of the 250 boards in this province, it seems to me, in which it would be possible to return the operating functions to the people and organizations that are most deeply involved. Then the government's role would be nugatory or wouldn't be there at all. In this particular way, I would think that the notion of freedom under law would be preserved.

But the fear of the Charlie MacNaughtons of the role of government, of assuming the responsibilities that a government in contemporary society must achieve if we are to heal up the wounds that exist.

If this government met the demands of the social service kind that are made upon contemporary government, over and above anything that it presently does, then the role of government would double and triple, and I'm suggesting that wouldn't be altogether a bad thing.

The mere fact, you know, that 38 per cent of the gross provincial product is made up through legislative and governmental expenditure, it seems to me, is neither here nor there. Twenty years ago a major American economist said that when it hit 25 per cent we were into socialism condign, ruthless and totalitarian in its nature. I say to members that socialism need not be and to the extent that this government is socialistic is not necessarily in any way totalitarian or destructive of human freedom.

I say again that far from that, the role of government controls the entering into the economy to assist. The role of government in actually operating industries works toward the general benefit and can work toward the general benefit of everyone involved in the situation. This is the way of the future.

It seems to me that in order to meet these needs which have become increasingly crushing the role of government must expand. The whole problem is not to hedge against it. It is not as the provincial government does now—to resent it, to throw its weight, as strongly as it can, against it to prevent it;

to begrudge it, to wail about it, as the Chairman of the Management Board does, and talk about reprivatization and all that sort of thing. But face it, and humanize it. Get as many people into the process of co-operation as possible so that coercion need not be used and wouldn't be used but it would be persuasive internally.

It would come inwardly from the people working in conjunction. Man would be recognized not as an isolated savage seeking to outdo the other fellow, but a profoundly social human being who has his fullest development only in a social context. As that social context expands and as the government gives greater affirmation to it and works in greater conjunction with the social organizations and gives them the power to expand and to operate, to that extent does it become contemporary and become a force of good and a force of alleviation in the world.

Again what one experiences over there in the Conservative mentality is the enormous inertia and a looking back to happier times, to more primitive times, to the role of the pioneer; a harkening back and a feeling of repulsion as to what's really going on. How can people who are so ill-disposed to the current movements—who instead of working with them, moulding them and humanizing them, resent them, fight against them—they are the least disposed to make the operation of government benign and to enter forthrightly into the real needs of the whole populace in all areas, in those of mental illness, or children who are afflicted in one way or another, or with the training programmes being given to those who are retarded—the innumerable areas in which but grudging acceptance has been made.

Therefore, I think we had better, at this stage in our history, forthrightly face up to the possibility of a very much expanded government sector and it must be financed, you know, through the tax system. If industry, through automation, is to be the chief beneficiary of that automation—and this is what is happening in the land; they lay off 500 men; that means a saving to that particular company of 500 individuals' wages or salaries.

Where does that money go? True, about 50 per cent of it flows into government funds, possibly, because it is a saving which would go into profit. But what happens to the balance of it? It goes off to a very segregated and singular group of people called shareholders. Why should they be the total beneficiaries of the affliction or sacrifice made by 500 others?

If the industry is saving that much money and throwing these people out onto the public realm, I say only the government is going to be able to pick up the tab and to do anything with respect to restructuring or making it possible for these people to be reincorporated into civic and economic life. If that is going to be the responsibility of government, and it is so thrown that way by industry itself, then the government must have a greater participatory role in the finances and in the savings that were made in order to bring that about.

So on moral grounds alone there are very few complaints, or should be, about the increased taxation that will have to take place, particularly with respect to corporations, than what presently takes place in this province and country in which the corporation tax is going down and down—from about 32 per cent of our total budget in 1952 to 1953, down to about 18 per cent today. Instead of it increasing and being arrogated onto that particular purpose, it is diminishing constantly because of a last ditch stand on the part of Conservative mentalities to bolster up and defend the private market system, which as I say is so woefully deficient in terms of providing employment and which breeds a great many ills in this society besides.

In this particular way may I also say that the tax system is a thing that cannot but wound anyone who knows or studies the matter.

For the past decade we have spent multiple millions of dollars with numerous inquiries—I sat upon one in this House at an earlier time—to revamp, restructure, bring equity into, the tax structure of this country. It seems to me, standing here today, that the whole effort has been an egregious failure.

It has gone down completely to defeat in the face of all the minions whose self-interest and aggressive intent has overridden government, this government as well as the others, and particularly Benson and the federal government. But this government was part of the push and our cretins were certainly outstanding in that darkness of two or three years ago.

You have been wholly successful and I don't congratulate you, because it will all have to be done again because of the press of rising expectations and because of human beings who have been derelicted because of it—people making $3,200 a year and having to pay $50 or $60 income tax, where you get a complete limitation on those making

any more than $25,000 or $30,000 above 50 per cent.

Far from reaching equity the thing was a retrograde step and spells out just how callous and how unsocial this system under which we presently live is.

I wanted to make mention, before sitting down, of two or three people in the House who I would like to call to mind. I do miss and would like to make mention of Tim Reid of the Liberals.

Another man whom I have great affection for and who performed yeoman service in this assembly was Jimmy Trotter, who has departed. I'll never forget the night up in a bleak and somewhat derelict landing strip at Timmins. It was raining; blue cold. We were both on a select committee. He gave me one of my initial political lessons. He stood there in the rain and said: "You know that you and I are only tokens to servitude." And I said: "How is that James?" He said: "We are only used as front men, sitting on this committee. They want to suck us in. They will be as courteous and even, ostensensibly, as flexible as possible, but we are only here to make the recommendations palatable to those who are so self-interested as to find them so."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He used the phrase "token to servitude."

Mr. Lawlor: Something like that, as I recall. Token to servitude—exactly.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is a Trotter-type statement.

Mr. Lawlor: And I said: "Well I am going to get off this committee. There is no point in serving. I am not going to be anybody's fall guy." And he said: "This is politics, Lawlor." And so I bowed my head in the face of the inevitable—as I hope the Conservative does with the increased democratic socialism that will pervade the land—and stayed in politics. But I give him credit for that.

To mention the members of my own party, I think that we have been greatly strengthened. I think the quality and deportment of members, of the new members of our party, has been something that we in this caucus are enormously proud of. And I think that you are up against people who will not be snide, who will not be unnecessarily vicious, but whose knowledge of affairs make them fine replacements to those people whom we have so regretfully lost. I think of my colleague who sat beside me, the vociferous one, the somewhat brassy toned Cliff Pilkey—that was a severe loss! But it will be restored. We will return.

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Don't hold your breath.

Mr. Lawlor: MacArthur Pilkey will come onto the beach, I am sure of that. And then Walter, of course! Walter Pitman. What a loss is there, my countrymen! I hardly think he can be replaced. The service he gave to the educational critique in this province is without pareil. I see he continues to write in the press, perhaps even more creatively than he was able to do under the impact and weight of this House, since perhaps he has more leisure in his present role. Nevertheless, we want to say we here in this caucus severely miss him.

We have made appointments with people in the educational sphere who, working closely with Walter, will continue the impact in that most vital of all areas in our legislative life and who have the internal feeling of what went on in the past few years in education; the whole critique we did make at one time about the non-neutral or the non-transferrable role that the Wright commission was for. We always claimed that it wasn't a sufficiently independent body, and now the whole thing is emerging.

Of course with the Wright report the thing that is being placed in its stead is even less so. The absorption of government in this particular way is something that is going to be found quite constricting and insufferable, particularly by those—and they are voicing their complaints quite loudly these days and I substantially agree with them—whose autonomy and whose sense of intellectual freedom can very well be affected. While this government has prated and given lip service over generations to certain autonomy at the university, I think that it has been severely undermined by everyone who reads objectively the strictures and recommendations of that report.

I want to end up by simply saying that if there is a sickness in this House, as I claimed last night, there is a cynicism pervading the air, that one small move toward alleviating that affliction, to making ourselves more viable, and more available even, would be the introduction of television into this body. My contention is that television should be in all legislatures, but we are only concerned about this particular one. Here is a marvellous invention which would cause the recrudescence

of democracy, where the people would then feel, would be at least open to and introduced and given the full amplitude of the media. Since we come as representatives representing 20,000, 30,000, 40,000 people generally, why not with this invention open this place up so that they out there can enter here and be present as they see fit.

I say that the news is distorted. It can't help but be, I suppose. Not as much as it is at the present time, but the necessary selectivity, whether it ran in the direction of sensationalism or not, distorts the fundamental life of this assembly and what we do. And if, beginning at whatever hour we open everyday, the television by way of special channels were turned on and were allowed to broadcast throughout the length of these hearings, then the populace at large would be free on their side of the fence to view us as they felt—at least they have that possibility.

I suspect that the interest would be generated as we come into a more leisurely society, that the role in civic affairs, the responsibility of the citizen, will be part of the dedication taken up in that life. It happened in earlier societies and it will happen in ours. The people out there will then be able to judge on their own merits our merits, by having the opportunity to see what it is that we do. I think on our side of the fence we will have—it may be beneficial; it may be detrimental—effects.

At least it will do more to seeing that attendance in this House is maintained, because I suspect the general citizenry, without good reason, would not be particularly happy to see the rows of empty seats. We all have legitimate grounds for being absent at times, but I think it goes on to too great an extent.

On the other hand, they would be able to hear their own member speak, if that was what they were interested in, or hear an issue under debate, or the press or the radio would inform individuals in advance as to what particular topics were going to be discussed that day, who the speakers might or might not be.

Again what fairer and more viable way to present to the citizenry, to the people who put us here, as to what the devil we are doing here. They say it is insufferably dull. Well, sometimes it is. There are occasions on which this is the best show in town. My lord!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Some days it is the only one.

Mr. Lawlor: And that is pretty often these days, for one reason or another. Once they see how splenetic and how exciting and intellectual and otherwise we can be, I'm sure that there would be an enormous surge—our Nielsen's ratings would shoot up on occasion to blind you.

In any event the cost, I suggest to you, should not be a consideration. This is a democracy and the benefits that arise out of that particular display—and I don't use the word advisedly—that come out of the showing of the actual work and the ongoing life of this body, would far outdistance it, in terms of participation, a general feeling of movement in the population, a feeling of perhaps greater rapport with ourselves. I suggest that nothing but good could come out of it.

It may mean that certain members will posture and primp before the camera. That can't be helped. This is part of the personality; this is precisely what is being shown. That is easily detectable in that particular medium. It may mean, too, that the members will have to prepare their speeches somewhat better. It does give—I can grant you that, and this can't be helped—a kind of premium to those who do take up so much of the life of this House—like myself wasting your time in this particular way. But again, this is what they put us in for. They are paying us. Some people you know are paid about $1 for every five words. I'm paid about five cents for every 100 words, or something like that. I figure, and it's going down from moment to moment. As a matter of fact, I will be speaking without anything at all very shortly—diminishing returns.

But I would ask the Prime Minister to consider introducing television as an experiment into this House to see what kind of a reaction it has. I would suggest that there would be groups of housewives, Conservatives and otherwise, who would form themselves in little bands and contingents all over the province on an afternoon. And since we sit so often into the evenings, they would be able to give us ratings and punctuate our speeches by way of written commentaries and what not. It would revamp and give a life and purpose to this body which somehow or other it presently doesn't have.

We feel remote. Very often, a lot of us believe—I suppose that you, a busy man, not having been completely caught up in the process, don't feel this—there is a certain waste in our operations.

Well, I think that is enough for one afternoon. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Davis moves second reading of Bill 27, An Act to provide for the Reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier is interested in making any further introductory statement on this.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will have some reply, of course, when the members opposite have made their thoughts known. This bill is not in its precise form, but there has been some rather extensive discussion of it already, including two or three statements by myself and others, covering the past two or three months. There is very little I can add at this moment and I shall await the observations of the members opposite.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Well Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good thing that the bill has come at this time, for we have had an opportunity to see the system, although not fully implemented at least partly in action over the few weeks that the House has been in session.

I want to begin by giving my view as to how the system of provincial secretaries for various policy areas has worked out—at least from my point of view, which is not entirely objective.

I must say that after reading the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity, I was prepared to give this system every chance and to consider that those ministers who had been selected by the Premier for special positions would in fact have substantial sway and direction in the development and evolution of policy here.

To be fair, it really is too soon to pass judgement, but so far it appears to have added nothing but confusion and to have downgraded the hon. gentlemen so selected. It also allows me, and others, Mr. Speaker, to predict to the Premier that he will not stick with the system beyond, let's say two or three years.

While I know his views—he has expressed them publicly and otherwise, that there may be some kinks in the system that will have to be ironed out but in fact it means that government can be more responsive—it appears these policy ministers are really going to be nothing much more than political ministers who are free to travel. When I talk about what we were debating yesterday, but they will move about the province hopefully to sound out public opinion and perhaps also deliver government opinion to those people concerned.

While this is probably a good thing in its intrinsic concept, let's say, Mr. Speaker, still I cannot see that under the attitude toward the new organization of the government it can add effectively to the sensitivity of government in any appropriate way.

I actually feel sorry for the policy ministers so designated. They themselves seem to have some difficulty saying, to critical people like those in opposition in the Legislature, and even those not so critical outside of this House, just what their function is. I heard the new policy minister, the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) say in an interview some weeks ago that he felt that he would have to take the first year at least, perhaps 18 months, before he felt confident enough to assume a position of leadership in the development of policy.

And he has some other problems. Even yesterday that particular minister referred to his interest in agricultural trade. It occurred to me what a great deal of difficulty he would have, not in theory but in practice, in trying to lead the Department of Agriculture and Food, for example, in any areas of policy the way the government is presently constituted.

It does not mean there cannot be changes in personnel in the future, but we have to think of this as an example of practical government, and as an example of practical government I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that this one is unworkable.

I do not want to take time talking about specific ministers and the way they would respond to specific new responsibilities, other than to draw to your attention, sir, that the three new provincial secretaries for policy have had little or no contribution to make in this chamber, and it is very difficult to see where they make a contribution elsewhere. But it is obvious only those ministers with departmental administrative responsibilities are going to have a political force and sway in this House, which has some importance;

and in the community, which is most important—and I would say even in the caucus of the government party.

While it is fine to have the three thinkers and two or three of the hangers-on in that circle come to the special caucuses that we see announced from time to time in the halls of the Legislature, it will still be the Minister of Education himself who directs the grants—it will still be the Attorney General himself who has that historic responsibility who will hold some sway with the thinking of those who support him and the administration in this House.

I feel that, essentially, those in the press gallery who predicted that these policy ministers were doomed for personal downgrading are right. I did not believe that that was so, and frankly I am sure that this was not the intention of the Premier. But this is the way it is going to turn out.

I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that these particular ministers in these offices are going to be little or no functional value in the community, or even to the Premier, who has had such high hopes and expectations of reforming the machinery of government.

This is essentially the newest concept in the reorganization that is before us in this bill. The bill allows any number of ministers to be appointed, any number of parliamentary secretaries to be appointed, but we are dealing specifically with 22 ministries, or 22 individual and separate responsibilities. So we still have a large ministry indeed and it occurs to me—I am not sure everyone would agree that this is an important matter—but with such a large ministry there should be some way whereby the leader of the government can see that the deliberations of this House are monitored by the ministers in some other way than telling off a parliamentary secretary or some person hired in the department to read Hansard.

I think back, and I am sure that the Premier will recall that his predecessor used to spend many long, boring hours—some of them not so boring, some of them interesting—occupying that very same seat where the Premier sits in regal loneliness right now, listening to what goes on in this House—listening to the contributions from this side and from his own members. I can think of many occasions in the last few days when good speeches have been delivered, certainly from all sides, when there wasn't a significant ear tuned in the government benches to hear what was said. This is really not a part of reorganization of government, other than we are maintaining a very large ministry, with the power to increase its size. While I am sure we are going to have an opportunity to debate the relevance of this House and what can be done about it, that essentially the House is relevant when the members elected to it have the ear—the thoughtful, sensitive ear—of the appropriate minister of the Crown when the Premier himself cannot be here.

Maybe government is a lot more time-consuming and complex than it was when John Robarts was here. But after he had won a smashing victory in an election, he got so that he did not come in so much either.

But I am sure the former Minister of Education will recall that while we used to jibe at him sometimes with his very heavy responsibilities in that huge and growing and expensive department back in the 1960s, that the Premier himself would sit there hour after hour. And while he did not often join in the back-and-forth jibing, it was amazing how often a note would arrive on our desk giving perhaps his personal view of a suggestion that had come from a member in the lengthy hours of those debates. So I would say, we are not—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Right! Start writing notes!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I notice that he sends a few of them.

But Mr. Speaker, I would say that one of the things, if we are going to reorganize the ministry, is to recall that the ministry, while they have many things to do, surely their prime function is to get what the people's representatives say in some sort of a thoughtful way by sitting in their seats here and taking part in the debate.

One of the most embarrassing things that must face any member of this House, and particularly those in support of the government, is when they finally rise after a long wait to express their views and find nothing but empty seats, and perhaps the House leader—poring over many documents there—sort of representing the ministry.

I could take some time and point out that some of the ministers do attend quite regularly. The Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Bernier) is here whenever he can possibly be. The Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr) used to be here when he felt that he had some real say in the government, almost without fail; and he still does a lot of his departmental work here.

Well, I suppose this could degenerate into some sort of a homily on political manners. But the Premier must be aware that perhaps while he can stand the criticisms that would come from this side, I doubt that he can stand the attitude which is surely expressed either to him directly, or in the government lobbies by his own supporters; that the government is not paying sufficient attention to the views expressed by the duly-elected members of the Legislature on all sides.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the next thing I have to say will not be misunderstood. In the past I have been, I suppose, somewhat personally critical of the attitudes expressed in this House by the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). But I want to talk about the office which he is now holding and how it has been added to in this reorganization.

It seems strange that we should be called upon to consider a substantial departure in the organization of government by creating an office called the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I have been critical that the government is too big, but I believe that particular single office is too big, and that in fact it should be divided. I would suggest specifically that the matter of the relationships between the government here in Toronto and with the government in Ottawa, should come directly under the jurisdiction and purview of the Premier.

I also believe that the basic planning function, as it correlates many departments, should also be directly under the Premier's control.

To make the Treasurer, with all of the influence and importance of that particular job also the chief planner, the chief negotiator with the government of Canada, and also in fact the Caesar, the proconsul when it comes to municipal affairs, is simply putting too much authority in one department and on the shoulders of one man.

I am not talking here about the competence of the Treasurer. If I were I would certainly say to you, sir, that he is indeed a competent minister. We will look forward to his performance tonight, which in bad circumstances will undoubtedly be a good performance.

But still, to make this man the proconsul of all of the areas of substantial and growing importance of government is a mistake in judgement, while in the same reorganization bill he in fact downgrades the importance, the position—the ability to contribute to the thrust of government—he downgrades this attitude in many other people in his ministry, able and otherwise. Surely he has gone too far in the other direction in this particular office.

Once again, I would predict there will have to be some separations here. We look forward with considerable apprehension to the substantial changes in municipal government, which I feel sure will come about in the next three years. On another occasion I will say that they will be imposed by this government.

We are not here to debate this particular aspect other than I simply call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that in areas already under study, with as much co-operation with local officials as possible, the Treasurer of Ontario, the Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, has made it clear that these supposedly autonomous and duly elected municipal officials do not have the choices that they would expect. They simply select from the cafeteria of alternatives that is presented by the one-time Minister of Municipal Affairs in his new capacity.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. The Premier is heading for substantial difficulties, even with the large and placid majority which supports him in this House. If he believes that during the next three years, using the undoubted ability and force of the minister dealing with that aspect of intergovernmental affairs, that he is going to remake the map in the image that we have seen developing in recent years, undoubtedly he is going to be disappointed and politically embarrassed. The people of the province will not be well served.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer specifically to some other areas of the reorganization of government. As you know, in the recent election campaign we were concerned with another alternative in reorganization, not just replacing little Tories by big Grits but revamping the flow of authority from the people through the government and to the administration. Our alternatives may or may not have been inspected by you, Mr. Speaker, or anyone else in this House who is interested in some alternatives.

We were concerned, in fact, with reducing the size of the ministry itself. It is interesting that we no longer have departments; that might take a little getting used to. I don't know what the philosophy of this is but having ministers running ministries instead of

departments, I guess, is something that we can cope with without too much trouble.

It is difficult to understand why we should consider maintaining the fragmentation of the provincial authority for education. I have spoken about this before. I can't help but feel that the Premier is simply left with the job of finding suitable occupations for his colleagues in the former administration.

I suppose there are some practical aspects that have to be considered here, but surely there should have been some refining? I suppose we can look forward to this refining process before the end of 1972. We still have to experience the reform of the personnel in government besides the reform of the offices, and this in fact might accomplish a good deal that is not accomplished by the written word in Bill 27 before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I don't feel that the reorganization that is presented in this omnibus bill is going to serve the people, the taxpayers, any better than the former administration did. We felt that it was top heavy, that the lines of responsibility were obscure and tangled; and I would say to you, sir, that this is still the case. The Premier in his effort, which is a visible effort, to rise above the business of government—a sort of a blue bird of people versus cars circling over the nitty gritty of day-to-day business of government—is trying to achieve that. But instead of having an administration which he can run from the ski slopes of Vermont, or from the quiet of Georgian Bay, or in speaking to the many groups around the province which demand his attention—and rightly so—he is going to be faced with the problems that have already been demonstrated by his policy ministers and by the ministers in charge of ordinary administrative departments.

So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this bill. We think it is a mistake. We think it is based upon, let us say the bloodless examination of the business of government by experts from the administration and from outside.

There is no doubt that many of the members—all of the members—of the Committee on Government Productivity are well motivated, sincere and hardworking. Frankly I congratulate the Premier on the appointment of the executive director of that committee to his personal staff. I have no reason to believe other than that particular gentleman will serve the Premier, and through him Ontario, very well indeed.

But the recommendations, which probably did come from that particular gentleman as much as anyone else, have a bloodless tone of the efficiency expert who shoves around the little blocks with departmental ministry names on them, into the most convenient arrangement without, I would say, sufficient understanding of the fact that government is not a business. There is no understanding that no one heading this particular administration will go on to become president of the President's Club, that the person heading this administration must have as his main goal a sensitivity that will enable him to contact the province and not insulate himself from it.

In passing I would congratulate the Premier on the decision to accept that designation for his office. The other day when I phoned up about a small matter his secretary said, "Office of the Premier." I frankly feel like going back to calling him Prime Minister just so that we can continue that argument.

I recall on one occasion there was an announcement—not in the House, but somewhere else—that a special study group, a task force hardly—was set up to establish what the proper name for the head of the government would be.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He had to pay $15,000 too.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that a fact? Well, that's a happy figure.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a happy fact too.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It's a nice round figure.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I don't suppose there can be any kind of justification for the name in the fact that John Sandfield MacDonald they tell me was called Prime Minister, and so it doesn't make much difference other than I think it is a wise thing.

One of the real clarifications in the reorganization of government is that when the word "Premier" is used, we know we are talking about the head of the government in the province, and "Prime Minister" refers to the head of the government in Canada; or perhaps the head of the government in B.C. That's an involvement that may have to be settled in some other way.

Mr. Lewis: It is a threat.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I regret that we cannot support this bill, because I think that the reorganization of government is something that must concern everybody here, not just those who occupy the Treasury

benches and who have the day-to-day business of the government to contend with.

We on this side feel that it is needlessly complex, that the barriers between the citizens and the administration, between the members of this House and the administration, have been made thicker, more insulated, and that the members of the administration itself are confused by their new responsibilities. We cannot support the bill in its present form.

On the other bills that accompany it there will be some specific things to say, but we will reserve our objections for the vote on Bill 27.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to see on the front of Bill 27 the term "Premier". It is the only diminutive thing about the bill, or indeed about the man. It is the only contraction in status which he has suffered since the election campaign. Perhaps it is the way in which he compensates for the escalation of his department around him—now, I gather, up to some 74 civil servant designates all paying daily homage to the Premier. One never knows whether it's 74, 75 or 76.

Mr. MacDonald: He has his aides.

Mr. Lewis: Accretions, sometimes called additions, occur daily. We will have opportunity during his estimates to discuss their various occupations and activities more fully.

Mr. MacDonald: He needs a jet to take his court with him.

Mr. Lewis: Yes. The Premier will soon have to hire supervisory personnel to supervise the personnel of his department. That too will shortly occur.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When he puts out a new study.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Members have to ask for it first.

Mr. Lewis: I always rather liked the former member for Sudbury's designation. I think the Premier should call himself the first citizen and leave it at that. That has about it a tone of humility which is vastly more appreciated than the mere designation of Premier.

I'm not sure that we in this party will have worked ourselves into the splenetic fervour of opposition by the end of this second reading. I think that, on balance, we're inclined to feel that the reorganization of government is something that the government does—government, in this case, the Progressive Conservative Party. Whereas we would take pretty strong exception to some of the individual alterations the government has made, by and large, the bill doesn't carry with it a sufficient relevance in public terms to get one excited enough to oppose it. But I reserve that right, because some of my colleagues around me who will follow may make observations and indicate perceptions to the House that certainly work me up, Mr. Speaker.

My ardour to oppose this government needs very little support. I have just a few observations to make by way of preliminary contribution from our party. I think one of the things that is, perhaps, wrong with the bill is the uncritical acceptance of the COGP. I have considerable personal admiration and think many people in the New Democratic caucus have admiration for what the COGP undertook to do and much of what it has performed. But there is a tendency in the government to embrace uncritically—am I too unkind to say almost mindlessly?—all of the holy writ of the COGP.

I have a feeling that the government has surrendered itself to a frame of mind of the management consultant, which in the long run will provide serious disservice both to government and public.

I'm not certain about that. It's an apprehension which many of us share. One of the things which it is clear the people on the COGP do not understand, and never understood, is the political process. They have a great deal of knowledge of the administrative processes. They have considerable understanding of the managerial functions. They clearly know how to impose a corporate structure on government, but I don't think they have any appreciation at all about the political process.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: I wish that committee had been forced in its terms of reference to sit from January to June in the legislative chambers and watch the debates and not be allowed, mark you, not be allowed—

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): At $300 a day?

Mr. Lewis: Well, what else did they do to earn their money?—and not be allowed to leave the chamber and understand what it means to transfer the essential ministerial and administrative and managerial functions into the life and heart of debate; into seeing the

way in which politicians are moved by the nature of the debate; into seeing the way politicians are either present or absent; into seeing the way in which the legislative process either distorts or alters or fulfils the essential structures which have been provided by COGP.

I have a feeling the perspectives would have been quite different; that if you have any flavour for the political process at all, then you realize that you can't do things like giving to the Treasurer all the authority which you have rendered unto him—not because of the man's own capacity, but because of the way in which it will break down in the simple matter of legislative function.

That you cannot create provincial secretaries in the way in which they've been created, because in political terms it doesn't work and won't work and cannot work. You cannot have certain ministerial responsibilities when in fact your ministers do not condescend to attend the House beyond the question period.

The political process militates against much of what COGP has done. If they had spent some time understanding the way in which the House works and the way in which political exchanges occur, they might have altered the structure which they laid out.

I am not certain about that, but I have a feeling that they were rather removed from the political process. May I say, as an aside, that that is why the commission which the Premier intends to establish, I trust, on the Legislature and the functions of legislative members might have more relevance if the commissioners have some political sense. I would have wished that to be true of the COGP as well.

The second point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, was that it is very difficult to develop confidence in one of the most dramatic departures of the government, and that is the provincial secretaries. I will not prejudge it; it just seems to me to be inherently unworkable. I was personally intrigued—I think this extends again to feelings on this side of the House generally—by the idea of ministers to deal with conceptual areas. I suppose there is an argument to be made that a minister gets bogged down in the administrative minutiae of his department and that there is value, instead of having an endless array of interdepartmental committees, in having ministers who sit back and have a sort of conceptual range.

Who was that writer for the Globe and Mail who became a thinker for the Department of Education? He sat up in some office somewhere—

Mr. MacDonald: That was one way to silence him, too!

Mr. Lewis: It was St. John, wasn't it? Bascomb St. John? You see what happened to him? I don't know what happened to him and you know—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is still there.

Mr. MacDonald: He is even more silenced than the superministers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is still there and still performing a very valuable function.

Mr. Lewis: He must be the prototype of the superminister. Years after you don't know where he is and haven't heard of him again.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All the member had to do was ask.

Mr. Lewis: Now that I have asked I am just as mystified.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member's former colleague knew where he was—right here.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier must enlighten us on the philosophy with which he infuses the Department of Education.

Mr. MacDonald: He was more effective when he was outside criticizing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member means he made it easier for them—they had nothing to base their criticisms on after he left.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): That is why we took him in.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a slanderous comment on the former member for Peterborough. He had more to say than all the ministers put together.

Mr. Lewis: The departure of Bascomb St. John was hardly noticed by the readers of the Globe and Mail, let alone by the members of this Legislature.

I would have thought that the conceptual idea was a worthy idea, but the more one sees of its working in the Legislature the more one recognizes, perhaps in a way which should have been recognized in advance, that you can't separate the administrative and conceptual functions.

In fact it is an artificial separation. In fact, it is a commentary on the inadequacy of the former ministry rather than on the need for separate conceptual jobs. If you have a good minister, and if you have cabinet ministers who have some substance and some wit, perception, intelligence and all the rest that goes with a good cabinet, you don't need to make these artificial distinctions between those who administer and those who think.

I suspect that the government will find that it is going to be a difficult process to sustain. Again I can't prejudge it; others have done so. Others say that the Premier and Clare Westcott sit and plot diabolically the downfall of those who have dared to challenge and they have done a magnificent job. I don't know who induced the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development to go off to Cuba, but it was a very Machiavellian ploy and it served a very good purpose. I haven't seen the Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) for days. I don't think the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) will ever return. You know, the Premier has despatched his superministers around the globe, one presumes.

Mr. Renwick: Where are they? What countries have they gone to?

Mr. Lewis: One wonders where they are. They will slink in and out of the House like the worthy spectres they are now that the reorganization is complete.

Mr. Singer: Learning to cut sugar cane?

Mr. Lewis: What is it that the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development said? He said he thought he was a sort of telephone to the people; that was the way in which he described it. The Provincial Secretary for Justice described it as a link with the people. There they are out linking and telephoning.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, it hardly seems an important enough reorganization of government to work the member for Lakeshore into the volcanic fury which would have him enter this debate, as I am sure he will shortly. Which leads me to the third point I wanted to make.

The shift in departments is a bit peculiar and many of them are questionable. In some of them they have maintained the inherent contradiction in the department.

One of the sorriest things about their reorganization of government is the maintenance of something called Natural Resources and the imposition on the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier) of the simultaneous responsibilities for the extraction of mineral wealth and the preservation of the environment.

If anybody wants to understand why pits and quarry legislation has not been extended throughout the Province of Ontario, it is because of that inherent contradiction in the portfolio. And portfolios like that and, as my colleague from Wentworth was saying to me earlier, the portfolio of Consumer and Commercial Relations, with those kind of inherent contradictions, are simply going to render those portfolios far less useful than they might have been.

Why they did not see it clear to have a Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs is something that is hard to comprehend. We don't worry quite as much about the numbers of government departments; we do worry about the basic relevance.

A word, Mr. Speaker, for the passing of the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), which I think should be stated in this House, in memoriam.

Mr. Renwick: The member is attracting crowds in the gallery.

Mr. Lewis: Well when you talk about the member for Wellington-Dufferin the gallery is filled.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: That is what usually happens, because it is such an oddity in this House, Mr. Speaker.

There he is, ladies and gentlemen, third from this side, front and centre, the member for Wellington-Dufferin, the only man who exposed himself to his constituents on a number of occasions many years back. And I may say—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps a degree of greater exposure by the member for Scarborough West to his constituency might have more success.

Mr. Lewis: Well perhaps; his majority was greater than mine. I was just recalling one of the more vivid moments of debate that the member for Wellington-Dufferin will also recall.

But I notice that the Ontario Water Resources Commission is now in the Department of the Environment and that the member for Wellington-Dufferin's tenuous grasp on the head of that commission is about to come to

an end. We all pay the deferential respects which he is due and we ask en passant, Mr. Speaker, what percentage of the $36,000 to which he was entitled he will receive between the point of his appointment and the final passage of this bill, and for what purposes and to what end. And we assume that he will be deeply involved in the government department thereafter.

Regarding the hon. Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, some comments have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and others will be made by the member for Ottawa Centre; I shall not comment further on that. I think some of the ministries are probably untenable; time will show.

The last point I wish to make is that I think the government has paid too much homage to form. The quest for accessibility in government terms is not satisfied by structure alone. Accessibility is as much an attitude as it is a structure. And the attitude of this government terms is not satisfied by structure manifest in the refusal to attend the Legislature, it's manifest in the absence of television coverage of the debates, it's manifest in the refusal to have the financial critics—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

There will be no applause or interference from the spectators in the galleries.

Mr. Lewis: I can understand the applause.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Clean them out!

Mr. Lewis: Aha! A Tory spoke!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! If there are any further demonstrations in the galleries, I will have to ask the attendants to have the guests removed.

Mr. Lewis: May I appeal to those in the gallery, Mr. Speaker, to understand that this is a very select club and that in fact the proprieties require silent attention without public expression of feeling, emotion, opinion or attitude. I'm sure that the galleries will understand that because the words in this chamber are so reverential, the mere public cannot be allowed to comment thereon.

Back to the point I was making. One of the ways the government might improve its accessibility, is to alter this fusty old chamber and the absurd protocols.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Why doesn't the hon. member turn around and take a bow.

Mr. Lewis: I am talking to the minister? No I am not talking to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: I don't understand, Mr. Speaker. I was just making a few observations on the government reorganization bill.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Why doesn't the hon. member turn around!

An hon. member: Why doesn't the hon. minister go home and sleep!

Mr. Lewis: I understand that the hon. minister is now the Solicitor General-designate; looking after the police.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes!

Mr. Lewis: I hear the minister's first telegram of congratulations was from Mayor Daley in Chicago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What does the hon. member do for an encore?

Mr. Lewis: Okay. That is the way I feel about the ministry; but I'm not going to be involved in it any further.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may just draw to a close—I just don't think it is a matter of structure.

One of the interesting things that has happened in the reshuffling of the cabinet is in regard to the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter). The Minister of Health is one of the most accessible ministers in the cabinet. I've not been to see him personally, but I hear it from many public groups and I hear it on all sides.

He embodies in his person a view of government which says to the public as a whole: "Here I am"—whether it regards nursing homes, whether it regards denturists, whether it regards alterations to the Ontario Health Insurance Plan. We may disagree on the policy which ultimately evolves and for which he is ultimately responsible, but one has the sense of accessibility and one doesn't need to elevate the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development in order to get it.

The members are so preoccupied on that side of the House with structure and with form and with artifice that they have for-

gotten that the nature of accessibility involves other things. It involves the way in which the government relates to the Legislature and the people; not simply the bureaucratic devices it allows to provide "input"—a word which is now very much au courant on the government side. The Premier used it earlier this afternoon.

I have, Mr. Speaker, despite the events of the Legislature, still not worked myself into the position of opposing the bill. We have very serious reservations about a number of the clauses, as the government can see. We will try to pursue them more specifically with the hon. members in clause by clause debate. We hope they will take some of the admonitions seriously in the process of this debate.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to participate in the debate? The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, it struck me as I was listening to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party that really, judging by the members of the COGP and the kind of approach they came up with, that you could in fact do a very neat corporate structure on the proposed reorganization which is coming in this bill.

It would start out with the Premier, modestly titled now as the chairman of the board, presiding in his benign way over the corporation—perhaps a bit indifferent or unknowing about some of the things that it was doing that he didn't want to know about, but taking credit for its achievements and rather generally reflecting a benign and benevolent public image. The sort of thing that Colonel Saunders reflects on the "chicken-lickin'" shacks that are dotted around this province and other parts of the country.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's "finger-lickin'."

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, "finger-lickin'." That's what it is. Yes! Anyway, the Premier licking his fingers at the top of the corporate structure, with the Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—I hope I got that right as a matter of fact.

One of the problems I recognize as a former journalist, and I don't think the government recognized in this whole thing, is that the new titles for the ministry are terribly, terribly long and they don't fit into headlines very well. I just hope the government doesn't have a problem with that problem. There is no way you can put the hon. minister's title into a headline. If he is called super-Darcy then that's really the government's own fault, because there is no other way in which journalists will be able to deal with him.

Anyway the hon. minister is the president of the corporation, responsible for co-ordination, overlooking the budget and this sort of thing, having too a number of staff people reporting to him in the same way as the chairman of the board has a communications consultant and an executive director of his office and other high-priced staff around him.

Then there is a series of senior vice-presidents, men who have performed creditably in the service of the corporation, or who are deemed to have performed creditably, and have been elevated to the position where they don't have to administer anything, but they think—that would take in the three provincial secretaries.

Then, finally, there is a series of operational vice-presidents. These would be people we would know in this chamber as the departmental ministers with a controller here and one or two other corporate odds and sods, if you will, fixed into the whole structure.

Of course the problem—and I think my leader has already touched on this—is that a corporate structure like this may be very well for AT&T or for International Nickel Co., or for one of the other models which the members of the Committee on Government Productivity may have had in mind when they went ahead and made the recommendations. Maybe it's Gulf Oil, or maybe Mr. Powers thought that the model that he has developed quite successfully in Noranda Mines would be suitable. But it really is questionable as to whether it is that suitable within the government of a province of seven million people, the government of the Province of Ontario.

I think that if you look at the role of the president, of super-Darcy, as the Minister of—let me get this straight now—of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs specifically, you can really see where the whole approach breaks down at the political level.

It may well be that as president of a corporation with a budget of $4.5 billion, the kind of structure that the government is proposing is workable. At that point the response to the public doesn't have to be that immediate or that great; the sensitivity to the public doesn't have to be that great; the responsibility to behave in the public interest isn't that great.

Were I to have written a letter to the president of Bell Telephone, for example, and complained about some aspect that is concerning me and their operation—that is also a very large corporation—the president probably never sees the letter. In fact the vice-president doesn't see it either, but somebody in the office sees it and shoves it off to the regional vice-president responsible for eastern Ontario and it is dealt with at that level and only if I am dissatisfied and particularly persistent do I come back and write again.

At that point I get up to the vice-president responsible for all of Ontario and, on the third round, I might get up to the assistant to the vice-president who works directly underneath the president. Finally, on the fourth or fifth round, I might be able to get up to the president of the whole gang.

That particular digression is an example, it seems to me, of the kind of problems that are being set up specifically in the office of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs by the kind of structure and by the concentration of functions which he is undertaking within his office.

There are a large number of responsibilities in that office and there are a large number of people and groups and agencies and governments who will want to have some kind of access and some kind of information and some kind of consultation with this very important super department which is being put under the Treasurer. It is just not good enough that when they write or when they call, they get dealt with the way I get dealt with when I put in a complaint to Mr. Scrivener in Bell Canada.

Mr. Scrivener can, quite properly perhaps, refer me to a regional junior vice-president. But the municipal people in this province, the industrial people, and the regional development associations which are concerned with regional economic planning, the groups that are concerned with regional physical planning, and with other aspects of regional planning; the various groups—be they academics, be they industrialists, be they trade unions, be they any kind of group within the society of the Province of Ontario—who are concerned about the economic future of the province, who are concerned about taxation, who are concerned about this process which is so central—the whole political process about who gets what and how—are going to find themselves subjected to a reply from the third internal vice-president responsible for their particular region of the province.

He should have another name because this is a government and we have deputy ministers instead of vice-presidents, and assistant deputy ministers instead of branch directors and people like that. But essentially there is no other way in which the hon. Treasurer and his people are going to be able to handle the political relationship with the people in the various groups in this pluralistic society of the Province of Ontario without a form of delegation which makes political consultation a mere mockery.

Now my leader has already said that at this point we are not going to oppose the bill in principle, and that is perhaps out of a certain deference, a certain feeling that if the government really thinks, after seven days I think it was of cogent consideration of the report of the COGP and subsequent reconsideration in the ensuing two or three months, that it can make this thing work, we are at least willing to give them the opportunity. But at the same time I think it has to be made very clear that we are giving them the opportunity, if you will possibly giving them some rope, and seeing whether or not they can make it work or whether they will be hanging themselves on the scheme that they themselves have created.

It seems to me that if you argue, as the COGP argues, that there is a need for policy ministers and there is a need for constellations of ministers within the fields of natural resources and within the fields of justice and the fields of social services, but when you come to the area which is looked after by the hon. super-Darcy that really the same kind of arguments ought to have consistently been applied there.

However, the COGP didn't see it that way and neither, apparently, does the government. The COGP said that there were a number of important functions involving broad policy considerations which didn't fit logically into any one of the three policy fields and which don't themselves warrant the creation of a policy field. I think that if we were to be taking over this scheme that the government is devising we would be asking the COGP whether or not they really couldn't count to four, because there are some very cogent arguments for saying: "If you are going to do this policy game in this way at all—and we do question whether you should—we don't understand why a fourth policy field has to be concentrated under one minister rather than being given the kind of assistance and the kind of political responsiveness that it should have."

I've tried a couple of times to divide up the responsibilities of the hon. Treasurer-and-everything-else. The most logical way of doing it might be some combination of regional planning, economic planning, municipal affairs, federal-provincial relations and treasurer, and one or two of those jobs could be combined with the function of policy minister. It is possible that you can have three or four people in that particular field.

Certainly if three or four people in that particular policy field, if there was a minister for economic planning, if there was a minister for regional planning, if we had again a Minister of Municipal Affairs, the responsibilities they would bear would be no less weighty, no less time-consuming, no less important than the responsibilities that will be borne by most of the departmental ministers within the proposed new cabinet.

In fact it may be the Treasurer's own admitted ambivalence which held him back from this kind of step. The government, as is well known, is barreling, some might even say head long, into socialism while madly proclaiming that it is going in exactly the opposite direction.

The Treasurer himself, in a rather long interview with a Globe and Mail reporter, admitted as much today when he talked about riding a dilemma and talked about his fear that the private sector was simply not going to do the kind of things that people were demanding of our society, of our economy, over the next 20 or 30 years. The Treasurer fears that if the corporate sector cannot do the job, then he really sees no solution other than having government intervene as a regulator or as a doer and initiator.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Regrettably!

Mr. Cassidy: Regrettably!

Mr. Lawlor: Weeps crocodile tears!

Mr. Cassidy: In a sense that may be one of the differences between our party and the Treasurer's party—

Mr. Lawlor: Tears of the iguana.

Mr. Cassidy: —that is that he regrets and he cries shame on himself as he goes ahead and does the things that the more intelligent ministers, even on that side of the House, admit have got to be done.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): He backs into socialism instead of facing it.

Mr. Cassidy: That is right, I have always felt, in fact, that one of the reasons why this province needs a New Democratic government is that we would admit that the problems have to be faced by government action as well as private action. We would not go into it backwards, madly proclaiming that we were really leaving the job up to the private sector.

The government is hypocritical and it is doing a con job as it proclaims the virtues of free enterprise and gradually more and more creates a mixed economy in which the government's role becomes greater and greater. The reason they do it, of course, is that they know perfectly well that if they really put the reliance on free enterprise that their rhetoric calls for, the people of this province would rise up and would have them out of office at the very first opportunity.

Mr. Lawlor: Hear. Hear! Bankrupt!

Mr. MacDonald: Their rhetoric is bankrupt; that is for sure.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The people know what is going on.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, the device which has been used, both to mark out the Treasurer's status as president of this quasi-corporate structure on the other side of the House and also in recognition of his very heavy responsibilities, has been that unlike other ministers who have either no or one parliamentary secretary, the Treasurer has qualified for two.

I have already expressed misgivings about that particular precedent. I do not think it is a good one and I do not think it is going to work, because I think when the people come in from Barrie or the regional municipality of Ottawa-Carleton or Thunder Bay, when the ratepayers' association or the federation of community college students, or whoever it is, come in to talk about taxes, when the various groups come along, they want to talk to the guy who is in charge. They know by the very wording of this legislation and by the statements that have been made by the ministry opposite that the parliamentary secretaries are $5,000-a-year decorations on the face of the government whose only function is to fob them off, and nothing more.

Frankly, I am worried about one of the clauses of the bill which permits the Lieutenant Governor in Council to appoint as many parliamentary assistants as the government may wish. In fact, there is hope for

some of you guys coming up in the next few months, because if the government so wished it could appoint every backbencher in the House on the government side as a parliamentary secretary.

Mr. MacDonald: Those who are not on commissions.

Mr. Cassidy: Those who are not on commissions!

The hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin possibly will be looking for some kind of appointment to compensate him for his—what I am sure he must regret—rather substantial forthcoming loss of income which will be occurring as a part of this bill.

More specifically, there are a few minor points that rather confuse me. I think it is maybe just the aspect of the confusion that enters in when a government enters helter-skelter and headlong into this kind of reorganization. I would cite, for example, the transfer of adult education into a category which is lumped together with recreation, camping and physical education and put under the Department of Community and Social Services.

I think that we may have some more to say about this when it comes to clause-by-clause study, but it strikes me that putting the responsibility at that particular point really misunderstands both the desirability and purposes of adult education; and certainly misunderstands the drift and the intent of the Wright commission report, which is proposing an integration of living and learning, which is proposing an integration of services of the colleges, community colleges and universities of this province out of the wider public, among other means through adult education.

Likewise, in another rather confusing kind of transfer, the Department of Tourism disappears. The Department of Industry and Tourism loses the control or the responsibility for historic sites, which apparently are being moved from being an historic attraction to being an educational resource and are being put under the Department of Colleges and Universities.

So Colleges and Universities will not have the function of adult education, but will have the function of maintaining historic sites, which I think in many people's minds were generally a tourist attraction and were a form of education only in the very broadest sense of the word "recreation," with recreation and self-development somewhat combined.

About the only logical one of these transfers that I can see is the transfer of community centres from the Department of Agriculture and Food to the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I am also concerned, and again this is specific, with the decision not to tie down responsibilities for certain very important Crown agencies in the new Act. Specifically, responsibility for the Securities Act, which formerly came under the Department of Financial and Commercial Affairs, is now nominally with the new Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. But, in fact, it is open to the cabinet, to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to transfer responsibility for securities administration to another department. I am not really convinced it doesn't belong squarely under the ministry that is generally responsible for other aspects of protection of investors and of the public.

The Ontario Development Corp. and the Northern Ontario Development Corp.—I'm afraid I can't remember what ministry they have now been put under; it is in the resources field—but presumably they too are left free to roam around with some minister who likes to have them with him and who will trundle these agencies from place to place rather than leaving them sit with the Ministry of Industry and Tourism where it would certainly seem logical that they belong.

Anyway, I would hope that the Treasurer or the Premier would speak in the debate and explain how they really consider that the role of the president of the corporation can be carried out and can be successfully fulfilled while respecting the political traditions and necessities of this province in the 1970s.

I am sure they can explain how that would work at Gulf Oil or Noranda, or in some private corporation. But in terms of the professed aims of this whole reform—responsiveness, freedom to make policy, this sort of thing—these things just don't exist in the hon. Treasurer's office, and I find very little evidence that they are going to exist. I think that very important co-ordinating department is going to be remote, when it should be close to the taxpayers and close to the public, as well as difficult of access, and therefore is not going to be doing the kind of job it should be doing for the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, while the House no doubt now understands why we don't oppose this bill in principle, we do feel there

is much that is lacking in it and a great many changes ought to be made before it comes back to us in its final form.

Today I want to simply draw the attention of the House to one facet of this bill, which I think should be looked at very carefully and perhaps understood a little more clearly by the government than it is at present; it is the removing of the youth and recreation branch from the Department of Education and placing it in the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps to the experts, looking at this from afar, the COGP in its wisdom may have felt that it was a logical thing that youth and recreation should be a function of Community and Social Services. That may well be from a point of view of one who is simply looking at it from a distance. But for the person who has been involved in this process in the community this transfer does not make very much sense. It has implications which are far-reaching and are disturbing to the people who are actually engaged in this kind of work in the community.

I have before me a letter, one of several which have come to me, and I have had many phone calls on this. I want to put on the record the written word of one Gordon C. Hutchinson, who is the director of recreation in the borough of North York; a man who is also vice-president of the Ontario Recreation Society; a man who has had wide experience in this field, who knows the score and who is very much disturbed at what is going on here or what is suggested in the bill. If I could read, Mr. Speaker, what he has penned here I think it presents the point of view more effectively than I could put it in my own words. I think it is a point of view which the Premier and his government should listen to very carefully.

Mr. Singer: The minister has already had extracts from that. That was sent to him several days ago.

Mr. Young: I want to put it on the record here. I quite realize I asked Mr. Hutchinson to forward his ideas to the government and I believe he has done this, but I think it also should be put on record here in this House. Mr. Hutchinson says this:

> I want to state emphatically that if this move does take place, it will be the most retrogressive step ever taken by the government of Ontario. For almost 25 years public recreation services, as a function of local municipal councils, have been a part of the Department of Education through enabling legislation known as the community programmes regulations.
>
> For almost the same number of years, professional training and certification of recreation staff has been identical to the teaching profession and also part of the Education Act.
>
> In recent years, community programmes and the personnel of the youth and recreation branch have been officed and supervised by Department of Education superintendents. Any change now would be confusing and a severe retardation of that which thousands of recreation practitioners and educators have worked diligently to accomplish. The progress of recreation services in municipalities throughout Ontario would be set back many, many years and might never regain the important co-operative relationship which has been achieved.
>
> In our present area of increased leisure—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the member going to vote for the bill?

Mr. Young: To continue:

> —recreation and education have become blood brothers. Learning for living might well be the motto of this family. Schools and educators still have a role of vital importance to impart academic training, knowledge and how to use information resources. Recreators working with educators can complement this service through the teaching of leisure skills and carry-over education which can prepare young persons for happy fulfilment now and in the future when leisure time is available to them.
>
> With all due respect, few educators today possess the training, skills or the philosophy to accomplish this total concept. At the present, we are working together because we are really one in the provincial structure. If we are to be put under a separate ministry, we will no longer be part of each other. This has consequences of the most serious nature.
>
> Many community schools are operating now and many more will follow. These have come about through co-operation between the two municipal authorities in education and recreation working with local community agencies. The Board of education cannot do it alone. Many facilities such as swimming pools have been built adjacent to schools by municipal

councils because of the kinship of educators and recreators.

Many community councils involve total partnership of all contributing agencies brought about by total co-operation between the two major municipal authorities, education and recreation, giving leadership to various agencies and to the general public.

Separate school supporters paying general municipal taxes can participate and use public schools in leisure hours as a result of the common bonds which exist between municipal recreation authorities and education authorities due to the common ties at the provincial level. I am certain that much if not all of the good developed over the past 25 years will be seriously affected if the present plans of the government are not reversed.

I say most honestly that what we have been able to do [Mr. Hutchinson says] in North York is the result of having a common bond through the Department of Education. We in recreation are accepted as brothers, or at least cousins, by the educators. The local youth and recreation branch representatives can come into any school or recreation centre and have full respect by both authorities. I am positive that this will be lost if they are coming from a different department in the province.

It has been suggested that the community school person may stay with education and the rest will go to the social services. This should be even worse and would tear every community into shreds of competition. The public and agencies would constantly be changing their loyalties between recreation and community schools to see from whom they can get the most. Co-operation would become almost non-existent.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I bring this letter to your attention and I have placed it on the record because of a feeling that this kind of separation would be an extremely unwise move on the part of government. It seems to me that this is one area where the government ought to take another look at the bill and that these changes can be made before it comes back to us for clause-by-clause examination, so that these two facets of education in the community are not torn apart and thereby made far less efficient than they are today. I would urge upon you, Mr. Speaker, that this second look be taken on this aspect of the bill which is before us.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, several things in this bill concern me. One of them has to do with my former profession, and that is the forestry industry. I am very seriously disturbed about what has happened in the field of safety in the forest industry and the Loggers' Safety Act. Some years ago, when the Loggers' Safety was first brought into being, it was the work of many people in that industry who devoted their time and talent to working in devising an Act that was to serve the industry well. Recently, under the new system and the change coming into being, the Loggers' Safety Act was to be revised and updated. This has been held in abeyance because of the changes, and it is my belief that this should not have happened. I simply think that now that it is going to be in the hands of the Department of Labour they have a duty to get this revision underway immediately.

I also feel the reason for this being in the Lands and Forests department rather than in Labour was the particular unique features that are a problem in that industry. And the one group of people we have who are very creditable, very well received, were the people in the Department of Lands and Forests throughout Ontario.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I see the name "Lands and Forests" being done away with as a name, because throughout northern Ontario it has stood for something over very many years. I realize that the programmes and policies in operation are going to be maintained under a new department, and I know that in maybe some years hence, when maybe somebody again decides to change those names once more, maybe somebody else will find himself standing here as I am and expressing regret for the passing of a very creditable name. I do know that throughout northern Ontario and throughout central Ontario, of which I am a part, it has stood for something that has been very meaningful in the people's lives. So that to change it, seems to me to be somewhat regrettable.

You know I remember back when the Department of Lands and Forests came into being, with the phasing out of the old Game and Fisheries Department. At that time, it stood for something and it was a loss at the time, but time has healed those feelings and those regrets and we now have a similar day and event again.

But I do feel Northern Affairs has a particular meaning; and it is being phased out. These are regrettable things to me, as a person who lives in northern Ontario. Even the downgrading, somewhat, of the incorporation of Tourism into another department has a particular meaning to many people.

I realize that these things are going to be maintained in programmes and policies and things for people, but I do believe that Municipal Affairs has a particular meaning for this Parliament, because before, from about 1849 in this piece of land and real estate, it always was that a minister had the sole responsibility for municipal affairs and local government in our form of responsible government. This is regrettable I know to many people, because they feel they no longer have someone who has a complete interest; he is going to be under a divided interest.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that some of these things could have been accomplished in a different way and not have had so much change. Somehow, someone read the book "Future Shock" and reversed the process.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, from time to time governments do have to undergo internal alteration—manipulation, I suppose, and change. As a matter of fact, for the first time in our society we are experiencing a crisis in institutions of all kinds. They are seeking to revamp themselves internally to meet those times.

We, therefore, in the New Democratic Party cannot feel unduly excited or disturbed over what we consider fundamentally a manipulation in the internal offices of government. We have some misgivings about it. We suspect if certain members over here occupied the posts that our opposite numbers occupy they would have more efficacy than official power in effect.

But leaving that aside, how can one become incensed over mere regulatory controls and the way in which government is structured and organized? Its aim, as the report sets forth, is to give greater flexibility—that is a questionable proposition in the context of the way it is being done—effectiveness and streamlining to the present operation of the government.

We over here from time to time point out that the wrong subject matter is under the right minister and vice versa. There is always some hazy area, some shadowy or grey area as to the total operation.

My misgiving has to do basically with the motivation with which the government brings in this kind of legislation. It is, as we would say, perhaps no window-dressing, but the kind of structure that holds the window up.

Perhaps the reason behind it is because of the impress of technology in the society, with all that implies of impersonality and the obtuse or the abstract being raised against and above people in a general sense. Perhaps the restructuring is done under the sway or the bane, if you will, of science—perhaps that was the chief motivation, and I am sure in this particular case it is, because these people are all efficiency minded you know. Sometimes I think efficiency is the last refuge of a scoundrel.

What G. K. Chesterton always pleaded for was the inefficient man, because he usually got something done. But if the chief motivation and the complexity of contemporary government is the proliferation of your services, these, I say, are all together, in my opinion, by and large beneficial and positive and affirmative the more that you do it, within some reason—not to the extent that you do it at the present time—but to the extent that you are willing to extend these powers, and the design is not purely technical and brought about by supple restructurings and where things fit into pigeon holes and are set into niches and look nice and work with relative efficiency over against grinding people in the gears. The gears, you know, may mesh nicely, but that only means you come out in smaller particles at the end.

That would be a fear, particularly with the organizationally minded nature of the present administration in the province. There is always here, on the other side, the mention by the committee of the freeing of ministers from responsibilities so that they may dedicate a greater portion of their time, number one, to thought; and number two, to people.

That bemuses me. It seems to me that working into the heart of the system is the creating of a great lacuna or emptiness, the emptiness that is being filled up by the Provincial Secretary for Resources, for instance, or the lamentable emptiness which one feels more than one can put his finger upon, arising out of the Minister of Justice, now the provincial secretary. He seems to be beside himself and to have very little or nothing to do.

I would like to know what these gentlemen really do propose to do in their leisure, in, as this text says, "their coming to meet the

future, their anticipation of trends." Are they going to become sociologists? They would certainly have to be made over from the kind of men they are presently now—ad hoc fellows who adapt themselves to every wind that blows, seeking to get the best effect and to garner in the greatest credit and the most votes.

As far as ranging over the contemporary scene, adapting to it, meeting its demands, and again as I said in an earlier speech today, seeking to breathe a bit of the joie de vivre and blithe spirit and the life force into the thing so that human possibility will be expanded, it seems to me that they have a vacuum. This is not the kind of person.

Do they intend to consult with Herman Kahn and spend some time at the institute down on the Hudson? Has the Minister of Resources, the Provincial Secretary for Resources, been spending his days and nights reading "Future Shock?" Apart from the Prime Minister's rather skirmishing and passing references to Buckminster Fuller, is it his intention to have him in an advisory capacity in this government? Just what is all this stuff about?

It seems to me the other way around. Three very good men, on the whole—have now been kicked upstairs in a fashion, and their role and function are going to be sorely missed in the hands, by and large, of less capable people. This is a shame from your own internal point of view in the government.

So looking over the reformulation, while we are willing to give it a chance to see how it operates, we think that, functionally speaking, it can bring some benefits if the right men are filling the job, that it does open up the paths to creativity. I hope it brings the kind of creativity I discussed earlier, that you do go to meet the future and welcome it and not be afraid of your own powers and not regret government and not hold back against urgent necessities the crying needs the people give you.

You're there to serve the people, not to withhold in some aristocratic, aloof way; in your privileged zeal to forfend and fortify all vested interests over here, who won't give an inch. You're in that other position where you serve a greater realm and you have a wider constituency to give your attention to. You meet the needs of your people, even if it means the expansion of government; even if that will mean, as it will inevitably mean, it must mean, that the problem in future is not socialism, it is whether it will be democratic or not. Therefore, you adopt some of our stances and take the same positive and open approaches to the future and to what is requisite in the contemporary economy to make it operate—it won't operate as it presently is. It is going downhill.

The whole fight on the ecological issue—there is a straight conflict there. The whole business of levelling off economic growth and seeking some stabilization so that these resources will not be eaten up is part of this thinking process that must be adapted to. The zero growth rate problem must be contended with and contended with very quickly.

The business of waste, the sheer waste in the economy, when men are unemployed, when the economy is not working at its potential—and our economy never does except, again, in time of war. It's always working at something like 60 per cent of what it could do. If it did what it could do, half the nations in the world would be living in clover. No, that is not the way of this system. It is too tight, too close to the chest and too invidious, too greedy, to extend this generosity and benefits unless it is rewarded in the first instance and above all.

The work of the policy ministers does open an enormous function in terms of meeting the needs of the time through the best thinking that goes on in the population. It means a willingness to reorient radically all their notions; and if that is their function and purpose, thank heavens! It may bring a new life and a new spirit to the government of Ontario instead of the digging in of heels and the repression and the business of clobbering people in order to bring law and order into being, and the coercive intelligence and the restrictive measures; all the things that diminish the growth of the spirit.

The second thing it does is to open the ministers, in some kind of vague and totally amorphous notion, to rapport with the general public. Somehow these ministers are going to be free to deal in a more direct way with the constituency, with the citizen body at large. Does that mean that they go on the dried-up chicken circuit? That they are eating the same kind of peas every night? What does it mean in terms of circulation?

Does it mean that they are prepared to work more closely with committees, to make a more conjoint effort to welcome people

here and have discussions with them, with those belonging to various representative groups in the community? Just what does it mean? Is this to be an exercise in fatuity too?

I mean the pleasantries of discussion; the Parkinson's Law of filling up the time available with some task that may or may not have any great significance.

All these things pass through our minds when we see the reorienting of the present; the destroying, in effect, of six ministries; the incapsulation of them. We would have thought that, at an earlier time, while giving credence to this new scheme that there were altogether too many ministries. Many of them could be brought together; but what this does is lift into a kind of empyrean—and an empty empyrean at that it seems at the moment—a number of ministers without anything particularly to do.

And then the trading of notes, the taking in of each other's washing, the proliferation of memos that must pass between them. The Treasurer sits on the policies and priorities committee and he also sits, as does the Chairman of the Management Board, on both committees, and the ministers meet him. They come back. They go along the hallway and they duck into a different door and they have a little discussion in there. Then they retire to the washroom. Then they come back into the library and they sit around. There are sometimes six and there are sometimes eight and they talk to one another. I suppose they get so fed up talking to one another they wouldn't be seen dead talking to one another at dinner.

This is the kind of feeling one gets about it. The make-work possibilities are out of this world and that gives them the sense of actually moving, of some life actually being there. The trading of notes and the ongoing internal discussions become almost an end in themselves, an endless Sisyphean toil, rolling the rock up the hill and letting it fall down again.

I don't know how you seek to avoid all that sort of thing which seems to be built into this new notion—the sheer business of talking for the sake of talking without trying to come to grips with issues—unless you have men of a considerable thrust and creativity, who are vitally concerned with the issues of the day and simply not reposing their fannies in lucrative offices and so forth, and taking the easy way out and the line of least resistance.

If that is the kind of men then this thing will not work. The whole thing will capsize and we will watch it with the greatest interest. We are mesmerized by the way in which the thing is developing at the present time. I am sure that you over there feel as experimental, as tentative and as unsure of yourselves with respect to how the thing should really operate, as we on this side of the House. We will give it a chance and watch it for the next few months.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of very erudite debate about this bill. Talking about giving it a chance, the hon. member for Lakeshore—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Singer: I'm sorry I missed all the—

Mr. MacDonald: No possibility for erudition. We knew what was coming.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York South is still smarting. I'm sorry that they knifed him in the back a couple of years ago, but the member for Riverdale did it and it happened and it's too bad; but I'm sorry he is so sensitive.

Mr. MacDonald: Why doesn't the member deal with the issue?

An hon. member: Coming right up, coming right up!

Mr. Singer: Well if the member would just give me a chance. I get so nervous when I'm heckled. I wish you'd let me speak and not interrupt me.

Mr. Renwick: He is easily derailed.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the member for Lakeshore said something about giving this bill a chance. I don't think we've really got much choice. The bill is here and it's important for government that it be passed. I would predict, without taking very much of a gamble, that it will be passed.

And it really doesn't matter whether it is passed or not, because the system has come into being and we see it here. Whether the ministers have the statutory authority contained in this Act or whether they don't, the whole system is started for better or for worse; and I say it's for worse, Mr. Speaker, because as we sit here and try to figure what goes on in government we are less far ahead then we were before the new system had started.

You've heard about the management experts introducing a system of expert management into government and the Premier obviously has bought it and has initiated it. He wants new jobs, he wants new titles for all of his friends and he's spread them around pretty well. You'll be hearing in due course about the four or five of the Tory backbenchers, the 78 of them, who haven't got some extra pay. It's a pity, but I'm sure within the four walls of this statute, or something else that he'll invent, he'll look after those few who haven't been looked after yet, and that I guess is the object of the whole exercise. Let's give everyone a new title. Let's give everyone some extra pay.

And it really doesn't matter because two people are going to run the government—Bill and Darcy, and that's it. Bill and Darcy run the government, and nobody else has anything really to say about it, anything really to decide or any real influence or authority. And no one knows anything, Mr. Speaker, because we can't get any answers. And when Bill or Darcy are backed into the corner, Bill or Darcy don't answer either.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the hon. member to use the proper decorum in the chamber and refer to the ministers properly.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Darcy better be careful.

Mr. Singer: Oh well, all right. If, Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of members named Bill or Darcy, perhaps—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He is right on there; he is right on.

Mr. Singer:—I should refer to the hon. member for Chatham and the hon. member for Peel South. The power lies in two gentlemen who—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, I don't mind the dialogue of the member for Downsview, it really is very constructive, very helpful—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Meaningless slogans!

Hon. Mr. Davis:—but when he is going to refer to me, in that I just want to protect the interests of my colleague from Peel South (Mr. Kennedy), please designate me as the member for Peel North. In at least that aspect I hope he could be somewhat accurate.

Mr. MacDonald: This is his minor erudition.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peel North is in fact quite correct, and if I've cast any aspersions on the hon. member for Peel South I apologize to the hon. member for Peel South.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would not want him to be in any way insulted.

An hon. member: Just off target.

Mr. Singer: Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the new regime has taken over and the titles are spread around, the jobs are spread around.

We don't know quite what they are; we can't get anything from the secretaries. The best contribution we had the other day was a treatise on what goes on on the beaches of Cuba. I think that's very important. I think it's important that we should know how we cut sugar cane. I think that's of great importance.

I have been waiting, Mr. Speaker, with great interest for some meaningful suggestions to emanate from the Provincial Secretary for Justice, who now has nothing to do except sit and ruminate and come forward with new ideas. He has produced one. Something about control of offtrack betting, which was substantially a summary of ideas that were put forward by the opposition some 2½ years ago and which he adopted almost entirely, after having taken a lengthy trip through Asia and Europe and all over the world.

He came back with the idea and said, "Isn't it wonderful that we have thought of this all by ourselves?" But have we heard either from the Provincial Secretary for Justice or from the Attorney General (Mr. Bales), he is no longer the Minister of Justice, or from the Solicitor General (Mr. Yaremko), about things of current importance?

I don't know whose responsibility it is—I see the new Solicitor General is going to be responsible for the Lightning Rods Act, and I would think that we could look for some exceptional new ideas about location and safety insofar as—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He may even strike twice in the same place.

Mr. Singer: —lightning rods are concerned. But we haven't heard anything, Mr. Speaker, about such matters of importance as the reorganization of coroner's courts. We really haven't heard anything at all from the Attorney General about what he is going to do about the dismal condition of the courts at the city hall in Toronto. The Provincial

Secretary for Justice the other day said that he had discovered that it was terrible. But it gets worse day by day and nothing is done about it. We haven't heard a single new theory in the field of the administration of Justice since this new organization came about.

And really, Mr. Speaker, what is the significance of this statute, it is meaningless. The fact is, we used to have a minister around here a few years ago whom we called the minister of everything; well we've got another one now. As you know, the minister of everything no longer represents the riding of Riverdale, he now represents the riding of Chatham-Kent. It's a change of faces.

The power all resides with two people, surrounded and buttressed by a mass of civil servants—74, or 75, 76, 77, 78, the latest count isn't available this afternoon—but everybody gets paid, that's the important thing. So you keep them quiet because you give them extra pay for extra little jobs and nobody bothers anybody.

Occasionally, people like the member for Victoria-Haliburton, who hasn't got caught up in this great giveaway programme, will get up and be mildly critical. But that's about all, because the member for Victoria-Haliburton has been around long enough to recognize that probably the mantle has passed him by. It's not too likely that he is going to be a parliamentary assistant, or a minister of one of these new departments that may or may not have something to do, and so he feels that maybe he should get up and get some of these things off his chest and he makes a very mildly critical speech. But, Mr. Speaker, is the cause of government in Ontario going to be better served by this statute? I think not.

Are we, in Municipal Affairs for instance, going to have any authority left in the municipalities, or is it all left with—I was going to say Darcy again, but I won't—is it all left with the hon. member for Chatham-Kent, who sends with his own hand messages to the chairman of the Municipal Board? Rather interestingly, I did bother to look through Hansard a while back and noted that a series of ministers of Municipal Affairs over the years used to get up and say, with great pride, that the Municipal Board was independent and that they didn't want to interfere with it and that it would make up its own mind in its own way and it was a separate arm of government and it had responsibilities and so had the cabinet ministers.

Well all that seems to have gone. We haven't even got a Department of Municipal Affairs any more, for a minister. It is all thrown into Darcy and Darcy is rapidly gathering so many things under his umbrella that he has no time really to come into the House or to talk with us any more. So it's very hard, Mr. Speaker—I am sorry, I made that same mistake again—the hon. member for Chatham-Kent really doesn't have time to come to us and tell us if there is any theory about how municipalities should be run, except as he determines from time to time and from day to day. He concerns himself about the construction of new commercial and industrial developments in Toronto in advance of the Municipal Board having dealt with them. I don't know, is the Municipal Board merely an extension of the left arm or the right arm of the hon. member from Chatham? Or is there really any point in having municipal councils any more?

I can't really let an opportunity like this pass, Mr. Speaker, without saying a word or two about Spadina. One has to wonder again, Mr. Speaker, whether there is going to be any municipal autonomy and whether or not a decision made by a municipal council or a series of municipal councils, and all the planning that has gone on for many years, is going to be lightly set aside by ministerial action without any alternative being presented. One has to wonder about this. Who is responsible? Is it the Municipal Board? Or are these memos going to keep flowing from the hon. member from Chatham on to the other voice of government?

Mr. Speaker, by and large this debate on the second reading of this bill is comparatively meaningless, because the government isn't going to change a word. Whatever they are going to do they have already begun doing. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre, from being a very useful member of this assembly, has turned into an almost useless appendage.

Mr. Lewis: Carleton East it is. The hon. member for Ottawa Centre remains as useful as ever.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the member was right the first time.

Mr. Singer: Well, I mean the one who just was off on his little trip.

The Provincial Secretary for Justice hasn't really made any contribution; and the hon. member for St. Catharines, I suppose is thinking about educational matters.

I would like to have seen one of these new provincial secretaries, other than the hon. member from Chatham, get up in the Throne Speech debate or in this debate and say: "I now have a job that I can understand. These are some of the things that we are worrying about. These are some of the problems that we are wrestling with. We are going to bring to the Legislature a series of new ideas and new suggestions that really will co-ordinate the particular fields that have been assigned to us." But there has been nothing like that, nothing like that at all.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, certainly we must oppose this bill. But opposition to it really is like banging one's head against a brick wall. The deed is done, the government is determined that these new titles and the new pays that go with them are going to be perpetuated. They are going to look after all their friends. And, don't worry, the hon. members for Peel North and for Chatham-Kent have everything under control. It doesn't matter if you don't know what is going on; they will do what is good for you.

They are digging themselves in, and it is going to be a while yet before the public will have a chance to assess. It was a pretty good con game they started in advance of the last election, but they got away with it. I don't think they'd get away with it again.

I couldn't let this opportunity go by, Mr. Speaker, without saying what I think about the new system of government. It has taken government away from the people. It has given it to two or three people on the government benches and the rest of us can be damned. The public can go wherever people go and the government sends them; there it is. This bill should not pass. The government should come back a little closer to the people instead of being taken away from them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there are only two points I want to make, but I can't withhold a brief comment on the contribution of the Liberal Party to this debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought the member was going to save me that pleasure.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Downsview has said something about the government having conned them. As a matter of fact, if all it had to cope with—and this is the problem; it clutters up the political scene in this province—was the Liberal Party, it's no wonder that the government continues to be able to con the public.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: Oh, the member is getting pretty weak!

Mr. MacDonald: We have listened, Mr. Speaker, to the leader of the Liberal Party –

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): No, they have not.

Mr. MacDonald: –delivering more speeches on government reorganization than any other single issue in the last year. Now he disagrees with some of it and there's such a massive opposition to government reorganization over there that nobody else in that party is willing to contribute except the hon. member for Downsview. He has really nothing to contribute, but I know of nobody who can speak at greater length the less he has to say.

Mr. Gaunt: You too!

Mr. MacDonald: So he rose and in a sort of high-school debating fashion he has now given the backup speech to the leader on government reorganization; the main preoccupation of the Liberal Party. Well Mr. Speaker, let's forget about them because no wonder they are passing all too slowly off the Ontario scene.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: At least, Mr. Speaker, I am glad I have got them into this debate. We now know they are alive again.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Hopefully with a little substance, there are two areas that I want to isolate and focus on briefly. I don't intend to speak generally about the COGP, or generally with regard to the whole thrust of the government's reorganization. That has been done by many other speakers, including the Leader of the Opposition.

An hon. member: And much better than you!

Mr. MacDonald: And therefore, within that context, I want to isolate just two areas. I remember John Robarts saying many times that one of the problems of government was that you had such a proliferation of interdepartmental committees trying to cope with the problem of horizontal relationship between departments that have at least some

overlap in their function. With such a proliferation of committees everybody was busy attending committee meetings before the administration could proceed to implement any programme that spanned the borders between two of these vertical departments.

I remember, for example, the kind of study that was done by Processor Krueger as he zeroed in on the whole question of regional development in the Province of Ontario. He came forth with a study which had almost Gilbert and Sullivan overtones in terms of its analysis of the confusion and empire-building and the internecine warfare that went on between a couple of departments, and so on.

His plea, his answer was, that in such a major area of government policy, you should have an interdepartmental committee under the Prime Minister, with somebody heading it up whose position would be the equivalent of a deputy minister—responsible directly to the Prime Minister. Therefore he would have the power to knock the cabinet heads together because the cabinet ministries involved in this interdepartmental co-operation would know that he was acting on behalf of the man who had the power to knock their heads together—namely the Prime Minister.

We never really got around to that. We got close to it on one or two occasions. But because of this fundamental problem of no horizontal relationship, there emerged from this committee of technocrats within the government and businessmen—who brought certain areas of skill that were useful if you sought efficiency and efficiency alone, but were so incapable of grasping political subtleties—there emerged this proposition of superministers.

Quite frankly, I share the misgivings with regard to whether or not this is going to be an effective solution. So far it has done nothing so much as to destroy three of the major cabinet ministers who, if they are doing something, nobody can find out exactly what it is. It is increasingly obvious that they are not certain what they are doing and what they should be doing. I don't think it is going to work. But even if it did work, Mr. Speaker, what puzzles me is that the government really hasn't gotten at the fundamental problem.

It is one thing to have a superminister who is going to draw together those departments that have some share of common responsibility and to think in terms of the policy conceptions that would span those various departments; that is one function. But as the leader of the New Democratic Pary has indicated, you can't really separate that function from administration. In separating it you really haven't come to grips with the real problem, for the real problem is the need for interdepartmental co-ordination in the fulfilment of any policy decision you make.

I ask the simple question: How are you going to avoid a new creation of interdepartmental committees for the implementation of the programmes, after you have figured out what the programmes should be at the superminister level? It seems to me that you have stopped halfway; indeed you have only covered the less important half of the job, because the superministers are really going to be deciding with certain areas which traditionally have been cabinet responsibility and involving more than one cabinet minister.

The government has sort of broken it down into areas and said to each one of those ministers, "Fine, you concentrate in that particular area." They are really doing part of the traditional overall cabinet job. I have yet to see in this government reorganization the mechanism for the interdepartmental co-ordination of the implementation of the programme which is the most important thing in the final analysis, other than a new proliferation of interdepartmental committees.

I would appreciate from the Prime Minister some clarification on this when he concludes the debate, as I assume he will.

The second, and the even more disturbing point—quite frankly, I do not know whether this was a flight of fancy on the part of the members of COGP or whether it is a really meaningful new line of thinking. I am almost persuaded it is the latter, because quite frankly some of the public pronouncements outside this House, particularly by the provincial Treasurer, suggest in his philosophic outpourings that he is documenting the point I now want to draw attention to.

One of the premises upon which the COGP predicated its recommendations was the proposition that there should be a sharp delineation between policy formation and programme delivery. This is the reason why the government has its policy ministers. They are doing the co-ordination and working out the policy and the ministries are going to be preoccupied—and then the real question is, with what? With what are the departmental ministers going to be preoccupied? Because let me draw your attention to a statement on page 50 of the third interim report: "The programme delivery of the ministries would be exclusively in the hands of boards, agencies and commissions."

On the next page it goes off into another concept which is somewhat different but not fundamentally different—the whole concept of reprivatization. This business-oriented committee has a great preoccupation with contracting out. It is the kind of approach that so many businesses have and this government has resorted to in getting somebody else to do the job so that it can undercut its own employees and can destroy the solidarity of the civil service and any union group. This is allegedly going to tap new areas of flexibility and new areas of community involvement and new areas of imaginative contribution to the delivery of the programmes. The government is increasingly going to send out the work to be done to agencies, boards and commissions, some of which will be in the public sector; and many of which, if we are to believe this document, are going to be in the private sector.

They have even coined a magnificent new word for it – reprivatization. It took me about two days to be able to get my tongue around the word. It is the most unlovely product to appear in a long, long time – reprivatization. As a matter of fact, it is a reminder of some of the things I used to see back in the rural concessions.

An hon. member: The House of Parliament.

Mr. MacDonald: But I ask you, Mr. Speaker –

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is that parliamentary?

Mr. Lawlor: It is not.

Mr. Deans: It is necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what exactly is the government up to? I quote once again the words of this report:

> In other words, the ministry concept described earlier would be maintained with the exception that delivery of the programmes of the ministry would be exclusively in the hands of boards, agencies and commissions.

One of the things that I have paid tribute to, with regard to the COGP, is that I think some of the effectiveness that is going to flow from this report is because it is made up of people who had some relationship to government.

I could understand that statement coming from businessmen. This is just a therapeutic exercise on the part of businessmen always to suggest that governments cannot do things and it should be shuffled back into the private sector. Indeed, the provincial Treasurer goes around the province with his philosophic outpourings backing up that kind of concept all the time. But I cannot excuse that kind of proposition coming from five or six of the top civil servants who, indeed, are now responsible for many of the ministries at the policy level. Indeed, the executive director of the COGP, as I understand it, is now in the Prime Minister's office masterminding the implementation of the COGP recommendations. Well we will find out what he is in there for then—the Premier shakes his head—at some other time.

But the words are there—that "the delivery of programmes will be exclusively in the hands of boards, agencies and commissions." And I repeat, when you tie that in with the concept of reprivatization out to the private sector, I wonder whether ultimately, when you have really completed this, the ministers in the departments that are supposed to be delivering the programmes will have anything more to do than sit and think, like the superministers. Not only will the policy formation be away off somewhere but the delivery is going to be away out in boards, agencies and commissions.

I think it is about time that the Premier or somebody clarified these rather ambiguous sections and indicate whether there is any basis to the comments of some of his most important colleagues, like the provincial Treasurer, suggesting that credence should be put in these phrases.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In spite of the fact that I agree with the member for Downsview that probably there is not going to be a single word changed in the bill, I felt that one should not let an opportunity go by without putting in two cents' worth.

Hon. Mr. Davis: How much worth did the member say?

Mr. Roy: Two cents, just two cents. It is nice of the Premier to stick around as well, for two cents.

The member for York South mentioned that this party had been advocating reorganization of government. Obviously he hasn't understood what proposals we were putting forth and he doesn't seem to under-

stand what proposals are being put forth now, and I suppose that is one of the reasons he is sitting where he is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, what I can't seem to understand is the party to my left and especially the member for Lakeshore going on with his philosophical explanation of how these things are going to work and how he could, after this sort of dissertation, possibly vote for this bill if he doesn't know what this thing is going to do.

Mr. Reid: Well, that is the way they operate.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the reservation that I have about the bill is that no matter how good the legislation is—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He is after his leader's job now.

Mr. Roy: No, no.

Mr. Martel: Another one in the leadership race.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the problem with the legislation is that no matter how good the legislation is we still have the same players involved, the same crew. You see, the Premier of this province at election time talked about a new image—sort of a new crowd coming into focus—and no matter how good the legislation is we still have the same ball players.

Mr. Reid: They send them to different countries.

Mr. Ruston: They elevated some pretty poor ones.

Mr. Roy: And the Premier will certainly understand this analogy—he often mentions the Maple Leafs and the act of faith it takes to support this particular team—if one were to change the name and call it the Boston Bruins and not change the players, one would still lose, you see, and that is the problem with this piece of legislation.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): They haven't got a Bobby Orr over there.

Hon Mr. Davis: I'll have you know Boston is a great winner.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at the performance of the superministers or the provincial secretaries over the past month to have some concern, because there seems to be a deliberate effort in this way, a slick way, to move the executive arm of government away from its legislative responsibility—and we have seen it!

How can one not have apprehension when we look at the superministers or the provincial secretaries sort of bouncing off questions, or possibly not even attending the House.

I can have a certain amount of sympathy for the member for Carleton East, who sat there for the last month not having anything to do, not really having any performance in this House. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it is out of pure frustration that he decided to have a trip to Cuba. He wanted some action and action he got.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: His deputy suggested it to get him in the news.

Mr. Roy: According to the provincial secretary he not only got action in Cuba, he got it when he got back here.

An hon. member: Everything but a holiday.

Mr. Roy: I can only echo the words of my leader about the overwhelming responsibility or weight of government that has been put on the provincial Treasurer. We look on one hand at the responsibility for federal-provincial relations, the responsibility for communication with municipalities, and I don't think I can be as kind, even as my leader, as to suggest that perhaps it's not only a question of capability because the Treasurer has got too many duties. I suggest to you, that in the past the provincial Treasurer has not exactly been the biggest fan of the federal government or in any federal-provincial relations—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Mr. Roy: —and he has not made too many friends with the municipalities either and yet he has got all these responsibilities.

On the other hand, we have the Provincial Secretary for Justice. I quite agree with the frustration of the leader of the New Democratic Party when he stood up in the House some weeks ago and asked the Provincial Secretary for Justice what he does, because it was always my understanding that the Attorney General's department was not all that heavy. But all at once it seems to have been broken down. We have the provincial secretary and, as the member for Downsview said: "What has he done except run around

the world a little bit looking at offtrack betting?"

Mr. Haggerty: Right from the horse's mouth.

Mr. Roy: We have the present Attorney General, whose performance we saw a couple of weeks ago, as well his performance when he was Minister of Labour and that slick little deal that was pulled with the Workmen's Compensation Board. We now have, as well, a Solicitor General—this same gentleman who had problems with the Indians before, now has got the police. That's quite a switch. It is going to be interesting to observe for the next while.

Mr. Haggerty: The member will meet him outside the door.

Mr. Roy: Then I understand we have under the same Provincial Secretariat of Justice, the Ministry of Correctional Services. How many correctional institutions does that minister have to look after?

Mr. Haggerty: They need them over there.

Mr. Roy: Has he got four or five?

Mr. Haggerty: The minister will need them there.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: The member should do a little more homework.

Mr. Roy: He's got how many?

Hon. Mr. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Four? The member's got to be kidding. About 70.

Mr. Roy: Seventy institutions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Oh, if you start counting the local jails, he doesn't even have to bother with that. They look after themselves.

We have these ministers on the one hand who have all the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: We have these ministers on the one hand, Mr. Speaker, who have these overwhelming responsibilities, and we have individuals on the other hand and we have no idea what they are doing. I can only say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this slick exercise by the government is just—

An hon. member: A gamble!

Mr. Roy: —another game of chess where the players are being moved around; but it's the same crowd, the same crew, and hopefully if we keep adding our two cents' worth once in awhile we'll get to the people.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. The Premier made an undertaking, I think when he introduced the bill last fall, or during the brief session we had, in which he indicated he would be making a statement with regard to government reorganization as it affected Northern Affairs. I am wondering if there is anything in this legislation that will ensure that the responsibility for the Northern Affairs offices will remain with the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Mr. Martel: If they don't all get pulled down first.

Mr. Stokes: He indicated in the preface to the annual report of the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs that this was subject to change and that it could become a part of the Treasurer's responsibility on intergovernmental affairs. I'm wondering since the Premier is aware of the sensitivity of this issue, inasmuch as the people in the north feel that—

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): They are just after suffering from the government.

Mr. Stokes: —there should be one government department that has overall responsibility for administering what we normally refer to in the north as northern affairs, is the Premier prepared to give that undertaking now, that that will remain with the present minister who has that responsibility?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I just have one or two brief comments. One is, I'd like to draw the Premier's attention to the fact that, on the face of the bill, the bill is introduced by the Hon. W. G. Davis, Premier, and on page 1 of the bill itself, part 2, it's under the aegis, I suppose, of the Prime Minister. I wonder if he could, perhaps, explain this. He's getting almost as schizophrenic as my friends on the left there, and perhaps it was just a misprint somewhere along the line.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I really was going to give the hon. member for Downsview this great news. There is a very real possibility that, when this piece of legislation gets into committee, I may personally move a very significant amendment, where, under part 2, the name "Prime Minister" may be altered to that of "Premier," which just proves to the hon. member for Downsview that we are prepared to make alterations.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Downsview will vote against it. He'll vote against that, won't he?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to participate in the debate? If not, the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that all of us are anxious to return here sharp at 8 o'clock, and in that my contribution may exceed the five minutes that are left, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 28, 1972

Use of government plane by cabinet ministers, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Singer, Mr. Shulman, Mr. Roy, Mr. Stokes 649

Location of new airport, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 652

Pre-budget briefing, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Cassidy 653

Employment situation for casual workers, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Shulman 654

Cost of land for WCB building, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 655

Eligibility for housing assistance to residents outside Sudbury, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Martel 656

Rescinding of forgivable loan to Northern Electric Co., question of Mr. White: Mr. Lewis 656

Northern Ontario Development Corp., questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence and Mr. White: Mr. Stokes 657

Death of Claude Gervais, question of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 657

Judge Ross Inquiry on egg marketing, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Gaunt 657

Hydro development on the Madawaska River, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. R. F. Nixon 657

Post-audit functions of Provincial Auditor, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Roy, Mr. R. F. Nixon 658

Farm tax rebate, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Spence 659

Industrial Safety Act, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Gisborn 659

Gertler report, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Good 659

Brooker Trade Bindery Ltd., question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 659

Hydro transmission corridor in Pickering airport area, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer 660

Nursing Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Paterson, first reading 661

Child Welfare Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 661

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne: Mr. Lawlor 661

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 671

Reorganization of the Government of Ontario, bill to provide for, Mr. Davis, on second reading 671

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Davis, agreed to 695

Recess, 6 o'clock 695



No. 19



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, March 28, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By his own hand, W. R. Macdonald, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1973, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, March 28, 1972.

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 1.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, the budget for 1972 which I am presenting today reflects the confidence of this government in the strength of our economy and the future of our province. It maintains the momentum of Ontario's actions to restore full employment. It seeks to foster maximum expansion in private sector activity and investment. It purposefully slashes the growth in provincial spending and reorders our priorities to meet urgent social needs. It increases our financial aid to local government. It accelerates our programme of tax reform by redistributing property tax burdens on the basis of ability to pay. It preserves responsible financing by raising taxes in selective areas. And it reinforces the new government organization which will lead to more efficient and better public services for our people.

I am confident that the positive fiscal programme contained in this budget will commend itself to the members and to the people of Ontario. The substantial, but manageable, deficit which I am proposing will stimulate economic recovery. The rigorous restraint on spending will make room for expansion of private sector activity and curb inflationary forces as the economy moves back to full performance. The reform initiatives will contribute to stronger local governments and a fairer distribution of total tax burdens. This expansionary and progressive overall programme stays within the limits of moderation and will help to bring about renewed prosperity and a better life for all Ontario citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as in previous years, my budget statement is supported by three important budget papers. Budget paper A discusses the course and impact of the Ontario government's fiscal policy in 1970 and 1971 and the economic outlook for 1972, as the bases for our fiscal policy in the coming year. Budget paper B provides full details on the new property tax credit plan to be introduced in 1972. Budget paper C contains the government's financial statements, together with an explanation of the improvements we have made to contribute to a fuller understanding of our financial operations.

In my last budget statement I reported at length on the unsatisfactory course of federal-provincial relations and on the detrimental impact of federal policies on the Ontario economy. In particular, I pointed out that restrictive federal economic policies were driving Ontario's economic growth far below its potential, and creating high levels of unemployment, and that the federal tax reform proposals were impractical and unacceptable. Since that time I am gratified to say the situation has improved considerably. The federal government has adopted a positive and expansionary fiscal policy, has cut taxes, and has legislated a greatly modified and more acceptable tax reform bill. As a result I have been able to construct the 1972 budget with greater confidence in the direction and impact of federal policies.

The past year has been one of intense activity in federal-provincial affairs. In the area of fiscal and financial relations, there were two conferences of first ministers, three meetings of ministers of finance and numerous meetings of officials. Agreement was not reached on constitutional reform and the distribution of powers, nor on improved tax

sharing and a new deal on fiscal arrangements. Progress was made, however, on reform of the tax structure, and the new federal income tax legislation has now been accepted by all provinces.

Let me recapitulate the Ontario government's position on tax reform and fiscal arrangements and outline to the House the approach the government is taking to achieve basic reforms in these two key aspects of federal-provincial relations.

After years of study and debate, a new national income tax system has been legislated and is in operation, thus substantially completing the first stage of tax reform. I am pleased to report that the major contribution of the Ontario government toward this end is partly reflected in the tax changes that have been enacted. Among the major improvements in the new tax legislation that we worked hard to secure are:

Reduced tax rates to ensure that reform will not result in revenue gains to governments;

Reinstatement of an effective tax incentive for Canadian small businesses;

Abandonment of complex and impractical provisions to integrate personal and corporate taxation; and,

Introduction of a simple and competitive capital gains tax.

On the other hand, the new federal legislation falls short of our expectations and our equity and growth objectives in a number of respects. It is not comprehensive reform in that it fails to take into account total federal-provincial-municipal taxes. It ignores completely Canadian families who are too poor to pay income tax. It is generally too complicated for the ordinary taxpayer or small businessman to understand. Its international provisions are too harsh and threaten the desirable expansion of Canadian-based multinational companies. On that matter, I am hopeful that the federal government recognizes the need to introduce amendments to ensure that Canada's tax law is in tune with international economic realities.

The Ontario government has already enacted the personal income tax components of the new federal tax legislation. On the corporate side, however, we delayed implementation until our studies were completed and until we were reasonably confident of the workability and adequacy of the new federal tax provisions. Our analysis confirms that the new federal legislation is cumbersome and intricate but also that it contains a number of definite improvements over the old law. We recognize as well that Ontario corporations would prefer to operate under a system of uniform rules covering both the federal and Ontario taxes. The practical advantages to our corporations of a uniform federal and provincial system outweigh the disadvantages inherent in the new federal legislation.

Accordingly, the Ontario government intends to parallel in its Corporations Tax Act the federal changes affecting corporations—retroactive to Jan. 1, 1972—with the exception of those provisions relating to mining and petroleum companies and to international income. The major changes in mining taxation legislated by the federal government will not take place for a number of years. In the meantime, Ontario is developing a long-term policy on mining taxation along the lines I described in my 1971 budget. My colleague, the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), will be bringing forward these major amendments to our corporations tax legislation in the near future. This complementary action by Ontario will complete the implementation of the first stage of national tax reform.

Reconstruction of the Canadian tax system must now move into a second stage. As the Carter report made clear, income taxation constitutes only part of the total tax system, and the remaining parts are also in need of reform. Indirect taxes such as the federal and provincial sales tax merit particular attention in this second stage of reform because they have a large bearing on individual tax burdens, on economic activity and on government financing. Our system of capital cost allowances also requires thorough reexamination. In pursuing this second stage of tax reform, I believe that one consideration must remain paramount. Whatever changes in indirect taxes and depreciation allowances are made, they should aim to improve the competitiveness of Canadian firms, strengthen our manufacturing and industrial sectors, and promote greater participation by Canadians in our future economic growth.

The clear thrust of tax developments elsewhere in the world, particularly in the European Economic Community and in the United States, is toward liberalization and positive incentives to stimulate business expansion and exports. Canada cannot, Mr. Speaker, afford to lag behind. It is imperative, therefore, that this second round of tax reform be pursued within the context of international taxation with the aim of improving the competitive position of the Cana-

dian economy. The government of Ontario is prepared to co-operate fully with the federal government in developing new tax measures that will achieve this end. Among the options that could be considered are value added taxes similar to those used in Europe and a DISC incentive along the lines adopted by the United States.

It is important that the pitfalls and tensions of the first round of tax reform be avoided during this second stage. In my view, many of the difficulties encountered in overhauling the income tax system, as well as the real shortcomings that remain, can be attributed directly to the unilateral approach to reform adopted by the federal government. Successful tax reform requires full consultation among all the principals involved. I should like to state now, therefore, that the government of Ontario insists that the provinces be involved directly with the federal government in the development of further tax reform measures, and from the beginning of the process.

At successive meetings of finance ministers over the past year, the Ontario government joined with the federal government and the other provinces to renegotiate federal-provincial financial arrangements, including tax sharing, cost sharing and equalization. We approached these meetings in the hope that substantial reform of federal-provincial financing could be achieved. Certainly this government is convinced that basic reforms are vitally necessary if the resources of all governments in Canada are to be utilized to provide the maximum in public services and programmes, within realistic levels of taxation. Some progress was made, but I must again report to members that the results of federal-provincial negotiations fell far short of Ontario's expectations and needs.

Earlier statements of the Ontario government at federal-provincial conferences have been tabled in this Legislature. In line with this practice, therefore, I am tabling today "Supplementary Papers on Federal-Provincial Finance," which contain the views presented by Ontario at the February meeting of finance ministers in Jasper, Alta. Without repeating our argument in detail, let me review briefly the province's objectives and stance in these fiscal negotiations.

On tax sharing, the Ontario government seeks a fundamental and overdue reform—a new deal which corrects the existing fiscal imbalance in our Canadian federal system and redistributes future revenue growth fairly and reasonably between the two levels of government. Without greater access to elastic tax resources, the provincial-municipal level of government will not be able to discharge its existing expenditure responsibilities, let alone make adequate provision for emerging public priorities. This fact has, once again, been documented in the latest projections prepared by the continuing committee on fiscal and economic matters.

The federal government has refused up to now to recognize these facts and the inequity of the existing situation. Instead it has counselled the provinces to raise their taxes independently. Ontario has consistently pointed out that such independent taxing provides no real solution to the underlying problem. The provinces and municipalities have already been forced to increase taxes regularly over the past five years to compensate for their inadequate tax capacity. This has driven total tax burdens to a very high level and has compounded the task of reforming the total tax structure. Further independent tax increases, particularly in the income tax field, would simply increase the already excessive level of total income taxation and wipe out any lasting benefits of tax reform to the taxpayers themselves.

To compound the problem, the new income tax system introduced by the federal government involves a steady erosion in provincial revenue yields over the next five years and restricts the real ability of the provinces to use the income tax field in future. Under the new income tax system, the provincial share of revenue growth over time will be lower than under the old system; the provincial tax on dividends will decline absolutely; and the provinces will not share at all in the higher revenue elasticity of the reformed income tax structure. In short, once the federal guarantee has expired the provinces will be forced to increase their income tax rates merely to regain the revenue potential and tax sharing position they formerly enjoyed. This is totally unacceptable to Ontario.

Accordingly, we advanced in Jasper a two-part plan for reform of tax sharing over the next five years—a plan which is fair, realistic and well within the financial capacity of the federal government to accept. Only with such a solution to tax sharing can we hope to maintain a truly national income tax system in Canada, one which serves the needs of the provinces as well as the federal government.

On cost sharing, the Ontario government is convinced of the need to assume full pro-

vincial responsibility for the established shared-cost programmes in exchange for fiscal equivalence. As I said in my last budget, such a fundamental restructuring of current arrangements would produce many benefits, with no financial gain or less to either level of government.

It would enhance accountability, flexibility and priority-setting at both levels of government.

It would promote efficiency, eliminate anomalies and greatly simplify intergovernmental finance.

It would eliminate excessive administrative overhead and bureaucratic machinery at both levels of government.

It could be achieved for Ontario without disadvantage to any other province that chose to continue in shared-cost programmes, as demonstrated by the case of Quebec.

These reasons are all summed up in the basic principle of public finance that the government responsible for spending should also be responsible for raising the necessary revenues. At the present time, Ontario receives some $1 billion in federal shared-cost contributions, involving 52 individual programmes spread among 13 Ontario departments. Against this background of a multiplicity of joint programmes and sharing formulas, as well as myriad interdepartmental connections between our two levels of government, there appears to be no other common-sense solution.

We are encouraged that the Prime Minister of Canada, in response to Ontario's arguments, stated that the federal government has no objections to the principle of moving to full provincial responsibility and accountability in these spending areas. What must be agreed upon, then, is the appropriate fiscal equivalence, and a practical programme-by-programme timetable for realizing this desirable reform. We intend to initiate bilateral discussions with the federal government as soon as possible to work out the details for assuming full responsibility for existing shared-cost programmes.

On equalization, let me reiterate the firm position of the Ontario government. We agree fully with the continuation and expansion of equalization payments to provinces having an inadequate fiscal base. We support continued efforts to improve the equalization formula in order to make it as consistent and fair as possible. Moreover, we do not believe that any plan of guaranteed income transfers to people would adequately replace equalization transfers to governments as a means of ensuring a reasonable level of public services in all provinces. We are equally convinced, however, that the entire bundle of federal policies to reduce regional disparities and redistribute public resources in Canada has not produced concrete results commensurate with the resources committed.

Ontario has proposed, therefore, that all federal programmes for regional redistribution—relocation grants, tax concessions, regional development subsidies, implicit equalization in cost sharing, selective expenditure policies and equalization payments per se—should be analysed and discussed openly to determine their total costs and benefits. In this way, duplication could be eliminated, programmes working at cross-purposes could be rationalized, and Canadian taxpayers would be assured that their money was being used effectively to achieve a better regional balance in our Canadian federation.

In 1969 my predecessor, the hon. Charles MacNaughton, tabled in the House the Ontario government's white paper on provincial-municipal structure and tax reform. In my budget last year I reported on the substantial progress we had made in implementing this plan. This budget contains major new initiatives in the provincial-municipal sphere.

The government's reform programme will proceed simultaneously on two fronts. First, we will continue our programme of taxation and financial reform to reduce the property tax burden and distribute it more equitably among taxpayers. Second, we will establish new regional governments and make other structural changes to modernize our local governments and permit broader-scale planning and improved services. These balanced changes will move us much closer toward realization of the long-run goals that the Ontario government set for itself in 1969.

The Ontario government will introduce this year a property tax credit plan which relates the property tax burden borne by each taxpayer in Ontario to his ability to pay, as determined under the personal income tax system. For three years Ontario has pressed the federal government to incorporate a credit against property taxes within the basic income tax system. Now, the federal government has agreed to administer this plan, beginning with the 1972 taxation year, and the Ontario government will finance it for the benefit of Ontario taxpayers. For this positive decision I sincerely thank the Minister of Finance of Canada. I would also like to commend the Department of National

Revenue which worked closely with us to iron out the administrative and operational details of our property tax credit plan. This, in my view, is an excellent example of how two levels of government can work together harmoniously.

Our property tax credit plan has one primary objective: to produce a fairer and more progressive distribution of the property tax burden borne by individuals and families in Ontario. It will replace the basic shelter grants that have been in effect since 1968 and deliver from the regressive property tax, according to individual needs. The specific tax credit formula that will be incorporated in the 1972 income tax form is $90, plus 10 per cent of property tax paid, minus one percent of taxable income, up to a maximum credit of $250. Roomers, boarders and renters, as well as homeowners will be eligible for the tax credit but, unlike the basic shelter grants, tax relief will be confined to the principal residence only and to Ontario citizens only.

Ontario's tax credit will deliver substantially greater tax relief to low-income families and individuals and to pensioners and farmers. The position of middle-income taxpayers will remain more or less unchanged, and high-income taxpayers will face an increase in taxes of about $70. The total cost of the tax credit plan will be about $160 million in the first year, or modestly more, as compared to $158 million in property tax relief had we continued the basic shelter grant programme in 1972.

I should like to point out that the province's two additional programmes of special tax relief—the supplementary grants of $50 to $100 for needy pensioners and the 25 per cent tax rebates to farmers—will continue unchanged in 1972. Once the tax credit plan has been in operation for a year, however, we hope to be in a position to replace these special programmes by enriching and modifying the general property tax credit formula. We are also exploring the possibility of extending our tax credit approach to take account of other provincial taxes, such as the retail sales tax and health premiums. Eventually, this approach may also prove to be an effective vehicle for implementing a guaranteed income to the working poor and replacing the present jungle of welfare and income support programmes. The complete details of the Ontario property tax credit plan for 1972 are set out and explained in budget paper B accompanying this budget statement.

Reform of provincial-municipal finance is again accorded a high priority in this budget. For 1972-1973, we have allocated a further $75 million as increased provincial support to local governments in order to reduce the total weight of financing that falls upon the property tax. This increase in permanent provincial support to local governments consists of $47 million in grants to school boards, $16 million in unconditional grants to municipalities and $12 million in grants for urban transit systems.

The increase in education grants for 1972-1973 represents the third step toward our target of 60 per cent provincial support. In 1970-1971, the province raised its support level from 47.9 per cent to 51.5 per cent, and in 1971-1972 further increased it to 55.6 per cent. The additional $47 million we have provided for in 1972-1973 will serve to increase our support to an estimated 58 per cent, and I would hope that a higher percentage will be reached when the final figures are in for 1972-1973.

The $12 million in grants for public transit systems will help to maintain the level of transit fares and reinforce municipal priority-setting in favour of public transit systems. The $16 million increase in unconditional grants will improve the long-run financing position of our municipalities and achieve a better distribution of our unconditional support among municipalities.

The new unconditional grant will be based on a single progressive scale related solely to population, as recommended by the Ontario committee on taxation. It will also reflect the 1971 census of population and recognize the costs of providing police services. Full details of these changes will be provided when the requisite legislation is brought forward immediately following this budget.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to stress the beneficial impact of Ontario's continuing reform programme on municipal finance and property taxation. As I have said, our additional reform measures for 1972-1973 will shift $75 million of the total financial burden from local governments to the province. This is in addition to the permanent financial support to local governments that was provided by the reform measures in the four previous budgets and the accumulating value over the years of these previous reforms.

The cost of every one per cent increase in our education support, for example, rises from year to year as total school board spending increases. The costs of other reforms also increase in value in each succeed-

ing year after being implemented. Thus the total impact in 1972-1973 of the province's long-run reform programme is measured by the cost of the reforms implemented in the past four years, the accumulating value of these previous reforms and the $75 million in additional reform in this budget.

I can report to members therefore with some pride that Ontario's total reform effort since 1968 has a value to local governments and taxpayers of $585 million in 1972-1973, as shown in a budget table (see appendix). Without this massive and permanent shift in financing from local governments to the province, property taxes in 1972-1973 would have been much higher and or local services would have been greatly reduced. The province is firmly committed to this long-run increase in financial support to local governments in order to minimize the pressure on the regressive property tax.

In addition to the value of our reforms, natural growth increased our basic grants to local governments by some $430 million over the past five years—from $955 million in 1967 to an estimated $1,386 million in 1972. Thus Ontario's overall support to local governments in 1972 will amount to $1,386 million in basic grants plus $585 million in reform, for a total of $1,971 million. This means that more than 50 per cent of local government expenditures in the coming year will be financed by the Ontario government.

Rapid population growth in Ontario's urban areas is forcing governments to make difficult choices between the quality of our environment and our economic standard of living. A major goal of this government, therefore, is to accommodate private economic development within the framework of our policies to improve the quality of life in urban and rural Ontario. The measures which this government is taking to improve the effectiveness of local government organization in Ontario are designed to assist in the achievement of this goal.

These measures are based on three main principles. First, there are simply too many municipalities. The reduction in the number of school boards in the province is a precedent for the kind of rationalization necessary to improve the quality of municipal services. Municipal governments—more than 900 of them—cannot be expected to deal effectively with problems that are common to the residents of wider local areas. Second, there are far too many special-purpose boards and commissions. They obscure the accountability of councils and impede comprehensive priority-setting. Third, decisions made by separated cities or towns and counties affect the same geographic areas and the same people. This problem must be studied carefully to ensure the proper co-ordination of planning decisions.

In applying these principles, I also recognize that the government of Ontario by itself cannot deal effectively with the complex problems of our society. Its partner must be local government, which has a close understanding of local issues.

In the year that I have been Treasurer, I have become more convinced than ever of the need to reform local government structure in Ontario. The purpose of our reform programme is to create strong local governments with the capacity to provide effectively for their own needs, and to relate to neighbouring jurisdictions and the Ontario government on a co-operative and progressive basis.

Accordingly, we are establishing restructured local governments in Sudbury and Waterloo this year, and continuing our studies for other areas of the province. This structural reform will enable these areas to develop and implement an effective planning programme. It will even out substantially the disparities in the tax bases of the area municipalities within these regions. By pooling their resources, these restructured local governments will be better able to deliver the range of services demanded by our people today.

Reform, however, is not being limited to local governments. The structure of the Ontario government has recently been modernized. The new Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs will integrate federal-provincial relations, provincial-municipal relations and regional planning with our general budgetary strategy and economic policy. This in turn should serve to reinforce our reform objectives at the local level.

The present fragmented system of so many decision-makers distorts local decisions and land use policies leading to competition for prestigious developments and assessment dollars at the expense of more rational planning and balanced priorities. It is essential that the province and local government work together in the application of rational land use policies. The new ministry will formally link our regional development and local planning strategies, in areas such as the new community in north Pickering, the Niagara Escarpment and the Wasaga Beach community. The government will be providing $500,000 a year for the next three years to assist municipal councils to adapt their official plans to

the province's overall strategy for the Toronto-centred region.

In addition we will make available provincial personnel to work with municipalities in this undertaking. This reshaping of local government structure and the increase in financial resources will make it possible to assist in the transformation of rural Ontario into urban Ontario in a way that produces the widest possible benefits to all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I turn now to the urgent matter of the economic situation and the measures introduced in this budget to deal with it. When I introduced the government's revised fiscal plan for 1971-1972 on Dec. 13 I said that our objective was the continuing expansion of the economy and a substantial improvement in the unemployment situation. This remains the overriding goal of our economic policy.

One of the most striking lessons of economic stabilization efforts in Canada is that it takes several years to repair the damages caused by a recession, and a return to full employment. We are now going through such a period of economic repair and reconstruction. However, the cost, Mr. Speaker, of past deflationary policies in terms of lost income and lost opportunities will never be fully recovered.

During the past two years there has been a great deal of public concern for improvement in the quality and management of economic policies in Canada. Therefore I am pleased to note the change that has occurred in federal policies for economic stabilization and I hope, Mr. Speaker, we shall never again see a return to the economic philosophy of bringing the country to heel. My view which was shared by the Senate committee on growth, employment and price stability is that governments can achieve better policy co-ordination to improve economic management and thus attain high levels of employment at acceptable rates of inflation.

It is not the view of this government that there are sufficient jobs available if people would only go and look for them.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Could we have some applause for that?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The member asked for it and he got it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Someone needs to wake them up.

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr Winkler: Where does the member for Scarborough West stand on the question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, too many of our citizens have been denied the opportunity to realize their full personal and economic potential because of the lack of jobs and the inadequate rate of economic growth. A genuine full employment policy must bring the economy back to a state of normalcy so that the skills and talents of the population can be fully utilized.

Admittedly the task of regaining full employment is not easy. We recognize that the federal government faces complex policy problems in this regard. However, I would like to repeat now the request Ontario has made at many intergovernmental meetings in the past for fuller consultation in the process of economic policy formulation. Joint policy co-ordination of this kind would produce a total public action to speed economic recovery. For my part I am quite willing to make available to the federal government all the details of the Ontario government's short and long-run economic policies. In the past, too little practical information has been exchanged between the federal and provincial governments in such critical matters as employment policies and long-run industrial development programmes. I am hopeful that this situation will improve in the months ahead.

The economic picture has been improving over the course of the last year. The economy, however, is still performing considerably below its full potential.

In 1971, Ontario's gross provincial product reached $38.1 billion, an increase of about nine per cent over the $35 billion recorded in 1970. The volume of goods and services produced grew by 5.3 per cent compared to 3.5 per cent in the previous year, while prices on the average were up by 3.4 per cent, which was a small but gratifying improvement over the 4.1 per cent increase registered in 1970. In 1972, I expect the GPP to rise by 9.9 per cent to a level of $41.9 billion. The gain in the volume of goods and services produced should be in the order of 6.3 per cent while prices are forecast to rise at last year's rate of 3.4 per cent.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): The Treasurer is dreaming.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not expect a quick end to the problem of unemployment. It seems likely to persist through this year and into 1973. To achieve our three per cent

target we face the difficult and uphill task of absorbing over 70,000 of the persons currently unemployed and of providing new jobs for our rapidly growing labour force. Ontario's population in total is expanding by a little over two per cent a year, but our labour force is growing very much faster. In fact, at the beginning of this year, Ontario's labour force was over five per cent larger than a year ago on a seasonally adjusted basis. This is an exceptional rate of growth, even for Ontario. It has significantly affected the progress of stabilization policy and prolonged the period necessary to achieve full employment.

The expansion of new jobs in the last half of 1971, however, was very encouraging. Employment, seasonally adjusted, rose by about 45,000 jobs a quarter and has pulled ahead of the labour force growth since November. The final quarter of 1971 saw seasonally adjusted employment up 123,000 from last year, and in January and February of this year, the unadjusted data showed an average year-to-year gain of 137,000 jobs. The particularly sharp upswing at year-end and into the first part of 1972 was largely the result of provincial-municipal and federal employment programmes, and the expansionary thrust of fiscal actions and monetary policy.

In October and November of last year, unemployment reached the uncomfortable level of 5.6 per cent, seasonally adjusted.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Very uncomfortable!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since that time, I am pleased to see that it has dropped steadily to its present seasonally adjusted level of 4.5 per cent. The experience of the past indicates that we should realistically expect month-to-month fluctuations around the basic employment trend. My expectation is that for the remainder of 1972 economic growth will generate new jobs at a rate of about 30,000 a quarter, seasonally adjusted. Average employment in 1972, therefore, should be up by close to 120,000 from the average for last year. This is a very healthy rate of increase but I am concerned at the same time by the sheer size of the problem that faces us if the labour force continues to grow at rates in excess of 3.5 per cent a year. Given these basic trends, I am forecasting unemployment in Ontario to average 4.8 per cent in 1972 compared to 5.2 per cent last year.

Mr. MacDonald: Where is the government's three per cent objective?

Mr. Lewis: The government might create a few more jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the budget today, I have designed what I believe to be an appropriate fiscal policy to promote growth and employment within the limits of our financial capacity. I am convinced that it is appropriate to keep Ontario's fiscal policy in an expansionary posture and to keep driving toward the three per cent unemployment target. Any unemployment figure in excess of three per cent is not acceptable to the Ontario government.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): For how many years is the government driving at that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We know from experience that the Ontario economy can operate successfully at that level.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Why is three per cent acceptable?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It seems clear that Canada is facing a very difficult period for several years ahead unless governments can achieve a correct balance between private and public sector expansion. It is not axiomatic that the only way out of an unemployment problem is through inflated public spending. The private sector is still the dominant part of our economy and I believe it now has to take up the considerable expansionary momentum we have provided and carry it forward. The economy needs a period of controlled fiscal thrust, combined with reasonable ease in credit conditions. This will make room for monetary policy to stimulate the job-creating expansion of consumption and business investment. The urgent need now, therefore, is to maintain the province's fiscal policy on a steady course and to avoid at all costs precipitous action that would force federal monetary policy into extreme positions and bring about a return to tight credit conditions.

New jobs require capital investment. I would remind members that every permanent job in this province requires thousands of dollars of investment in machinery, equipment and construction. Members will recall that when governments were hit with the tidal wave of the post-war baby boom they were advised to step up dramatically their capital investments in education facilities. Now these young people need jobs and housing. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that fiscal and monetary policies recognize this

demographic and economic fact. Over the next several years, government policies should be geared to stimulate investment and consumption in the private sector. Only in this way can we create the jobs necessary to absorb the rapid expansion in our labour force.

In developing the Ontario government's role in this optimum growth strategy, we have sought to accomplish two complementary objectives. First, we have sought to stay within prudent financial limits and to avoid fiscal actions that would jeopardize the province's long-term budgetary control. Second, we are working to improve the internal efficiency of government in order to minimize its claim on the economic resources of the province.

The flexible fiscal strategy that the government has followed in the past two years has involved the full use of our financial capacity. Members will appreciate that in order to deal with the unemployment problem our budgetary cycle was accelerated by some six months. The step-up in expenditure levels achieved in 1971-1972 amounted to about half the growth in expenditures that otherwise would have occurred in 1972-1973. Thus, in this budget, we are moving back to trend on the expenditure side, while maintaining an expansionary overall fiscal thrust.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): The government will catch that up four years from now before the election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let me turn briefly now to the full employment budget—

Mr. Lewis: These fiscal thrusts of the Treasurer's.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which puts the total government operation on a national accounts basis—

Mr. Lewis: The cut and thrust of fiscal debate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and therefore provides the best measure of its economic impact.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Even he can't keep it straight.

Mr. Lewis: Sounds kind of erotic.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The full employment deficit will increase from $165 million in the calendar year 1971 to $182 million in calendar year 1972, largely because of the continuing economic thrust of last year's cuts in taxes and the new spending plateau achieved by the special employment programme of 1971.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Called jet propulsion.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This ensures the continuation of a dynamic economic thrust in our fiscal policy.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: This is the most astonishingly Freudian budget we have had in a long time.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Never mind the cut and thrust.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Have the budget presented a year earlier and then take it back.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Some of the thrust we rolled out last October hit its mark, too, yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am also making available this year for the first time a national accounts version of the government's budgetary operations. A more detailed explanation of the relationships between the administrative, cash, national accounts and the full-employment budgets is contained in budget paper A which accompanies this statement.

Let me turn now to the government's expenditure programme for 1972-1973. We have budgeted for net general expenditures of $5,051 million in the coming year. This is an increase, Mr. Speaker, of only 4.5 per cent over last year's expenditures. It indicates the government's firm determination to contain the expenditure growth of existing programmes in order to permit the maintenance of a balanced fiscal and economic policy within the practical constraints of our financial capacity.

Effective control of government spending requires more than the adoption of short-term efficiency measures. It also depends on the existence of a comprehensive system for the development and ordering of priorities, the allocation of resources on a cost-effectiveness basis and the co-ordination of the component parts of government. Thus, Mr. Speaker, to begin the outline of expenditures for 1972-1973, it is appropriate to direct our attention to the current reorganization of government.

If government is to maintain a long-run

capacity to deploy its resources effectively and to respond to changing social needs, policies geared to achieve immediate efficiency must be in harmony with the continuing review of the basic effectiveness of the total organization. It is vitally important, therefore, that we develop a comprehensive response to meet the increased responsibilities and workload which society demands from modern government.

Following the third interim report of the Cronyn committee, the government has introduced legislation to implement Ontario's new structure of government. The new system, which the Management Board is establishing for the government, goes beyond reorganization and consolidation. It is resulting in a fundamental improvement in the basic processes of policy development, resource allocation and intergovernmental co-ordination, as well as a regrouping of functional and administrative responsibilities.

The creation of two senior cabinet committees, the policy and priorities board and the Management Board, ensures overall policy and administrative co-ordination of all government activities. The creation of the three cabinet policy portfolios in the fields of justice, resources development and social development has provided a strong overall framework for co-ordinating new programmes and recommending priorities. It has also improved the organizational basis for co-ordinating the administration of programmes and achieving the most effective and least costly methods of meeting our broad economic and social objectives.

The Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs performs an integrating role in the new government structure. It combines into one ministry most of the responsibilities of the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Treasury and Economics. In particular my ministry is responsible for:

Fiscal and economic planning, federal-provincial and provincial-municipal financial relations and taxation policy;

Central finance management and accounting policy for the government;

Co-ordination of policy development and the operation of programmes as they relate to both the federal and local governments; and

Regional development, community planning and the strengthening of local government.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And anything else we might think of from time to time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am confident that we have created in our new ministry a strengthened and integrated capacity for overall economic policy and budget planning, for the reform of provincial-municipal finance and planning, and for the achievement of our long-run objectives in federal-provincial relations. We will also continue to perform an important service and advisory function to the cabinet and all ministries.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): And he only gets paid once!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Economic progress today involves more than tax reform or good planning by one level of government. It involves the co-ordination and joint planning of both the federal and provincial governments in terms of long-range strategy. What is abundantly clear is that initiatives in one area of policy, affecting the economy, have implications for a number of other areas. For example, it is not possible to talk about changes in competition policy without considering implications for industrial strategy, nor is it possible to consider either without regard to an evolving position on foreign investment in Canada.

Accordingly, the new ministry will be giving priority attention to the overall aspects of economic policy both within Ontario and on a federal-provincial basis. Policy positions are being developed on each of these subjects. We are also undertaking a careful review of broad environmental policy, policy bearing on the alternative uses of resources, the provincial role in matters such as energy policy, and the balance between primary, secondary and tertiary economic activities in the province.

In particular, the question of growing concern about the balance between economic growth and environmental preservation will be a matter of special attention in the coming year and one which we believe should be treated jointly with our federal counterparts. The select committee on economic and cultural nationalism has already provided some suggestions on foreign investment in its first report. In addition, my colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), will be bringing forth recommendations for an Ontario position on the federal Competition Act.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Singer: So that's what he's doing!

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Something to do, eh?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: They will emasculate that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The new Management Board is a particularly important operational part of our financial management system. The effectiveness of this body has already been dramatically demonstrated this year in the construction of our 1972-1973 expenditure plan. In this regard, I would like to pay particular tribute to the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton) and to the other members of the board.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: He is very pleased the Treasurer acknowledged him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Through their untiring and successful efforts in launching the new system, they have produced a comprehensive expenditure plan within the context of the striotest constraints ever imposed on provincial spending.

Having outlined the broad structural reforms which will promote long-run cost control and efficiency, I want to draw your attention to some further measures which the Management Board is taking to reduce provincial government costs. To begin with, our policy of limiting the growth of the civil service has been highly successful.

Mr. Singer: What about the Premier's office? It hasn't been very successful there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Very minimal.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In 1971-1972 complement increases were limited to a growth rate of about two per cent. The only significant change from the original plan was an increase of 327 positions under the Ontario Health Insurance Commission, which was a transfer of positions from private agents and involved no overall increase in expenditure.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): I thought the Premier got all those positions.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, what about the Premier's increases?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The current consolidation of the old departments into a smaller number of new ministries will in itself yield administrative efficiencies and reduce pressure for staff increases. In addition, by developing the concept of a complement pool, the Management Board can place greater emphasis on the re-allocation of position vacancies among ministries, rather than simply within ministries. This, together with the highly effective teamwork between the Management Board staff and the interdepartmental task forces implementing the reorganization of government, has resulted in a small net increase in the authorized size of the civil service for 1972-1973.

A total of some 1,725 new positions have been approved, of which 1,064 will be drawn from the central complement pool. As a result, the net increase in civil service jobs in 1972-1973 will be only 661, an increase of less than one per cent.

The Management Board has allocated the largest portion of the new positions to the Ministry of Health for its psychiatric and retardation programme. A total of 436 new positions have been approved, which will result in greatly needed improvement in staff-patient ratios. The remainder of the new positions have been distributed among the other ministries and programmes to relieve the pressure of workload increases being carried by present staff and to facilitate the introduction of some new and expanded services.

To further our objectives of cost control and programme effectiveness, the government will be considering additional reports from the Committee on Government Productivity relating to some of the major administrative systems within the provincial government. These will include studies and recomendations for increasing effectiveness in human resource utilization, communications and information, real property management and automatic data processing. Recommendations accepted by the government will be implemented by the Management Board.

In addition, the Management Board has intensified its scrutiny of expenditures with the objective of recommending to the Cabinet the elimination of programmes and grants that have outlived their usefulness. This year, steps have been taken in this direction with, for example, the elimination of wolf bounties —

Mr. Singer: Oh yes, that is a big saving!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — and the continuation of rural hydro power bonuses and community centre grants to larger municipalities.

Mr. MacDonald: The member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) will take it up.

Mr. Renwick: They'd better flood that valley.

Mr. Martel: Cabinet ministers will get the biggest gain.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I shall now turn to the composition of our 1972-1973 spending programme. This year we plan to increase net general expenditure by $216 million which, I repeat –

Mr. Martel: Sand blast.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: – represents only a 4.5 per cent increase over 1971-1972. Mr. Speaker, this will be the lowest percentage increase in spending for 19 years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Aren't you fellows happy with that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The effectiveness of our policy of expenditure restraint is particularly evident in the direct operating expenditures of our own ministries and agencies. We have held increases in our own direct provincial expenditures to only 2.7 per cent. In this way we have been able to devote the bulk of our total resources to increased transfer payments to school boards, municipalities and institutions.

Transfer payments for operating expenses will be increased by $192 million or 6.1 per cent. As you will see from the accompanying table [see appendix], the only major expansion which has been permitted in this area, aside from the increase in general legislative grants, is in health and welfare programmes. The increase of $137 million or 13.13 per cent is largely to cover our new programmes of nursing and home care benefits and increased hospital operating costs. Capital expenditures will decrease primarily as a result of the phase-down in the vocational school capital grant programme.

On the investment side, loans and advances will increase by $31 million or five per cent. The estimates for 1972-1973 clearly indicate the changing nature of our provincial investment priorities. Capital funds for the provision of educational facilities have been reduced, now that the growth rate in school enrolments has levelled off and our network of community colleges has been substantially completed. This has freed capital resources for other priority areas such as pollution abatement and housing. This year capital loans for the construction of educational facilities will decline by $53 million and the relative share of this sector will decline from 61 to 50 per cent of total loans and advances. In contrast, loans for housing and environment will increase by $29 million in 1972-1973, raising the share of these two items to 30 per cent of all loans and advances.

Mr. Deans: Will the Treasurer actually spend it this time?

Mr. Lewis: The government never uses that money.

Mr. Deans: It has budgeted for it every year since I have been here but never spends it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Detailed information on the composition of the total spending and investment programme is displayed in budget paper C. Along with this budget, the government's 1972-1973 estimates have been tabled, showing the complete programme and activity details of our expenditures. The estimates and the tables in budget paper C reflect the new ministerial structure resulting from our major reorganization. Comparative figures for previous years are also presented within the context of the new organizational structure, and, Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriate time for me to acknowledge the successful efforts of the staff of the Management Board and their colleagues in the operating departments for completing the very difficult task of converting expenditure data to the new format in the short time available.

Continuing with the expenditure side of the budget, I wish to describe the policy highlights of our employment programmes and review some important dimensions in decisions in provincial spending.

Earlier I emphasized that the highest priority of this government is to achieve full employment in Ontario. Our strong commitment to this goal and our comprehensive programme to achieve it was extensively documented in my budget presented last December. As outlined at that time, this part of our expenditure programme consists of three components. The municipal employment incentive programme, the Ontario seasonal employment programme and a programme of accelerated capital works. These three programmes require a total expenditure of $78 million, of which $54 million will be spent in 1971-1972, and in 1972-1973 the balance of $24 million will be primarily devoted to the continuation of the municipal employment incentive programme and capital works acceleration.

The members may recall that my December

budget stressed the importance we attached to channelling funds through municipalities and other local bodies to capitalize on their ability to implement temporary employment projects. The government's confidence was well founded. There has been a very strong local response to the municipal employment incentive programme. The allocation of $35 million to this programme has been fully subscribed and applications have been accepted for over 1,600 projects, from 975 municipalities, school boards and other local bodies. The 31,000 temporary jobs created by this programme exceed our original estimate. This experience with winter employment programmes in 1971-1972 and, in particular, with the municipal employment incentive programme gives us a strong capacity to deal with the temporary high unemployment situation next winter, should the need arise.

As the Premier announced on March 10, the government will again provide a large number of temporary summer positions, offering students challenging and meaningful employment. This year we expect to hire 12,500 students in regular departmental programmes and to expand the number of our highly successful special programmes such as SWEEP and the retardation student volunteer programme. The total programme for the summer of 1972 will provide employment for 18,500 students at a cost of over $21 million.

I should now like to direct attention to some further highlights of our spending programmes. Previously I referred to the fact that this year we have given a high spending priority to the field of health. The inclusion of nursing home care within our health insurance system and the improvement in staff-patient ratios in our psychiatric and retardation programme constitute a significant forward step in the delivery of health services to the people of Ontario. Together these changes will cost approximately $56 million in 1972-1973. These substantial improvements have been made in spite of the general reduction in health care premiums and the elimination of premiums for people aged 65 and over.

Continuing in the area of social policy, in 1972-1973 the Ministry of Health will proceed with the construction of a number of detoxification centres for the treatment of chronic alcoholics.

The Ministry of Correctional Services will commence operation of the Oakville reception centre which will provide a highly advanced system for the guidance of juvenile offenders. This same ministry will also undertake a new programme for group homes to provide a needed family environment for young people.

Last year the government established guidelines for school board expenditures in order to reduce spending increases and relieve the burden on local property taxes. At the same time, we further increased our general legislative grants to school boards. This two-part policy has proven successful. Costs have been controlled and the education mill rate has been reduced in many municipalities. Moreover, this has been achieved with positively no reduction in the quality of education in Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: A little more fervour in that applause.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Not very much desk-thumping for that one.

Mr. Lawlor: How do you measure that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since education will continue to consume a very large proportion of provincial-municipal financial resources, this government intends to continue its efforts to keep school board spending to the minimum consistent with quality education. Accordingly, we have established school board ceilings again this year. These ceilings have been set for both 1972 and 1973 in order to provide the school boards with an improved basis for forward planning and the achievement of efficiencies. Also, as reported earlier, we have again substantially increased legislative grants to school boards. Along with this increased provincial financial support, our policy of spending guidelines will ensure the continuation in Ontario of the best possible education system with no increase in cost to local taxpayers.

There have been strong cost pressures in the area of post-secondary education over the past several years. At the same time, tuition fees have remained substantially unchanged, and in some post-secondary institutions no tuition has been charged. The government believes it is inequitable for taxpayers to bear all of the cost increases in this area; rather, the students who benefit directly should bear a larger part of the costs of their post-secondary education.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Therefore, having reviewed the tuition fee structure in all our post-secondary institutions, we recommended increases of about $100 for our universities

and community colleges and the introduction of tuition fees in our schools of nursing and in teachers' colleges. The revisions in our grant payments will be based on the following basic tuition structure in 1972-1973: Universities and teachers' colleges, $585; Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, $350; Community colleges and schools of nursing, $250; Agricultural schools and schools for nursing assistants, $150.

These changes will result in increased student financial participation in their own education of about $23 million—

Mr. Lewis: That will increase accessibility.

Mr. Renwick: That's not going to help in my riding.

Mr. Shulman: It will keep the poor out of the schools, that is what the Treasurer means.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —funds that would otherwise have to be raised through taxes. At the same time I would remind the members that government financial assistance is available to students in need and that we have enriched our summer employment programme.

Mr. Lewis: Sure, the minister has implemented the Wright commission report.

Mr. Renwick: When is the government going to introduce tuition fees at the secondary school level?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member for Scarborough West cannot fight that one! That is the truth!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our spending estimates give increased attention to our social, physical and economic environment. In the field of transportation, municipal transit subsidies will be doubled to $12 million in 1972-1973. GO Transit will be extended to Georgetown—

An hon. member: And that goes through Brampton.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and funds will be provided for two pilot projects in urban transportation. In the field of housing, advances to the Ontario Housing Corp. will be increased by $14 million to expand construction of public housing units and our support for OHC operations will increase by $10 million. We are continuing to emphasize employment stimulation in Ontario's slower-growth regions, and assistance to small business for export financing and the installation of pollution control equipment. Accordingly, funds allocated to the Ontario Development Corp. and the Northern Ontario Development Corp. have been set at $36 million, an increase of $22 million over the amount of loans made in 1971-1972.

Mr. Renwick: That is the really weak part of this budget, that paragraph.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Another important objective in this government's environmental programme is the expansion and improvement of recreational opportunities for the people of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: Say, I bet the government is going to establish a land bank.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just you listen to this! During 1971-1972, expenditures for—

Mr. Shulman: Perhaps for holidays in Stowe.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —land acquisition and development were increased from $10 million to $17 million. In 1972-1973, this allocation will be further increased to $21 million, a 24 per cent increase over the 1971-1972 level.

Mr. Renwick: One dollar increase to—the lower the figures the higher the percentage.

Mr. Lewis: What happened to the $20 million land bank?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are $1 million over the $20-million land bank. Does the member want to go backwards? He wants to go backwards all the time.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is always going backwards.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Try not to raise your voice.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, these funds will be applied to the development and the acquisition of recreational—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Or does the NDP leader go sideways?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —land in special areas such as the Niagara Escarpment, Wasaga Park and Bronte Creek Park—

Mr. Renwick: People will be able to buy less and less!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and for the continued expansion and development of provincial parks and conservation authority lands.

In the area of pollution control, capital spending for water management will be increased to $55 million in 1972-1973. Portions of these funds are earmarked for the Canada-Ontario agreement which provides for the construction of $250 million of municipal sewage disposal facilities on the lower Great Lakes. This programme will significantly reduce the harmful effects of municipal effluent in Lake Erie and Lake Ontario on the Canadian side. For 1972-1973, we estimate that almost $3 million in tax expenditure grants will be paid to Ontario corporations to stimulate investment in pollution control equipment. The Ministry of the Environment will also undertake new programmes in waste management, involving the collection of abandoned automobiles and the curtailment of litter.

In summary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Renwick: That will be great. The new minister will be able to carry out those responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —I would again emphasize the tight spending constraints which have been imposed on our ministries and agencies this year, and the success which the Management Board has achieved in limiting expenditures. Within this context obviously there was not much room for new or enriched programmes involving large increases in expenditures. However, by means of highly selective priority determination and resource allocation and through the achievement of efficiencies in existing programmes, the government is continuing to respond progressively to social and economic needs—

Mr. Renwick: This is absolutely ludicrous. This shift in priorities.

Mr. Bullbrook: What is he talking about? He used to talk our language.

Mr. Renwick: Come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Reflecting this approach, the expenditure plan for 1972-1973 contains provision for new and expanded programmes in the fields of health, correctional services, transportation, housing, environment, land acquisition and development and, most important of all, employment.

Mr. Renwick: The Treasurer has destroyed the basis of priorities in the Province of Ontario.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We cannot hear the member for Sarnia, will he speak louder?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the expenditure plan I have just described—

Mr. Renwick: That is the worst part of the whole budget. That is what the minister calls cutting down on expenditure. Cutting down on everything in the whole province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh! The member would spend his way out of everything the way he spent his way into oblivion on Oct. 21.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Don't talk too loud, you haven't got enough support.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not quite, but they're working on it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The expenditure plan which I have just described involves gross budgetary spending of $6,364 million as shown in the estimates tabled today. Of this amount the government expects to receive almost $987 million from the federal government under the various shared-cost programmes. Interest earnings on the government's investments and advances to other public bodies such as Ontario Hydro, universities and school boards will be about $325 million. This then leaves $5,051 million in net general expenditures to be financed from available revenue sources.

We anticipate that our existing sources will generate $4,320 million, or only 3.3 per cent more than in the current fiscal year. In other words, the present outlook for budgetary revenue and expenditure would leave a budgetary deficit of $731 million, compared to $653 million in the current fiscal year. This deterioration would result in spite of virtually unprecedented expenditure restraint, with growth in expenditure only slightly in excess of the expected rate of inflation.

Mr. Shulman: There goes the sales tax.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On the non-budgetary account, lending programmes and repayments of loans will leave the government with net cash requirements of over $420 million.

An hon. member: And now for the bad news.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In total, therefore, our budgetary and non-budgetary transactions would produce overall net cash requirements in excess of $1,151 million for 1972-1973.

This budgetary deficit and the anticipated total cash requirements would exceed those of the –

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: – sharply expansionary 1971-1972 fiscal plan when total cash requirements amounted to $1.1 billion. The measure of total cash requirements is important because it reveals the extent to which government programmes require financial action in the form of borrowing and the use of liquid reserves.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It sets the major boundaries and limitations to fiscal policy actions. As I have mentioned before, the government considers it desirable to maintain an expansionary thrust. There are obvious limits, however, beyond which a provincial government cannot afford to go because of its limited revenue and borrowing capacity. Given these financial realities, I concluded that a cash deficiency of $1,151 million was beyond the limit of the province's financial manoeuvrability for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. Renwick: It was all right last year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Accordingly, the government set itself a target budgetary deficit of about $600 million and overall cash requirements as close as possible to $1 billion After the government maximized restraint in its spending programmes I was obliged to look to our revenue sources to reach this objective.

Mr. MacDonald: Here we go. This is where the election chickens come home to roost.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Given the target budgetary deficit, I decided to raise at least $130 million in additional revenue.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In considering options for additional revenue, I did not, of course, want to negate the beneficial economic and social effects of the tax and premium reductions already legislated by this government. I believe this problem has been successfully avoided.

This budget, therefore, contains increases in revenues from fees and licences of $40 million, from consumption of alcohol and tobacco of $50 million, and gasoline and motor vehicle fuel of $30 million, and from other tax changes of $14 million.

Mr. Deans: So the minister reimposes the five per cent machinery tax.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have undertaken, Mr. Speaker, a complete review of the structure of fees and licences.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Generally speaking, fees are supposed to–

Mr. Renwick: This is really imaginative.

Mr. MacDonald: The minister has forgotten so quickly. Where is the election promise of no tax increases? This is what his government was elected on.

Mr. Bullbrook: Cross over! The member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) doesn't have to take that.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: If he crosses over there he falls into a hole.

An hon. member: Where has the member for Sarnia been for the last week?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, fees are supposed to be charged which bear a reasonable relationship to the administrative or operating costs associated with the service, a control function of government, or a benefit to the user of particular facilities.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): How about contributions to the Tory party?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If there are any I would like to see them for a change, because I am one of those people who haven't seen any in my lifetime although I ran quite a few elections, I can tell you that.

Mr. Speaker: Members will discontinue the debates across the floor of the House and direct their remarks through the Chair, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In our review, we have attempted to restore this relationship within reason.

As members will recall, the Smith committee recommended that motor vehicle revenue should meet a reasonable proportion of the costs associated with the automobile. This relationship was improved in 1968 when motor vehicle registration fees were increased substantially, along with increases in the gasoline and motor vehicle fuel taxes. Since then, however, the relative contribution from motor vehicles has steadily declined. As a result, the revenue from motor vehicles has become insufficient in relation to the total costs which they entail for the people of Ontario.

I am recommending modest increases of $3 to $5 for 1973 licence plates for passenger cars. The proposed new fees will be $23, $32 and $40 respectively for four, six and eight-cylinder cars. Similarly, I propose that all other vehicle registration fees be increased by approximately 10 per cent.

In addition, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications will increase a variety of less important licences and fees, in most cases as an overdue recognition of costs in relation to benefits. Among the latter will be higher tolls on our two skyways, which even at double their present level will fall short of operating expenditure.

Mr. Deans: They should be taken off altogether.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Separate mention should also be made of the proposed increase in GO fares to reduce the operating deficit of our otherwise very successful GO Transit system.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: Shame!

Mr. Deans: It is disgusting.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The increased GO fares, valued at an additional $570,000, will be reflected in lower net expenditure.

Mr. Singer: How many customers are you going to lose?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Altogether the proposed increases for the Ministry of Transportation and Communications are estimated to increase our revenue by $31 million. The present $1 admission fee for Ontario Place and the Ontario Science Centre is unrealistically low in relation to operating costs. The new fee for Ontario Place has already been announced at $1.50

Mr. MacDonald: It was not an election year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —which will also be the new standard adult admission fee for the Ontario Science Centre.

Mr. Deans: You'll keep the poor out of those places.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Various other fees and licences will be raised in such ministries as Consumer and Commercial Relations, Labour, Agriculture and Food, Education, and Industry and Tourism. As well, there will be increases in fees for our provincial parks.

Mr. Martel: Shame! Shame on that one.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Among these, the daily campsite permits will be raised by $1 to $3.50 without hydro and $4 with hydro.

Mr. Lewis: What about the corporation tax rebate? Why couldn't they get their money there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These increases will bring charges closer to the costs of providing the services to which they relate.

In total, higher fees and licences, except those which reduce net spending, will raise an estimated $40 million in additional revenue. My colleagues, whose ministries are involved, will provide all the necessary details in due course, including actual implementation dates.

Mr. Martel: They look after the little people all right

Mr. Cassidy: It's the biggest con job in four years.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I also believe it appropriate—. Well now, I am going to get some from the member for Sudbury East right now.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer will be rescinding this whole budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I also believe it is appropriate to gain additional revenue from the consumption of alcoholic beverages and tobacco products. That's you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: There are people collapsing behind the Treasurer.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member for Lambton should come over. Don't take that.

Mr. Renwick: There will be an increase in the indemnity now.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Lambton will have apoplexy paying for this.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, as you and I both well know, alcoholic beverages and tobacco products already are a considerable source of revenue to the government. I would point out, however, particularly to my friend from Sarnia, that these taxes are essentially avoidable. You don't have to pay them.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, the Treasurer makes a great contribution himself. He really does.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but he is not beefing.

Mr. Cassidy: This budget will drive the population to drink.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Moreover, with the exception of a minimal increase in the price of beer in southern Ontario last year, taxation of alcoholic and tobacco products has not changed since 1969. Effective April 17, people in Ontario will be paying higher prices for the consumption of beer, spirits and wine.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Nineteen days to stock up.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The changes I propose can be summarized briefly—

An hon. member: I think he had inside information.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The changes I—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, some of us regard this particular item as rather serious, I might say.

The changes I propose can be summarized briefly as follows. The price of a case of 24 bottles of beer will be raised from $4.65 to $5, net of deposit, with commensurate changes in the prices of smaller cases of beers in cans.

Mr. Martel: Equalized, of course, across the province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The existing sales tax exemption for draught beer will be eliminated regardless of the quantity in which it is sold or its price.

Spirits and wines will be subject to price increases, ranging from about five to ten per cent.

Mr. Bullbrook: I bet your contributors drink a lot of beer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Spirits will increase by an average of 25 to 30 cents for a 25-ounce bottle, and wines will be increased by an average of 15 cents to 20 cents for a 26-inch bottle—a 26-ounce bottle.

Mr. Cassidy: Have another one.

Mr. MacDonald: What will a yard of molasses cost next year?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Return to John A.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is stocking up.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the above changes will increase revenue from alcoholic beverages by an estimated $38 million in 1972-1973. In spite of the increases, the Ontario price of alcoholic beverages, notably beer, will continue to compare very favourably with those elsewhere in Canada.

An hon. member: Aren't you proud of that?

Mr. Singer: What does that mean?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Turning to tobacco products, I propose to increase the tobacco tax effective at midnight this day.

Mr. Bullbrook: The increase will be passed on to the consumer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The tax on cigarettes will be raised by 1.2 cents for 20 cigarettes, or three-tenths of one cent per five cigarettes. The last time the tobacco tax was increased was in March, 1969. The increase applied only to cigarettes. I propose, therefore, to introduce higher adjustments to the taxation on tobacco and cigars.

An hon. member: That gets the rich ones, eh?

Mr. Cassidy: There is a gift there for your friends.

Mr. Deans: Is that how the Treasurer repays them for their contributions?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: All increases will apply to tonight's inventories. The additional revenue expected from the higher tobacco tax amounts to about $12 million.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to raise additional revenue from gasoline and motor vehicle fuel taxation.

Mr. Martel: That is a disgrace.

Mr. Foulds: Equalize it across the province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The change in motor vehicle licence fees that I have announced still leave motor vehicles too lightly taxed in relation to the total costs they entail. Therefore, I am proposing a one cent per gallon increase in the gasoline tax and a one cent per gallon increase in the motor vehicle fuel tax, effective midnight this day.

Mr. Martel: Equalized across the province, Darcy?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With regard to the motor vehicle fuel tax, my colleague the Minister of Revenue will be tabling a new Act—

Mr. Foulds: Two and one-half hours to stock up.

Hon. Mr. McKeough:—which will improve administration and enforcement of this tax and will include parallel provisions to those contained in the gasoline tax.

Mr. Martel: Same price across the province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These changes in the gasoline and motor vehicle fuel taxes should yield an additional $30 million in 1972-1973.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't the Treasurer do this last year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the land transfer tax has been reviewed a number of times, and this year I have decided to revise the existing two-rate schedule for the first time in six years. The new schedule will be three-tenths of one per cent on the first $35,000 and six-tenths of one per cent on any transaction value above the first $35,000. This compares to the present two-tenths of one per cent on the first $25,000, and four-tenths of one per cent on the value in excess of $25,000. In raising the limit to which the lower rate applies, the effect on homeowners will be minimal.

Mr. Bullbrook: A little unreasonable level.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For instance, on a $35,000 home the increase in the land transfer tax will amount to only $15, while on expensive property transactions the transfer tax will rise considerably more. The revised schedule of rates should yield an additional $4 million in revenue.

We support federal government efforts to encourage the use of Ottawa airport for technical stops by transoceanic flights. Such flights, therefore, will no longer be subject to the Ontario aviation fuel tax as of April 1, 1972. I estimate the revenue loss to be negligible, because of the limited number of such flights into Ontario at the present time.

Both the Smith and White committees considered the policy of remunerating vendors for the collection of taxes and concluded that such remuneration should be discontinued. A large number of jurisdictions have never provided for such renumeration, or have discontinued doing so. The main consideration in favour of remuneration is the goodwill of the vendors, but apart from that it is extremely difficult to devise a rational and equitable system of remuneration.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Don't need the goodwill this year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Most jurisdictions look upon the cost of collecting taxes as legitimate business expense. I have decided, therefore, to discontinue the system of remuneration in all tax fields where remuneration was provided for.

At the same time we have chosen this occasion to make allowance for bad debts that may occur in connection with the taxable transactions. This revised policy will apply to the retail sales, gasoline, tobacco, motor vehicle fuel, race tracks, and security transfer taxes. The removal of provision for remuneration effective with regard to taxes collected after April 30, 1972, should result in additional revenue from these tax fields of about $10 million in 1972-1973.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude this section on revenue changes by mentioning briefly a number of amendments to our tax statutes that will be brought forward in the coming months.

First, as I have already indicated, we intend to introduce major revisions to our Corporations Tax Act to parallel the new federal income tax legislation, except for those provisions relating to mining, petroleum and international income.

Second, minor changes in the paid-up capital tax will be introduced to ensure a more even application and to avoid the possibility of double taxation in particular instances.

Third, I propose to abolish the logging tax.

Mr. Martel: What are you replacing it with?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This move is fully warranted since the logging tax raises less than $2 million annually, yet involves substantial administration and has only an insignificant impact on companies because it is fully deductible from corporation income taxes otherwise payable.

Mr. Shulman: There is an election promise paid off!

Mr. Cassidy: How much was that worth in campaign contributions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Fourth, the fire marshal's tax will be abolished and replaced by a small additional levy on the insurance premiums written on property falling into the new property class used by the industry. This new levy of one-half of one per cent is expected to raise the same revenue as the fire marshal's tax but will become part of the corporation tax revenue.

Mr. Cassidy: Does he mean the corporations will get off scot-free?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Full details on these tax structure changes along with other minor amendments will be outlined when the Minister of Revenue brings forward the requisite legislation.

Finally I would like to make just a few remarks about the introduction of the province's new gift tax, related amendments to succession duty legislation, and our immediate plans with regard to the future of death taxation in Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: Scot-free. Not a nickel, eh?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On Dec. 29, 1971, I announced the government's intention to introduce gift tax legislation in the spring of 1972.

Mr. Cassidy: Was that a promise to the electorate you kept — no corporate tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This legislation is to be based on a model Act to be used by all interested provinces to facilitate administration and collection by the federal government. This legislation will be introduced by my colleague, the Minister of Revenue. The basic principles of the Ontario gift tax remain the same as in the Dec. 29 announcement. As I said then, there —

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the model Act been agreed to?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — will be an extended meaning of "gift" and tax will be imposed in certain circumstances, but it is not intended to tax transactions involving transfer of property between members of the individual's family provided the value of the consideration received is, in substance, not less than that of the transferred property.

You will be asked to approve this new gift tax legislation as well as amendments to our Succession Duty Act to allow for appropriate credits for gift taxes paid. I will also be withdrawing the temporary provision in our succession duties, by which gifts made after Dec. 31, 1971, and within 15 years of the donor's death would be included in the value of an estate. With our new gift tax, effective Jan. 1, 1972, we no longer require this provision to protect the revenue from succession duties and to have an equitable system of death taxation. The 15-year clause will be replaced by the five-year clause we had previously in our legislation and these changes will be effective as of Jan. 1, 1972.

It might also be of interest to the members to know that I have asked the Minister of Revenue to establish a special advisory committee to undertake a thorough examination of the existing Succession Duty Act. This committee will be chaired by Mr. J. Alex Langford, QC, who is a well-recognized authority on estate taxation in Canada.

We will be asking this committee to advise the government on a complete revision of the present Act. The committee's terms of reference will include an examination of the relationships between succession duties and the family farm, family businesses and the question of Canadian versus foreign control. The main objectives we seek in drawing up new legislation will be an equitable incidence, a minimum of adverse economic effects and greater simplicity. At the same time, the government intends to continue its policy of gradually reducing the level of succession duties as the capital gains tax matures.

Mr. Speaker, on balance, I believe the package of revenue changes I have proposed will be neutral in terms of equity, appropriate in terms of economic impact and positive in terms of provincial financing. The major impact will fall on those who smoke and drink and on the use of private automobiles. By securing a relatively greater contribution from these sources, our overall tax structure will be better balanced and our long-term revenue capacity will be improved.

In total, the revenue changes I have outlined are estimated to raise an additional $134 million in the coming year, bringing

our net general revenue for 1972-1973 to $4,454 million. As you will recall, I estimated our budgetary deficit before these changes at $731 million and our overall cash requirements at $1,151 million. The increased revenue will reduce our budgetary deficit to $597 million and our overall cash requirements to $1,017 million, meeting the deficit target the government established for itself and maintaining an appropriate expansionary stimulus to the economy.

The total financing requirements for 1972-1973 at $1,017 million will be lower than in the current year. Canada Pension Plan borrowings, plus other internal sources of funds, will generate $800 million leaving $217 million to be met by a combination of public debentures and the use of liquid reserves. This moderate level of financing will ensure that the province keeps its finances in good order and maintains its high credit rating. At the same time, I am confident that the balanced and progressive fiscal plan the government has drawn up will move Ontario toward full employment and greater prosperity.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this is a constructive budget which provides for growth and advancement within the limits of prudent financing. It maintains the momentum of Ontario's expansionary policies to reduce unemployment. It re-establishes an appropriate balance between the costs incurred and the charges levied for particular government services. It accords a high priority to reform and relief for property taxpayers. It recognizes that spending must be contained and priorities reordered if we are to deliver the maximum in public services per tax dollar collected.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it is a purposeful declaration of the confidence of the government of the hon. William G. Davis, in the inherent strength of our economy, the resourcefulness of our citizens and the bright future of this province of opportunity.

Mr. Bullbrook: It sounds a bit like Dalton Camp at the end.

Mr. Breithaupt moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Interjections by hon. members.

GIFT TAX

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GASOLINE TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOBACCO TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Tax.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Security Transfer Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of this bill.

LOGGING TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal the Logging Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: That is a good one, isn't it? Who was just appointed to the board of directors for Abitibi?

RACE TRACKS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Race Tracks Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MUNICIPAL UNCONDITIONAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipal Unconditional Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

REGIONAL MUNICIPAL GRANTS ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Regional Municipal Grants Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TAX REDUCTION ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves first reading of bill intituled, the Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MOTION FOR INTERIM SUPPLY

Clerk of the House: Government notice of motion No. 2.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moves that the Treasurer of Ontario be authorized to pay and the Provincial Auditor be authorized to approve payment of the salaries of the civil service and other necessary payments pending the voting of supply for the firscal year commencing April 1, 1972, such payments to be charged to the proper appropriations following the voting of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could the House leader indicate to us whether on Thursday we will continue with legislation, or what is his plan?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will continue with item No. 10 on the order paper.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, would the House leader be able to give us an order of the estimates that we will be considering next week?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I will certainly be glad to do that at the earliest possible opportunity, probably Tuesday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Will the House leader indicate when he expects the House to adjourn on Thursday?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: On what day?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thursday next.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: At the earliest opportunity.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, the House leader undertook to consult with the Conservative whip to see what arrangements had been made. He knows that the arrangement was made earlier today with the understanding that we would be adjourning at Friday's hour, 1 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I regret that I didn't have an opportunity to consult with the whips in the interim period today, but I assure the members that whatever the whips have agreed upon we will honour.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's all right by us.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): That's a switch!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is no switch. Where has the member been all week?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Where has the minister been all afternoon?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9:50 o'clock, p.m.

APPENDIX

Value to local governments and taxpayers of Ontario's reform policies, 1968-1969—1972-1973 ($ million)

	Value of reform policy				
Reform Policy:	**68-69**	**69-70**	**70-71**	**71-72**	**72-73**
Direct provincial relief of property tax burdens[1]	110	124	171	187	195
Increased provincial support to school boards and municipalities[2]	3	37	123	225	320
Assumption of costs of property assessment and administration of justice	18	19	41	43	46
Removal of property tax exemption on provincial properties[3]	—	—	8	9	10
Special financial support to regional governments	—	—	3	12	14
Total value of reforms	131	180	346	476	585

[1] Includes tax rebates to farmers, supplementary grants to GIS pensioners, and basic shelter grants (property tax credits in 1972-1973).
[2] Includes enriched legislative grants, road grants, unconditional grants, grants to transit systems, sewer and water grants, grants to Metropolitan Conservation Authority and increased mining revenue payments.
[3] Includes payments of grants-in-lieu of taxes on post-secondary education properties and provincial parks, and the removal of exemptions on mining facilities.

Composition of Ontario's expenditures and investments

	1972-1973 budget	**Increases (or decreases) over 1971-1972**	
	($ million)	($ million)	%
Net general expenditures			
Transfer payments (operating):			
School boards	1,135.6	112.6	11.0
Health and welfare programmes	1,168.8	136.9	13.3
Post-secondary institutions	631.0	92.7	17.2
Municipal transit and road maintenance subsidies	84.0	2.1	2.6
All others	304.8	(152.8)	(33.4)
	3,324.2	191.5	6.1
Direct operating spending	997.8	25.9	2.7
Capital spending (incl. transfer payments)	583.0	(66.5)	(10.2)
Public debt — interest	146.5	64.9	79.5
Total net general expenditures	**5,051.5**	**215.8**	**4.5**
Loans and advances			
Housing	135.6	12.9	10.5
Environment	62.4	16.5	35.9
Education	326.5	(53.0)	(14.0)
Other	126.5	54.4	75.5
Total loans and advances	**651.0**	**30.8**	**5.0**

Note: $53 million of the increase in grants to post-secondary institutions in 1972-1973 arises from reduction in the 1971-1972 grants to universities resulting from their change in fiscal year-end.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 28, 1972

Budget address, Mr. McKeough 699

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Breithaupt, agreed to 719

Gift Tax, bill to impose, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Gasoline Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Land Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Tobacco Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Logging Tax Act, bill to repeal, Mr. Grossman, first reading 719

Race Tracks Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 720

Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading 720

Municipal Unconditional Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 720

Regional Municipal Grants Act, bill to amend, Mr. McKeough, first reading 720

Residential Property Tax Reduction Act, bill intituled, Mr. McKeough, first reading 720

Motion for interim supply, Mr. McKeough, agreed to 720

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 720

Appendix, tax reform policy 721

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Thursday, March 30, 1911

No. 20

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, March 30, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors with us, and this morning in the west gallery we have students from Nelson High School, Burlington.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

MANAGEMENT BOARD ESTIMATES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was looking at that rather thin target over there—thin in one respect—but I'd like to ask the Chairman of the Management Board—he's not so thin, no I'd like to ask the Chairman of the Management Board about the item in the estimates that is associated with that particular board, which I think is particularly high. There will be an opportunity to get some detail on this, but is there any truth to the rumour that the Chairman of the Management Board is contemplating a new structure to house his growing bureaucracy?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): If the hon. member means a physical structure, the answer is no.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And can the minister indicate to the House the contemplated growth in the staff that would require such a large amount of money in the estimates to support?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities have been expanded somewhat beyond what the Treasury Board used to undertake and perform. The implementation of the recommendations of the various reports from COGP falls within the purview of the Management Board, and a deputy minister has been assigned to perform that function with support staff. The Civil Service Commission now will report to the Management Board. Without being specific and providing the hon. member with the details that I might if we were dealing with it in the estimates, I suggest that this accounts for much of the expansion.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister will be the Bud Drury of Ontario then? He is going to be dealing with the civil service.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I would rather not be Bud Drury, but that's all right—

STUDENT ASSISTANCE AND TUITION FEES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, the minister should do so well.

Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: In his capacity as the author and expander of the Province of Ontario's student awards programme, can he give the policy justification for the decision announced in the budget for the general $100 increase in tuition for post-secondary education, linked with a substantial reduction in the funds made available for the assistance of students in this province?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, there isn't a substantial reduction in the amount of assistance available for students in the province. What has happened is that the loan portion of the student awards programme is now the first $800 instead of the first $600; this is the most significant change in the student awards programme.

The rationale for an increase in fees relates to the increase in tuition costs generally. The general feeling is that the students, who are going to be the beneficiaries in the long run of the investment that the province is making in their education, should assume a greater portion of the responsibility. And while I am not as familiar with the figures as I was a year or so ago, Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that if the fees average out at, say, $580 or $585 this probably represents $585 over $3,300 or $3,400 which is perhaps the average tuition cost. So it is still, shall we say, a relatively small percentage of the total that the public are investing in the education of each student.

Mr. Speaker, while no government likes to see fees of any kind increased, we still have an obligation to the general public and we felt that it was appropriate that the beneficiaries—and the students are the beneficiaries of this investment by the public—should assume a greater portion of the cost.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I am talking about the policy of the government, and surely as it was enunciated by the Premier in his capacity as Minister of University Affairs, it was an approach toward an opening-up of the post-secondary style of education so that there would be no financial barriers at all. How can he square that with the increase in tuition by an average $100, and with the reduction of the funds generally available to assist the students?

Wouldn't he agree that there is a substantial and serious inconsistency with the attitude he expressed in his former capacity, and would he not also agree that this is a serious retrograde step not only in the eyes of the students concerned but in the eyes of the whole province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker, I think in the eyes of the whole province it will not be considered a retrograde step. Certainly I am sure there are some students who will feel that the fee should not be increased, and I really don't know where the Leader of the Opposition gets his information from. There hasn't been a substantial reduction in the funds that will be available for student assistance.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): No. The Premier assumes there will be fewer students.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Half-a-million dollars less for graduate students.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All it means is that a greater portion of student assistance will be by way of loan rather than grant. I think it should be understood, Mr. Speaker, that the $800 in this province is probably still lower than in any other provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Like the price of beer; the government is very proud of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the federal government wishes to change its involvement in that by way of grant rather than loan, this government here would have no objection. Mr. Speaker, I think the figures prove it—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Oh, isn't that nice!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —there will be no alteration in our view as it relates to accessibility. We've debated this in the House on many, many occasions—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not this!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes, of course we have! Mr. Speaker, with great respect we have and I fully—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was never proposed to reduce the assistance to the students. Never!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I fully appreciate that while it wasn't stated as categorically last September and October—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, on the contrary!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party have over the years advocated no tuition payable whatsoever. I didn't hear too much about this during the election campaign.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: After blaming Ottawa, it is characteristic that the Premier would go back to the election campaign and say who won the election, and try to justify it that way.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, I haven't interrupted him in his questioning and he might extend the courtesy of not interrupting during the answers.

Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition doesn't agree, that is his position. And if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to state that the tuition fee should not be raised, that the amount of grant should be increased and the amount of loan reduced, that, Mr. Speaker, is his right.

This government has decided that the amount of increase related to the total amount that the general taxpaying public is investing in education in the post-secondary system still does not represent any inhibiting effect on those students who wish to enter into post-secondary experiences.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a comment made by the Premier, and stating it in the form of a question: Is he not aware that on page 268 of the estimates

presented by himself to the House on Tuesday—it is page 260—that the amount for grants and awards to students is being reduced from $51,088,000 to $34,858,000 in addition to a reduction in the grants to the universities which will result in an average $100 increase in tuition?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And for community colleges and nursing schools and Ryerson—and everything else.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the increase in tuition fees will be paid by the students. But there will be no alteration in the amount of funding that will be available for the students under the student award programme; and no student will be precluded from access. No student will be precluded from attending a post-secondary institution because of lack of finance. The amount has been increased. There is no question that in a four-year programme, which perhaps may now be the average, a student who has qualified for the student award programme will have four times $200, which is $800 more by way of loan than he would have had prior to this year.

There is no question about that whatsoever. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no question whatsoever that related to the average incomes earned by people who graduate from our post-secondary institutions, they are in a better position to compensate for the investment, which is far beyond the $585 or $600 that we are making.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is not true since 1960.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is true. I would suggest with respect, Mr. Speaker, this has been the practice in the past two years in many other jurisdictions, even in the state institutions south of the border which are nominally non-fee-paying institutions. Their tuition fees, for even in-state students, still exceed the tuition fees that are requested here in the Province of Ontario.

As it relates to the private institutions in the United States, Mr. Speaker, their fees of between $2,400, and some up as high as $3,000 to $3,100, are paid entirely by the students and not through any form of student assistance.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary as far as I am concerned. Is the Premier not aware that there are an unexpected 6,000 places that will remain vacant in the universities of the province this year; and that the addition of this programme that we are talking about this morning will in fact deter many other students from considering post-secondary education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there may be a surplus of student places in our post-secondary institutions. There was a surplus in this past year; and there was a slight surplus the year before.

With great respect, Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that this did not relate to the amount of financial resource available to the students. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much of the opinion that the increase by way of tuition, the increase by way of the loan portion of the student assistance programme, will not deter or inhibit the person who legitimately wants to attend a post-secondary institution in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the Premier is wrong and will have to change his position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not wrong!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Assuming for the moment the opposition's case that this does serve as a further deterrent to the occupancy of places in post-secondary institutions, or even leaving that; how does the Premier now intend to rescue those post-secondary institutions, particularly certain of the universities, which are going to face a financial crisis the like of which they have not faced before?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, I guess one of the very distinctive differences between those who represent the public on this side of the House and those who represent the public on the other side of the House is that we take a more positive and optimistic point of view to many of these situations.

It is our view, Mr. Speaker, that the universities will not be faced with a financial crisis. It is our view that the funds that will be allocated to the various post-secondary institutions will enable them to meet their commitments, enable them to maintain a high quality of educational programme in this province; with respect, we do not think the member for Scarborough West's concern has validity.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): What is the Premier's rationale to the increase in tobacco costs of two per cent, the increase in alcoholic beverage cost of five to 10 per cent, and the increase in student fees of 17 to 60 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, if one wants to try to relate the increase of cost of liquid refreshment and tobacco to tuition fees, the member may do so. We don't relate them in that way on this side of the House.

If the member would check the figures very carefully he will see the percentage the student is asked to pay of the total tuition cost; and Mr. Speaker, we think that this is reasonable indeed.

An hon. member: Is the member saying the tobacco fee should be hiked?

Mr. Lewis: The government is just cashing in on the fashionable anti-student feeling. Look at all the police around here yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are the member's police as much as mine.

Mr. Lewis: I wouldn't deploy them as they were yesterday!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I don't deploy them either!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. Bounsall: Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I have heard it already expressed that the—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Economics and Minister of Municipal Affairs): Question!

Mr. Bounsall: All right; we will start it as a question.

Feeling optimistic the way he is that there will be no overall decrease in student enrolment this coming year because of finances, and I have heard it now estimated that there will be a 10 per cent overall decrease, will the Prime Minister, if he is so optimistic, make a commitment then that no university in Ontario will receive, in their university grants, less than they got last year; in fact less than they got last year plus the percentage increase of the BIU that is occurring this year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to phrase it very simply, the universities in this province will not be prejudiced by a reduction, or possible reduction, in enrolment. They were not prejudiced last year. There has to be some give and take in these situations, because some universities did not receive the numbers of students that they had anticipated; some universities received more. There has to be built into this approach, and I would hope the members of this House would recognize this, a recognition that a university that overestimated its intake would not have available to it the kind of funding that would enable them to have certain advantages that a sister institution would not have.

Mr. Speaker, the main question here, surely, is the ability of our post-secondary students to enter the institutions. This jurisdiction—

Mr. Foulds: In the courses that they want—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —more than any other in Canada has developed a post-secondary system which has made access to our universities, our community colleges and other post-secondary institutions—

Mr. Lewis: It is not what the Wright commission report says.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —available to all.

Mr. Lewis: That is not what Wright says.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has. We have never had a shortage of student places, which is not true in many other jurisdictions. We have a higher percentage of young people in the age group 18-24 attending our post-secondary—

Mr. Lewis: Sure, from a given class in society.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —institutions than any other province in Canada. We have a better quality, Mr. Speaker—the hon. member should be aware—than I think any other province in Canada. I think it is most—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Pardon?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): You built the system and now you are destroying it.

Mr. Lewis: You turned it into the best class system of education in Canada.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with the leader of the New Democratic Party and his former colleague, the former member for Peterborough (Mr. Pitman), we have debated this on a number of occasions—

Mr. Lewis: You do not demonstrate—

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and even the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). I think it is abundantly clear that even if tuition were free we would still face the same problem in this jurisdiction as they do in many others, that it is not—

Mr. Lewis: No, you would not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, we would—

Mr. Lewis: No, we would not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —still face the problem that there is a lower percentage of young people from the lower-income groups—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —attending our post-secondary institutions.

Mr. Lewis: The government raises the cost, and what does that do to the lower income group?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it does not relate to tuition.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The problem—

An hon. member: The Premier knows it does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member knows it doesn't. The problem exists—

Mr. Lewis: I certainly don't know it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —well before the student even enters grade 13.

Mr. Lewis: What is the government doing then?

Mr. Cassidy: What is the Premier doing about that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The problem, Mr. Speaker, relates to those situations, perhaps as early as grade 2—

An hon. member: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The discussions here, related to the student award programme are not relevant as to access to the post-secondary institutions.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Cassidy: They still are relevant.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They are not.

Mr. Foulds: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I would like the Premier to define his term "prejudice." He said at the beginning of that last statement that no post-secondary education would be prejudiced. I would like to point out to him that the institution in my riding—

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the hon. member wishes to ask a question—

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member wishes me to define what I mean by "prejudice", rather than his making a speech, I will endeavour to do so.

I am saying that under the grant formula with the estimates we have, no post-secondary institution is going to suffer economically by way of financial support from this government.

Mr. Bounsall: But you won't guarantee funding equivalent to this present year.

Mr. Foulds: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker; then how does the Premier account for the fact that Lakehead University, by the cutbacks that it is experiencing, is having to lay off or fire or terminate the employment of 20 faculty and 10 maintenance staff?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the universities find that they have a surplus by way of faculty related to the student-professor ratio, this is something that they have to deal with. But the funding that is allocated from this government relates to the number of students. The universities are treated in an equitable fashion. If, for some reason, one of our post-secondary institutions is not having the kind of intake, by way of student numbers, this is something it will have to resolve internally.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The overestimates are a product of the Premier's policies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, no government should, and we cannot, accept this kind of responsibility to pay for funds for those people on staff who are not producing in terms of student-professor ratios that are equal across this province.

Mr. Cassidy: This is directly counter to what the Premier said five minutes ago.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it is not.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West has a supplementary.

Mr. Bounsall: Would the Premier not agree that any overestimation of student

places that occurred last year came as a direct result from a directive from the colleges and universities asking them, in point of fact, to increase their projections, because of the intake of people wanting to enter the teaching professions they thought would incur, and that that is where the overestimate occurred?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that the bulk of the universities do not have teachers' colleges affiliated with them, obviously this cannot be factually the case. There are perhaps—what?—four universities that now have former teachers' colleges affiliated with them. There was some indication as to what might be the numbers that would be entering the universities, going into the teaching profession. But it should also be pointed out that the former Minister of Education, and even the present Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), has now made it abundantly clear that, while there is still need for elementary school teachers, the numbers required have been diminishing.

This fact has been made public. It is known in the majority of the high schools, certainly in our area and, I would like to think, throughout the province. But, at the same time, and I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, we have not curtailed enrolments at the teachers' colleges, because we think that the person who wants to enter the teaching profession should at least have the opportunity to do so, which, once again, is somewhat different from the experience in other jurisdictions.

While it has been debated in this House by members opposite that we should specify the number of elementary and secondary school teachers, and develop some form of entrance requirement that would restrict admission into the profession, this government has not opted for that procedure, because we feel this would be prejudicial to a number of young people who might turn out to be excellent teachers within the elementary school system in this province.

Mr. Speaker: There has been a sufficient and reasonable number of supplementaries. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

NAME OF COMPANY FINED FOR BAD SAFETY RECORD

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Will he identify the company which was fined $300,000 for a bad safety record and had that extra assessment removed, the name of which company would not be provided to the committee yesterday by the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member is referring to the company that was mentioned in Mr. Draper's speech?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Hon. Mr. Guindon: In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I thing it has been established beyond any doubt yesterday the company referred to is not General Motors, it is not Ford Motor Co. of Canada, nor any of the companies involved in the alleged lobby group.

Mr. MacDonald: All the more reason to give the company's name.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, I think as minister of this department I have to protect the board. It is not relevant to the case and I have to support the board on this matter.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): A mining company?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): We know what it is not. We want to know what it is.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Is it the minister's impression that a certain oath or requirement, either in the statute, the regulations or artificially prepared at the board itself, forbids any member of the board from giving this information? It is not specifically referred to in the statute. The statute was read by the leader of the NDP at the committee yesterday, and it does not contain such a prohibition.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker, I agree. I think I am pleased to inform the hon. member—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order, please. Before the hon. minister replies to the question, in part or in full, I should point out to the House that the sub judice rule very likely would apply to this particular situation. There is a broad interpretation of the sub judice rule in situations in which any persons might be prejudiced, or the outcome of the hearings might be prejudiced, and it is within the Speaker's responsibility and authority to rule. I have permitted one or two questions, and I will permit some. I am simply pointing out to the House that the sub judice rule

might well apply to certain questions in this respect.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): There is no court case. No.

Mr. Lewis: I am glad you are elevating the committee to the status of a court.

Mr. Speaker: We will wait and see. The Speaker will rule on this. I am permitting certain questions.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, sir. Surely the Workmen's Compensation Board is not before any court. That was made abundantly clear yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: Would that it were. We would have the right to cross-examine and demand evidence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There are no records being kept. There is no professional advice available. Surely the sub judice rule would have no application whatsoever. But, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me—Go ahead.

Mr. Speaker: I just want to remind the members that there is a very broad interpretation—

Mr. Shulman: That is very broad.

Mr. Speaker: —that has been followed in this House by custom.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): No.

Mr. Speaker: I took it upon myself to look up the previous rulings this morning, after hearing the radio, as to certain evidence and things that had taken place. I am simply pointing out to the members that, if the questions become of a certain nature, I will have to rule them as subject to the sub judice rule of this House.

Mr. Lewis: Most extraordinary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Now I am not going to restrict the questioning completely.

Mr. Lewis: What are you talking about?

Mr. Speaker: I will be glad, if necessary, to quote my reference and my authority.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary of the minister: Does this mean that the Minister of Labour is not going to fulfil his undertaking to this House that through the committee all information pertaining to this matter would be made available, and that in fact he is backing down on that commitment?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the minister is much in favour of providing all information possible. I think the members opposite saw that yesterday. I think they should realize that.

With regard to the question put earlier, I am pleased to inform the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as well as the member for Scarborough West, that his interpretation yesterday was right. The board may authorize an officer to divulge confidential information. They may, but in this present case we think it would be so damaging—

Mr. MacDonald: Why would it be damaging? Now the minister has brought it out.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: —and it's not relevant to the case. I'm supporting the board.

Mr. Lewis: On a supplementary: What right has the minister to make that assumption when the Premier, in this Legislature, referred all matters regarding the Workmen's Compensation Board to the committee and made it clear that he felt that the members of the House should be entitled to ask whatever questions they thought relevant and that the information should be forthcoming?

The minister has now indicated that under the Act we were entitled to that information, as we argued with him yesterday. We are now, as a House, asking him if he will name the company—because I find it more and more suspect—that received a remittance of $330,000 by way of levy so that we can decide, not prejudge, but we can decide whether it has relevance to the General Motors case?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): What is the question?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is known as a suspicious man, but in this particular case, I think for the good functioning of the board, if this had been relevant—

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: There is a principle involved here. The information that the Workmen's Compensation Board gets from both labour and management is very confidential.

Mr. Cassidy: The board's own people mentioned it in speeches.

Mr. Lewis: They talked about it in public speeches—including the chairman of the board.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: There was no name mentioned.

Mr. Lewis: But they gave the amount as an example of their actions—the amount which coincides exactly with that amount which was mentioned in the Globe and Mail. Now why can we not know the company?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who made the speech said he was very unwise in doing so.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, does that mean the chairman of the board—who mentioned the figure in a speech to the Industrial Accident Prevention Association in September, 1970 and again in November, 1970, the month in which the levy was to be applied to the company—was similarly unwise? May we not have the name of the company?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I pointed out to the hon. members this matter has been referred to the committee of the House, by the House. The member shall be called out of order under standing rule No. 16. I refer the hon. members to section 7, subsection 2, "they shall be called to order if they refer to any matter which is before any quasi judicial administrative or investigative body constituted by the House, or by or under the authority of an Act of the Legislature where any person may be prejudiced in such matter by the reference."

Mr. MacDonald: How is it going to be prejudiced?

Mr. Shulman: It doesn't apply.

Mr. Speaker: I therefore rule further questions on this topic out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask you a question with reference to this, because I am genuinely puzzled. The House passed an order, on the stipulation of the Premier, that all information shall be made available. What we are now trying to get is information which witnesses refused to give before the committee. Is that out of order?

Mr. Speaker: At this point in time the discussions in the committee have come to a certain point, and in my observation there are certain events that may or may not take place in the future, but could take place before the committee has completed its investigation of the situation. I do not think it would be wise or proper for this House to debate during this question period things that the committee has not completed its investigations of.

The matter of the Workmen's Compensation Board, by virtue of the Premier's statement, was properly brought before this particular committee of the House, the properly constituted committee. The committee is investigating a certain board or commission, and I think that is the place where this debate should take place, not in this House during the question period.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I draw your attention to this: The committee has completed its investigation on this point. The minister has confirmed this morning that the information will not be given, and therefore it is in violation of a rule of an instruction of this House that "all information shall be given." We are not talking about something that is continuing to be investigated, we are talking about something which the minister has confirmed this morning shall not be given. I suggest that this is an offence to this House, it is in contempt of this House and it is in violation of the resolution which the Prime Minister moved.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that the committee has not completed its investigations.

Mr. MacDonald: On this point it has.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on that point, a motion was passed by the committee, I am sure you are aware of it. But the point, sir, is this, that you might enforce the ruling of the House, or there is another person present who could relieve you of that onerous duty—the person who made the reference to the committee in the first place, calling for all facts to be laid before it. That, of course, is the Premier.

He cannot leave his neophyte Minister of Labour on the hook on this particular one. It is wholly his responsibility to see that the members of the committee and the House as a whole are informed of the facts. Surely the Premier is going to have to enter this discussion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to enter into the discussion by agreeing with the position that you have

taken. The committee is still meeting on this matter as I understood it at the committee meeting yesterday. But the matter has not been finally resolved—

Mr. MacDonald: The point has.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and I would say with respect, Mr. Speaker, that your ruling on this matter that the committee is still meeting—it hasn't reported back to the House—covers the matter certainly at this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How can we report back if we cannot get the information?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would you explain then to some of us in the opposition how we resolve the dilemma? A matter is referred to the committee. As a matter of fact, it is referred to the committee with the strict admonition to the House from the Premier—I can find his words—that all information will be made available.

We go to the committee. The chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board says that the nature of the authority given to him in the legislation does not entitle him to reveal the name of the company. We then argue that before the committee.

Today, the Minister of Labour says our arguments were right before the committee and that the chairman of the board has the authority to give us that information.

Mr. MacDonald: And he sometimes gives it.

Mr. Lewis: Now the Minister of Labour says he will not provide us with the information, the chairman of the board will not provide us with the information. Yet we have been instructed by the Premier, no less, to go to that committee and seek the information.

How then are we to resolve what is clearly a contempt of the Legislature, performed first by the chairman of the Compensation Board and second by the Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not to prolong this discussion on the point of order, but as I recall the rules of this House, the rules of the committee, and our procedures in this House, that while any member opposite has the right to ask any question—and by and large these questions are answered—the committee structure functions the same way as it does here. If it is a matter of policy and the government or minister, or even the Premier, says as a matter of policy it is not appropriate to give any specific information, this is the position and the tradition that has existed here.

Mr. MacDonald: If you have nothing to hide, don't hide it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Surely, Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference I think are very clear to the committee—they have the right to ask, to examine, seek out information. But if, as a matter of policy—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And to get answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —or if, because of legislation—and I haven't had an opportunity to personally look into the matter of whether the legislation does or does not preclude the chairman of the board or even the minister from making the name of this corporation public—but if, as a matter of policy, and surely the leader of the New Democratic Party can see this having application in some situations, if it is a matter of policy not to make public whatever it is that is being sought, then that has to be established and has to be accepted.

The leader of the New Democratic Party has every right to say he thinks it should be made public, but surely the Minister of Labour in his responsibility, if he thinks it is in the public interest that it not be made public, has the right—even under the rules of the committee—to take this position. Surely that is the way that this House and the committees must function?

Mr. Lewis: Well, then, by way of final point of order, from my point of view, Mr. Speaker. Since that then negates the whole purpose of this particular activity yesterday, will the Premier consider establishing a royal commission to look into the activities of the Workmen's Compensation Board as they relate to the ordering and remission of fines?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We have had three.

Mr. Lewis: How else is it to be done?

Mr. Speaker: That is hardly a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: How else are we to get the information?

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I have made a ruling, and I might say the Workmen's Compensation Board was referred to the committee by the general rule that applies with boards and commissions referred to the standing committee for that purpose. Now if that

committee had in fact completed its deliberations insofar as the Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned, I should never have made such a ruling today.

They have not completed their investigations; there is still opportunity for questioning. There is still the opportunity and likelihood that more information may be found and made public during the investigations or the sittings of the board. At such time as the board has completed this I would think questions may be proper in this House. While the investigation is going on, while the inquiry or whatever you wish to call it is taking place, while the board is still before the committee, I think any questions, in view of the nature of the topic, would be sub judice in this House and I have so ruled.

Mr. Lewis: You try to deal with Mr. Legge —with the condescension and the omniscience and the self-importance. You try to deal with it! And then with the Minister of Labour who backs it up.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, on a different point of order, if I may.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): I am sure the Speaker would not sneer at him anyway.

Mr. Shulman: My point of order, sir, is—

Mr. MacDonald: He sneers at the world.

Mr. Shulman: —we are entitled to the same rulings consistently from year to year—

Mr. Lewis: I am not going to pick you up on that Rod Lewis.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, I can't hear the hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that we are entitled to consistency in the rulings made in this House. The Minister of Labour has said that he cannot reveal certain information because it would be unfair to the companies involved, and that companies and labour are treated equivalently.

I refer you to the debates here on compensation in 1969, at which time a number of cases were raised by the former member for Dovercourt and myself, relating to unfair treatment, as we felt it, of certain individuals. At that time, the then Minister of Labour had no compunction whatsoever in revealing a great deal of confidential material from the Compensation Board's files about individuals.

Therefore, there is a serious inconsistency here. Surely labour should be treated the same as management, and management shouldn't be given this special protection.

Mr. Speaker: I hardly think that the points raised by the hon. member constitute a point of order because we are now engaged in the oral question period, and any minister has the right to refuse to answer any question.

Mr. Lewis: Fair enough.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have questions?

PRESENCE OF OPP IN LEGISLATURE BUILDING

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether to direct this to the Attorney General or the Solicitor General designate. I'm curious to know who gives the order or the authority for the number of Ontario Provincial Police officers present in the building at any time? What caused the need for the brigade or the battalion or whatever it was yesterday? I understood the need for them the previous day, but not yesterday.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I'm sorry, I didn't hear the latter part of the question.

Mr. Lewis: Why were there so many Ontario Provincial Police officers here yesterday? How many were there in the buildings yesterday?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): There was a convention!

Mr. Bounsall: A union meeting!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the security of the building is in the hands of a detachment of the Ontario Provincial Police. There have been a number of senior police officers in charge during the week, and the senior officer exercises his judgement as to the number of officers that there should be on the premises to ensure the security of the building.

Mr. Lewis: Well, are they on the—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are not instructed by the Solicitor General. My concern is to have an overall policy that someone is in charge of the security and they exercise their judgement.

Mr. Lewis: They weren't on manoeuvres or anything? They were here legitimately? May I ask the Solicitor General could he perhaps inform the officer in charge that when a number of students come to the Legislature to be present when a debate is taking place on the government of their university institution, it is not necessary to have arranged throughout the building and hidden quietly at the end of a corridor in a private room a virtual battalion of Ontario Provincial Police.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: What constitutes a battalion?

Mr. Lewis: I don't know. When I see that many police I think of battalions.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is given to hyperbole, is it?

Mr. Lewis: Hyperbole. Yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Hyperbole. Exaggeration.

Mr. Lewis: How many provincial police at any normal time are there around the building?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I have no idea.

Mr. Lewis: The minister has no idea.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: There should be sufficient to warrant the security of this building.

Mr. Renwick: The minister should inform himself.

Mr. Lewis: How was the security in danger yesterday, when students came to make presentation on a bill affecting their university government?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member knows there was a considerable number of students here the day before yesterday. There was literally a battalion of students here!

Mr. Lewis: The minister is given to hyperbole!

Hon. Mr. Davis: In fact, in the member's term, there were several battalions.

Mr. Ferrier: The Chamber of Commerce came down!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: As a matter of fact, if he were saying it, he'd say there was an army of students or a division!

Mr. Lewis: Probably.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: At least a corps.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say that the students conducted themselves—and the hon. member was aware—not in accordance with the traditions of this House or this unique building.

Mr. Lewis: Yesterday, they did. They conducted themselves well.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am just talking about the circumstances of the last couple of days.

Mr. Renwick: We are talking about yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I was not present in this portion of the building yesterday so I was unaware of the exact circumstances. There is a responsibility on the OPP to maintain the security of this unique public building—

Mr. Lewis: I think they are overzealous.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They are not overzealous. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I thought that the conduct of the OPP on Tuesday last—and it is exactly the same situation—was exemplary.

Mr. Renwick: I would be very surprised ever to hear the Provincial Secretary say anything different about them.

Mr. MacDonald: Did he think they were exemplary in front of the Ontario Science Centre?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is going to have to make up his mind isn't he—the member for York South?

Mr. MacDonald: The minister is going to have to make up his mind. When his friends are victimized he gets exercised.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: We should meet in the Science Centre then we would have the Provincial Secretary on our side.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I don't have a one-track mind.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

DISTRIBUTION OF INCREASES ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Lewis: May I, Mr. Speaker, ask the provincial Treasurer how will the additional revenue from the increase in beer prices be divided as among the provincial government, the federal government, and the breweries?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the increase on beer, Mr. Speaker, the province will receive about $28 million, the government of Canada will receive about $1.3 million and the producers will receive about $11 million.

Mr. Lewis: Eleven million dollars?

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): That's all.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River, a supplementary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): By way of supplementary, could the minister indicate—

Mr. MacDonald: That should pay for their contributions to the election.

Mr. Lewis: I would say that that covers the election.

Mr. Reid: Could the minister indicate what the breakdown is on the increase in price of alcohol—how much the province gets and how much the distillers get?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On spirits the province will receive about $8 million, the federal government about $0.7 million, and the producers something less than $6 million.

While I am on my feet no doubt the members would be interested in knowing the situation with respect to wines.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In that instance Ontario will receive about $2.3 million, the government of Canada $0.2 million, the producers about $1.5 million. In total, Mr. Speaker, Ontario will receive about $38 million, the government of Canada $2.2 million, and the producers in the several parts of the industry about $18.9 million.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: That is enough, thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth North has a question.

STABBING AT YORK UNIVERSITY

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Last Friday at 10 o'clock at York University there was a stabbing—a young female student's life was threatened in the shower by a male student. She proceeded out into the hall and was—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would ask his question?

Mr. Ewen: I am leading up to it, Mr. Speaker:

However, he was apprehended at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. I would like to ask the Attorney General what were the charges laid; and, having a case history, why was this student released; and thirdly, at what time was he released and how much was the bail?

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask the hon. member if this matter is before the courts?

Mr. Ewen: Mr. Speaker, this I do not know.

Mr. Speaker: I will permit the hon. Attorney General to answer then.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and obtain the information. There are certain other charges involved with this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

EXPENDITURE ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: In view of the Premier's statement last June at the time of his decision on the Spadina Expressway that he was going to emphasize people rather than cars, what would be the rationale behind the estimates in this forthcoming year? These provide for an increase in highway construction of some $30 million—that is over two years ago—to bring it up to $375 million and an increase of only $4 million in public transit—that is to GO Transit. In other words, we are still spending 50 times more on road transportation than we are on public transportation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer to that is relatively simple. There are still very large programmes and needs for highway construction in this province.

While this government is completely in support of developments of new rapid transit forms in our urban areas, it is quite obvious—and I am sure the hon. member must have some appreciation of this—that there are many parts of the province of Ontario that will never be serviced by this kind of transportation and it is surely our obligation to see that these areas of the province continue to be served.

As it relates to urban or rapid transit, the government's programme in this regard has now been introduced. It will take some of the larger urban centres a period of time to develop their design and whatever approach they may wish to take. When this point has been reached, Mr. Speaker, the funds will be made available.

It is quite obvious that a very major part of funding of the rapid transit in the Spadina corridor, if I may use that term—and I guess I can safely today because the members for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) aren't here—that there will be very substantial capital funding required by this province for that project. And it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the engineering has yet to be done. In fact, the actual route has not yet been determined so that there are not large sums allocated.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It will be a few years before the Premier is called upon to spend that money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I would expect it would be another year before, shall we say, significant sums would have to be allocated. I would hope that it won't be any longer than that, but that is part of the rationale, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deacon: May I ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: I regret there can be no supplementaries. The time has gone by for the oral question period.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Ewen, from the standing procedural affairs committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee has carefully examined the following applications for private Acts and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Morton Terminal Ltd.

The town of Port Elgin.

The Greater Niagara General Hospital.

The city of Brantford.

The city of Windsor.

The town of Arnprior.

The city of Oshawa.

The county of Prince Edward.

The town of Aurora.

The city of Toronto (No. 2).

The city of Vanier.

The city of Hamilton.

The city of Sarnia (No. 2).

Your committee recommends the applications of the county of Peel, the county of Victoria and the town of Preston be not reported.

Your committee further recommends that the previous order reporting the advertising sufficient with respect to the application of the University of Waterloo be rescinded.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on the report, I wonder if the Minister of Colleges and Universities would explain his participation in the changes in the University of Waterloo bill which resulted in its being thrown out of the committee yesterday?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Well, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the committee yesterday, we received a draft copy of the university bill from the university authorities early in February. There were a number of sections that needed clarification and there was also representation from the federation of students regarding sections which the students were taking issue with and on which we thought there could be some reconciliation. As a result, we met with the university authorities and they agreed to some of the changes and, as I say, mainly from the point of view of clarification except for one section which indicated the representation which would be made by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, we suggested that that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That isn't what the students were pressing for, I take it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, not that one. No! That allotment where a figure was changed from two to 10—and the reason for the change to 10 would be more in line with the principles laid down in the University of Toronto bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I didn't know the minister was worried about those principles in connection with this bill?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes! And there also had been indicated in a very broad sense in the

Wright commission report as to outside representation or lay representation on any university administration. The officials of my department had received some indication from the Clerk's office and also from the legislative counsel that those changes were really not material enough to affect the advertising which apparently had gone out. On that basis the bill was reprinted before it was introduced for first reading in the Legislature.

Really the intent of all this was that knowing there would be substantial debate on this bill and there were many points of differences between the administration and the students, we felt that where we could get agreement it would seem to make sense that those changes could be made in the printed bill as it was presented to the committee.

I also could mention at this time that one of the points that we disagreed on with the university was the provision regarding expropriation. They did not intend to exempt the municipality; this was contrary to our policy and contrary to previous university legislation, so they agreed to that change. But, unfortunately, in the advertisement there was specific reference to the provision for exemption from any expropriation.

As a result of this the committee, wisely I think, felt there was a technical defect here, a conflict between the printed bill and the advertisement, and therefore that the bill should be readvertised.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of clarification, is it true that the minister insisted on expanding the representation on the board that would be appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, with a similar reduction in the amount of representation from the local community, and it was on that basis that the lack of advertising was particularly sensitive?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I don't know really if there was any great insistence on my part; this was something that was quite quickly agreed to by the officials of the university. The figure 10 would be about a little less than one-third really, whereas the Toronto bill is about one-third, I believe—18 out of 50. There was no insistence, but I agree with the hon. member that due to the wording of the advertisement, this was another technical defect.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the report be received and adopted?

Report agreed to.

Mr. Clement from the standing private bills committee, presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr8, An Act respecting the city of Sarnia.

Bill Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr12, An Act respecting the city of London.

Bill Pr13, An Act to incorporate St. John's College School (Elora).

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing and penalties, if any, be remitted on Bill Pr13, An Act to incorporate St. John's College School (Elora).

Your committee further recommends that the time for introducing private bills and for receiving reports of committees on private bills be extended for three weeks.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I have perhaps a minor point: The bill was amended to take the name "college" out of St. John's College, but I believe I heard it read that way by the Clerk Assistant.

Clerk of the House: The amendment will appear in the reprinted bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put on the adoption of the report, what is now the understanding with respect to the University of Waterloo bill regarding republication and the return of that bill to the private bills committee?

Mr. J. T. Clement (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the University of Waterloo bill, which was introduced in this House by the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), I understand the way the matter was left yesterday it was to be readvertised. However, following the committee meeting yesterday, I had occasion to speak to Mr. Matthews, the president of the college, who approached me and I had a subsequent conversation with the hon. member and it may well be changed, I don't know. I'm afraid that's all the light that I can throw on it at the present time.

The students are concerned that the matter be reintroduced forthwith because they've taken the position that they'll be in examinations and unable to make the representations they feel are necessary in this matter.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, could I say a word on this point? I would like to say that the problem arose due to the fact that the procedural affairs committee ascertained that the bill was printed in a different form from which it had been advertised. I would like to relate to the members of this House that that different form of printing occurred here at the behest of the Department of University Affairs in conjunction with the legislative counsel. In fact, the university now is going to be put through the process of having to readvertise what is essentially a new bill, not the bill that was presented by them originally. I think this is not a very healthy situation when bills are advertised and then, with the concurrence of legislative counsel and a department of government, amendments are put into a bill which, in my view, rightfully should be introduced in the private bills committee. I can't understand the procedure being permitted whereby a minister can put a dozen amendments into a bill between the time it is advertised and taken to the private bills committee. I think the attention of this House should be brought to those facts.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may just pursue very briefly—

Mr. Speaker: On a debate of this type a member may only speak once. Does the hon. minister have any comments to make?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the committee yesterday passed two motions; one was to rescind its decision, and the second one, I believe, was that the bill be readvertised and that the time be extended to allow the private bills committee to sit and consider this bill and other bills that would not be considered within the time allowed for private bills sitting. I believe there is a motion to that effect. Now, whether that has to be considered by this House or not, I am not sure.

Mr. Speaker: The motion before the House at this time is for the report to be received and adopted.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that when the House adjourns today, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 4, at 2 p.m.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, in that connection, I wonder if I may ask the House leader what is the government's intention following Easter with regard to night sessions? Do we automatically go into the normal pattern of Tuesday and Thursday night sessions?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, we do. Monday as well, certainly in the following week.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

GREATER NIAGARA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. Drea moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF PORT ELGIN

Mr. Reid, in the absence of Mr. Sargent, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Port Elgin.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GAME AND FISH ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Game and Fish Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill is being introduced at the request of the Ontario Trappers Association. It sets up certain areas of the province in which the hunting of racoon is restricted in certain seasons so as to protect this particular industry.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): How's the trapping in High Park?

COUNTY OF PRINCE EDWARD

Mr. Timbrell, in the absence of Mr. Taylor, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the County of Prince Edward.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF ARNPRIOR

Mr. Yakabuski moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Arnprior.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF AURORA

Mr. Yakabuski, in the absence of Mr. W. Hodgson, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Town of Aurora.

CITY OF VANIER

Mr. Ruston, in the absence of Mr. Roy, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Vanier.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. Wiseman, in the absence of Mr. Wardle, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

MORTON TERMINAL LTD.

Mr. B. Newman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Morton Terminal Ltd.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. McNie moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

Mr. Beckett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SARNIA

Mr. B. Newman, in the absence of Mr. Bullbrook, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Sarnia.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Oshawa.

CITY OF OSHAWA

Mr. McIlveen moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the City of Oshawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 27, An Act to provide for the Reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT
(*continued*)

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, my reply on second reading will be relatively brief, in that this matter has been discussed both in the House and outside over a period of some weeks. I do express the regret—and I am sure that he will be here shortly—that the Leader of the Opposition isn't here to listen to my observations.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): He will be here shortly.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And of course I am particularly disturbed that the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) isn't here, because after his very excellent contribution on Tuesday—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Premier should take his tongue out of his cheek.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —after such a meaningful, constructive approach, I was really looking forward to replying to some of his observations.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The member will expect a reply.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, in that the member for Downsview is unfortunately not with us today, perhaps I will have that pleasure during the Throne Speech debate when I can make those observations known to him.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Don't worry, the message will be given to him.

Mr. Lewis: This is a special holiday.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, substantially farther south than Stowe!

Mr. Lewis: Just Morty and me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do regret, Mr. Speaker —and I say this very objectively—I do regret the attitude of the official opposition in this House. And yet I guess one could really predict they would vote against this bill, in that it has been the history and the tradition of the Liberal Party in the Province of Ontario to be reactionary, non-progressive and not interested in the development of better procedures and techniques.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: And a matter of deep frustration!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think when they have their leadership convention, they should seriously take a look, not at a new leader—because I think they have got the best that is available over there, incidentally—but at the name of their party. Because in the past six or seven years I have sensed—

An hon. member: That's right!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that on any matter of meaningful reform, whether it is county school boards, regional governments, tax reform, and now reform of the administration of the government, the Liberal Party have been far from a party of reform. They have been negative—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We're trying to keep the government from making mistakes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to get back to county school boards. I don't want to get back to the pamphlet for the 1967 election, where the then leader of the Liberal Party, still the leader—and I said in his absence he was really the best that was available there, without any question; and I say that very objectively, I really do—he said they were all in favour of school board reform, county school boards wherever possible—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It may be necessary for me to stay to see—

Hon. Mr. Davis: But the heat was on, the going got tough and, of course, we debated it in the House and they were opposed to it because they thought there was some political advantage.

I did read the blueprint for government; I did. I read it, Mr. Speaker, and I was going to observe this during the Throne Speech debate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I read it and I read it very thoroughly. I didn't read the part in the ads in the newspapers because, with respect, the print was a little small and it was hard to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: They also left out interesting bits.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I read it and I cannot understand, much as I would like to understand, how a party that is interested in reform and how the Leader of the Opposition, who has spoken around this province about the reorganization of government and alteration of ministries, is now prepared to vote against one of the most significant administrative reforms that has taken place in this province for many, many years. To me it is typical—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, that the official opposition is in difficulty today, and will continue to be in difficulty I am afraid, for some years to come. And Mr. Speaker, I recognize—

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): The Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) is almost asleep because he has nothing to do.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well let's not get into personalities and who is asleep and who is awake, because I could have some observations to make in that regard, and this perhaps isn't the time or the place. After all, it is on the eve of a holiday weekend when all of our thoughts should be devoted to charitable things and so on—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So I will not indulge in some of those things as on other occasions I might be provoked to do so.

Now that I have dealt with what I think was the main contribution of the official opposition; that is they are just opposed to any kind of reform, period; I will try to deal with one or two of the issues the Leader of the Opposition raised. I think there is a concern, and Mr. Speaker I acknowledge this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am glad I got back for the vital part of the speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What we are dealing with today is the administration of the government. We are not dealing with the function

of the Legislature, the function of the members. The commitment that was made in the Throne Speech is one that is going to be moved ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: When?

Hon. Mr. Davis: There will be a commission or a committee or a form of examination of the function of the House for all of the members.

To me this is very relevant. I share the concern that has been expressed, not just in the past two or three days, but for a period of time in this House as to the process here itself. I am as interested as anyone else in seeing if there are ways we can more meaningfully involve all of us who make a contribution here in this Legislature. And we all do; I am not going to be facetious about that, we do!

I am just as interested as anyone else in seeing if we can find better ways and means, also, of improving the participation of the backbenchers, on both sides of the House. Mr. Speaker, with great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, that is an issue separate and apart from the reorganization that is taking place.

Mr. MacDonald: Not really!

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is nothing in this bill and the reorganization that materially affects the other aspect of the matter that has to be assessed. There is nothing in the reorganization that alters the function of the executive council, the reporting to the House, the involvement of ministers in the House, the involvement of members. There is nothing whatsoever that alters the status quo in that regard. I think it is very necessary to make that point, because the two issues could in my view become confused.

Mr. Reid: That is true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, in his blueprint, advocated a reduction in ministers. There is in fact a reduction in operating ministries.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Of one!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well with all respect there is a reduction of more than one! The provincial secretaries in the policy fields—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is removing his policy ministers from that list?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes I am.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Perhaps that should be so; we don't know what they do!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I hope the members opposite will become sufficiently receptive over a period of time to fully understand what the policy ministers are doing and will be doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well the Premier can't have it both ways. He can't say he is reducing the size of the ministry; they are part of the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we have never advocated the reduction in the size of the ministry. The Leader of the Opposition has advocated a reduction in the size of the ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is trying to have it both ways. He is trying to say that he is reducing while he is not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I never really anticipated he would have the responsibility of doing it, I would be so bold as to make a prediction that it would never have happened. If he had in fact succeeded there would have been no reduction in the size of the ministry. He knows it and everybody else knows it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes there would, because I would not have to keep all the load of deadwood the Premier is stuck with.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I am delighted that the Leader of the Opposition has been somewhat provoked, I will not reply in kind as to the kind of kindling and wood he has available to himself within his own caucus—

An hon. member: He is right!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —because I like the members opposite, they are very genuine, sincere people; but I would say, and I say this to the Leader of the Opposition, he should be very careful how he refers to my colleagues and members of this government, because without any question, determination was made on Oct. 21, when the people of Ontario determined those who had the qualification and the capacity to administer the affairs of this province, and he knows it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And that is why he knows it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The policy minister has to justify his directive to sleep.

An hon. member: At least deadwood burns. You guys can't even kindle a spark over there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However Mr. Speaker, I don't want to go into the history of October.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: They are such a great bunch.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will do that sometime a little later on, but not today.

Mr. Lewis: Even without Tim Reid, the Premier still has that fellow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I miss Tim from day to day.

Mr. Lewis: Well the Premier really has a pretty large foil!

Hon. Mr. Davis: But there are others there who give me the opportunity.

Mr. MacDonald: The Premier is right. It is so painfully difficult.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There are others there.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with two or three specific observations made by the Leader of the Opposition, as they relate to the position of the government administration to the people generally. Once again there is nothing in this reorganization bill that will make the position as it relates to government and the people any more difficult than it is at present.

Mr. Nixon: It is currently difficult! It should be better. It should be improved. Why doesn't the Premier's man improve it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly it is difficult, and this is one of the tasks that we all have to face. The opportunity exists within the restructuring that is taking place to make the government more responsive to the needs of the individual citizens. If the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues can't sense this, if they can't see it, then Mr. Speaker they are the losers, not the government as far as this is concerned.

I must also observe—Mr. Speaker, when I check my notes very carefully, I can't find much else that the Leader of the Opposition asked or observed. There is a distinction between restructuring and what needs to be done as far as it relates to this House, and I would hope that upon reconsideration and the recognition that this is a very genuine move forward, a legitimate attempt to improve the administration, the Leader of the Opposition will have second thoughts, as he has on occasion, and urge his colleagues to support this bill on second reading; because surely he must recognize it is in the interest of the public that we all here serve.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But the Premier won't stick with it either. It is only an accessory.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was more intrigued by the observations of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who sensed he couldn't be worked up really, to be too enthusiastic about it, or too negative about it. I won't say he was waffling on the issue, because that would be misunderstood in the terminology that is being used.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): That is the Premier's favourite joke these days.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I did sense at least some recognition that perhaps this was at least worthwhile; attempting and reserving unto himself—

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, we share the worries that the Premier has—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The opportunity to second guess a year from now, or at some appropriate occasion.

Mr. MacDonald: —or that the Premier's Minister of Justice has.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So to the Leader of the New Democratic Party, I extend my sincere appreciation—

Mr. MacDonald: The worries about the restructuring!

Hon. Mr. Davis: For the very enthusiastic support he is giving to the significant reform that is taking place.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Now answer the substance of his comments.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I was interested in the question that he also raised as it related to the involvement of the members, and I will not repeat what I said because I don't think we're dealing with that issue as far as this bill is concerned. I'll just give you now my own observations, because obviously the head of government must assume the responsibility for this kind of reorganization.

And I say this to the members opposite, as one who must bear the ultimate responsibility for decision making in our democratic process, there is no question that the structure that is being developed enables the first minister in this provinces to have available to him now much better consideration of major policy matters that must be determined in the interests of the public of this province. For the first time we have an opportunity for much closer relationships between departments that have a common interest. We have very able men, our provincial secretaries, who can devote their full time to an analysis and development of policy, which helps the decision-making process as far as government is concerned.

I would make this prediction, Mr. Speaker, that what we're doing here in our restructuring will be, shall we say not necessarily duplicated or copied by other jurisdictions, but certainly they're interested, and I think one can see this as a developing procedure in other jurisdictions in this country. To me it is the only direction to go. It is not possible any longer for a first minister, along with his colleagues who have individual responsibilities for operating ministries only, to deal with the significant, basic policy decisions that any government must deal with today.

While I know we all have a little bit of fun in this House, and while I know the members opposite on occasion take delight in embarrassing ministers in their pursuit of very urgent public information, this is part of the game. We understand it, we appreciate it. I would say to you—and they don't need to speak for them—the provincial secretaries in the policy fields in this government are making very constructive, helpful contributions, and this will emerge as time goes on as being one of the very significant aspects of the reorganization that is taking place.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier politically slaughtered them.

Mr. Reid: His Secretary of Justice can't keep a straight face.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to get into a discussion on political slaughter, there is no one who can speak with greater authority than he can on that particular subject; no one.

I tell you here and now that the provincial secretaries—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: At least I was slaughtered in the open but these people were slaughtered in secret. These people, former leadership candidates, are left with positions that simply leave them without influence in the party or the government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Leader of the Opposition recognizes just how weak his position is; and I can tell you this, the provincial secretaries in this government do not feel slaughtered. They know the kind of contribution they are making.

Mr. Lewis: They just look it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They do not!

Mr. Reid: They have been run over by a truck then.

Mr. Lawlor: I can see a trickle of blood under the desk.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Be patient! The member has been patient for a number of years; be patient. His party will be patient for many years yet to come.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Don't count on it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The members know it will.

I want to make this abundantly clear, from one who is working with it on a day-to-day basis, the restructuring—the committee structure, the Management Board, the policy in priorities board, the involvement of the provincial secretaries policy determination—has been one of the most significant administrative changes that has been attempted; and, Mr. Speaker, it is going to work.

It is going to work in a way that will be helpful to all members in this House, but more importantly will be in the interests of the public we all serve. I really am quite disappointed that some of the members opposite can't fully appreciate what is happening. In fact I almost get the sense, Mr. Speaker, that a number of members opposite haven't even read the report. I don't say they haven't; I just sense that some have not very carefully—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is typical of the Premier, too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am just sensing it. Now maybe all of them have, but —

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A very sensitive fellow! While he is being sensitive, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier, who said a moment ago I had not asked any particularly significant questions would comment to my indica-

tion, to which he must surely have been sensitive, that municipal affairs have been seriously downgraded by being loaded into an extremely large compendium-style department; and this was an area of emerging importance, much more so than in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that very specifically. The concept or the involvement of this government with the municipalities has not been downgraded one whit by the determination to have it as a part of the Treasury and as a part of the new Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs. This is what I can't understand. The logic is so obvious to have matters of regional development, matters of economics, financing of our municipalities, related to the Treasury functions that even the members opposite, I would have hoped, would have recognized this.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Finish the list. The list is too long. It includes finance, it includes all planning.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a very heavy workload. I appreciate this. The Treasurer appreciates this. He has the capacity, thank heavens he has the health, to perform this very onerous function and does it extremely well.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier is concerned with the power and the glory, and somebody says that he has got the glory.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would say that in my discussions with the municipalities —and I have had a number—they recognize that really not only is this not a de-emphasis in our involvement or our regard for the municipalities, but it is a recognition of the priority we are giving to ths very important aspect of government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is an insult and the government is going to slaughter the municipalities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They recognize it. No question about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's right, the Premier is going to slaughter them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have taken longer—I really hoped we would get all the bills dealt with a little sooner than this—but there are two or three things I have to comment on.

To the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy): While I was under the gallery I listened to him very attentively and I have read what he observed and, Mr. Speaker, through you I would just pass on to him a little advice. If he thinks he is going to impress this government by trying to rationalize something as it relates to a corporate structure to the reorganization that is taking place, with reference to chairmen of the board, members of the board and so on, Mr. Speaker, I just have to very kindly observe that I am singularly unimpressed because it has no relevance whatsoever.

This is not a corporate structure. It is not meant to be a corporate structure. No corporation, from my limited knowledge—and I do confess my limited knowledge, Mr. Speaker, in corporate structures—in my view no corporation could operate under this structure. This is a public structure; it is devoted to the interests of people, no question about that. Any references shall we say made by the member for Ottawa Centre perhaps as something of an academic exercise, if I can use that phrase, are not relevant whatsoever. So I shall not comment any further, because it didn't make any sense.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for York South—it is true, Mr. Speaker, it didn't make sense. I read it very carefully. Some of his observations in the past few days have, and I will comment on those a little later on in the Throne Debate. I was very intrigued by one or two of them—quite intrigued—but on this issue—

Mr. Lewis: The member for Ottawa Centre has got to the Premier several times since this House has opened.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, he hasn't got to me at all.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier always feels compelled to deal with him very carefully. This is a corporate structure. It is the Premier's form of corporate structure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the member for Scarborough West knows this is not a corporate structure. He has spent half his life trying to analyse corporate structures and what is wrong with them. Surely he can see a very—

Mr. Lewis: More than half my life.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, he knows far more about them than I do. There is no question about that.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. And I'm telling the Premier from my well of knowledge he has got a corporate structure.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is not a corporate structure. He knows it, I know it, everybody else knows it.

Mr. Cassidy: It is as close to a corporate structure as the Premier could have made it, and he has—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is wrong and the member for Ottawa Centre—

Mr. Lawlor: There may even be shareholders.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, if we are going to talk about shareholders—

Mr. Lewis: In fact, that may be the new role for the government backbenchers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —the member for Lakeshore is a very substantial shareholder.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I mean in the affairs of government. I am not referring to the member for Lakeshore's economic share holdings.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the observations of the hon. member for York South, because he asked a couple of questions. I was intrigued by the questions because I understood them, but I did not quite understand their relevance.

As I recall the member for York South's questions,—he quoted from page 50 of the report, is this not correct? He was concerned, and I think it a very legitimate concern, about the concept of the operating ministries discharging their responsibilities through boards, agencies and commissions.

Mr. Speaker, as I read the heading on page 49 this is all under the section, Concepts for the Future; it does not relate to this bill and is not committed by way of government policy. In fact, very frankly Mr. Speaker, I have very serious reservations about some of the thoughts that are proposed under Concepts for the Future.

That, Mr. Speaker, very simply, is the answer to the member for York South. We are not dealing with that aspect of the report as far as this particular legislation is concerned.

I think there was one other question that he asked, and that referred to the observation on interdepartmental committees. Mr. Speaker, of course this is one of the rationales for the restructuring that is taking place. It will minimize the need for interdepartmental committees. I know this area, I have been on them; all my cabinet colleagues have been on them. They have functioned reasonably well but, let us face it, we all had our own operating responsibilities. Sometimes the interdepartmental committees would not get the kind of priority they deserved just because of time and commitment.

Mr. Speaker, we will now be able to minimize that. The policy field committees will be able to function in a way that is far more helpful and meaningful than was the case with the interdepartmenal committees. I think we will see far less of interdepartmental committees as time goes on.

The whole rationale, Mr. Speaker—this was demonstrated by the member for York South; he showed some very real appreciation of this. In fact, I would say, if I can sense these things, that he did in fact read the report and very thoroughly. One of the difficulties with government has been the vertical relationship that has developed over the years. This inhibits that kind of growth continuing; it lays the groundwork for the horizontal integration of government programme and administration that is so necessary.

Mr. Speaker, there has been nothing more effective devised, to our knowledge, anywhere that can come closer to accomplishing this very specific purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I am the first to admit that the decision to implement this report was not taken easily nor was it taken lightly. I have been in government long enough to know that the safest way to administer government is to maintain the status quo. Quite obviously, that would be the philosophy of the official opposition.

This government, and I think this has been demonstrated in the past 13 months, is not prepared to stand on the status quo. It is prepared to implement those reports that we think are helpful. It is prepared to experiment. It is prepared to live a bit dangerously. I am prepared to admit that, but we think we are doing it in the interest of the people and surely this is what the function is of this particular Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: The government is prepared to experiment but not to live dangerously!

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I anticipate we will have the tentative support of the New Democratic Party with their enthusiasm for reform, I do again express the regret that the traditional party of reform in this province finds its negative position to be such they will not support what I believe will be one of the very important changes in government administration to take place in this country. And Mr. Speaker, I have no reluctance whatsoever in supporting with enthusiasm the second reading of this most important piece of legislation.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I asked a few questions pertinent to northern affairs; could the Premier answer those?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities for the former Department of Northern Affairs will be in the Ministry of Natural Resources. I think this was the information that the hon. member wished. As it relates to the specific number of offices over a period of time, Mr. Speaker, this will have to be dealt with in the estimates of the department.

Mr. Stokes: But it will be the responsibility of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, it will be the responsibility of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Premier as well?

Mr. Speaker: No, we permitted the one point of clarification, this is most unusual. After every member has had the opportunity to enter the debate, the hon. Prime Minister sums up; the motion is now before the House.

The motion is for second reading of Bill 27. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

An hon. member: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole?

Committee of the whole House.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT

House in committee on Bill 27, An Act to provide for the reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 27, An Act to provide for the Reorganization of the government of Ontario. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to Part I?

On Part I:

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, Mr. Chairman, a small point. What is the advantage in abandoning the term "department," which is certainly on all of the printing in the government, it has been blazoned on trucks and graders; and in the minds also, of the traditionalists, which apparently according to the Premier I represent?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Chairman, just from the practical side, nothing will be changed until stationery and so on runs out, so there won't be any real economic difficulty involved.

The term "ministry" was recommended by the committee in their belief, and I think with some merit, that it more accurately reflects both our parliamentary system of government and the responsibilities that are involved. After all, they are ministers, responsible for operating ministries. And, of course, there is some distinction here between that term and the provincial secretaries for the various policy field areas. It is not a significant part of the bill, I'm not suggesting that, but we think it makes sense and we are adopting that part of the recommendation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right. I am interested in your response because the meaning of the word "ministry" seems to be—in the minds of some people, myself included—the minister and the top echelon of those people administering policy. Then, under them comes a department which is the operating arm, and I would ask the Premier if, in fact, the term "department" is going to be continued in use under the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, that, for instance, there would be a department of such-and-such under the Ministry of Education is a possibility, but the title will be Minister of Education, who is responsible for

the Ministry of Education—whether there could be departments or branches under that I'm not sure.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 1 stand as part of the bill then?

Part I agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions, comments or amendments to the first five sections shall we say? If so, which section?

On Part II:

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move—and I hope this is reported to the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) just to prove that I was prepared to make an amendment—that under part II, the term "Prime Minister" be changed to that of "Premier."

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In part II.

Some hon. members: In the heading.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Get him to write it out.

Mr. Chairman: Hon. Mr. Davis moves that at the beginning of part II the heading be changed from "Prime Minister" to "Premier." Shall the motion carry?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, obviously we are in favour of this change. Once again, it is probably as important as is anything in here as far as convenience is concerned.

I wonder if the Premier would enlighten the House as to the reports that he asked for about this particular designation. Somebody said it cost him $15,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I thought we had discussed this some time last spring. Professor Careless did a scholarly report on it. I don't recall the figure, but I know it was far less than that. As I recall his observations, once again, I guess it could be argued both ways, but leaving that aside at the moment, the term that I prefer is that of "Premier".

Mr. R. F. Nixon: So, Professor Careless' recommendations, although I am sure that they were useful and effective, were not of much use or effect with the Premier, who just decided that he liked the term.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just like, to know, to get as much good advice on these things as I can.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments in Part II? If so, what section?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Chairman, on Part II, section 3, subsection 2(1): which is really a specific way of getting at a fairly general section. The Premier did not refer to comments that had been made on this side of the House by the opposition and by this party, relating to the responsibilities that will be given to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough), who is mentioned here along with the other policy ministers.

I wonder if the Premier could, in fact, elaborate on the reasons for which a policy area was not created in the constellation of jobs which the Treasurer is undertaking; or the reasons for which some other device was not used—the Premier has spoken of an experimental approach—in order to ease the kinds of burdens that the Treasurer is going to have to undertake? On this side of the House we might have been quite happy to see a Minister of Economic Planning, perhaps, who had some of the responsibilities that the Treasurer has, but that may not be in the philosophy over there.

Without getting too political about it, there is very real concern here that the Treasurer can't do all of the jobs that he has been given. I am very curious, and the Premier might be able to enlighten us, as to why something similar or comparable to a policy area, with maybe a couple of other ministers working in conjunction with the Treasurer, would not have been created in that field.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply to that very briefly—and to say what I thought we might do during the committee deliberations—there are individual sections or parts of the bill, and the ministers who will be or are involved in those aspects may wish to answer some of the questions or observations themselves individually.

I would just say that one of the rationales for the combination of the functions within the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, of course, relates to the budgeting not the process but the responsibility the Treasurer must have in a very personal way for the budget itself. While, as I said before, I recognize it is difficult, from the workload standpoint—no question about that—I should also observe that the total responsibility for one of the very time-

consuming aspects of the former responsibilities in Treasury, that is, of Treasury Board, now Management Board, has been removed from that area and given to the Chairman of the Management Board. From a time standpoint—and the Treasurer himself could give you some greater breakdown of the time involved—the removal of this responsibility really frees up a substantial amount for the minister who is responsible for this particular area. But perhaps when we get to part XIV of the bill itself, if the member would like to ask a specific question or two or three or a dozen of the Treasurer himself, I am sure he would be delighted to deal with them.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I certainly will ask specific questions in time of the Treasurer, but I think that the questions now really relate to the Premier, because the bill stands in his name and he is effectively responsible for the overall reorganization and allocation of duties.

Perhaps I could ask it this way of the Premier, would he not agree that the responsibilities for economic oversight of the province in regional planning and the responsibilities for regional municipal government, taken separately, are each at least equal, and in many cases in fact are greater than the responsibilities of many other ministries within the reformed cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I don't agree with that whatsoever. I think the most relevant point is that those aspects are very directly related. There must be, I think, a very real degree of co-operation, and this can be best brought about by having it within the administrative jurisdiction of a single minister, between regional development and regional government.

I think the rationale is very obvious. I am not prepared to argue that it isn't onerous—it is—but I think the logic, the rationale for the combination of responsibilities in Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs it is very sound. And as I say, thank heavens the Treasurer is physically fit.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the argument the Premier has just made could be equally well made for suggesting that the responsibilities in the policy field of justice in fact do not require as many ministers as exist. In that field we have a Solicitor General, an Attorney General, a Minister of Correctional Services and a Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Now those are also quite interrelated, and in fact could easily have been compressed to one or two fewer ministries than they have there.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): More easily than what has been compressed in the present Treasurer's ministry.

Mr. Cassidy: Much more easily than what has been compressed in the case of the Treasury. I forgot to mention responsibility for federal-provincial relations; that is relations to senior levels of government as well as to junior levels of government. I am afraid that the Premier's answers certainly have not satisfied me so far that all of these things, which admittedly ought to be together in one policy field, should necessarily be combined in one particular cabinet minister, however capable or incapable the fellow happens to be.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I can't really add anything more. I think the logic is there; I think it is really quite obvious. If the member for Ottawa Centre feels it is too much of a responsibility, that's his point of view. I can't argue against that. It is a judgement decision; we have made the decision that we think it makes sense to do it and we have done it this way, and I for one am very sure it will work.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to pursue this just for a moment. It seems to me there's a fundamental inconsistency in their approach with reference to this paricular department, accepting the premises of what they are attempting to do.

For example, one of the premises—and to the greatest extent possible it is carried out—is the separation of the shaping of policy and programme delivery. They do that, for example, in the justice field, in spite of the fact that all of the departments that are down at the departmental level in the justice field were in one department not too many years ago. They have now become fragmented; I speak of the Solicitor General and Financial and Commercial Affairs, things of that nature.

Accepting their approach, why, in this particular area, don't they have a policy minister and certain departmental breakdowns for the delivery of those programmes? I suggest to the Prime Minister that there certainly is an inconsistency in the approach here as compared with the other three policy areas.

But there is another point I want to make, and it is that what they are attempting to do here, surely, is to establish a structure for some years to come; it is not a structure

tailored to meet the needs of any given man, albeit as versatile and as great as the present provincial Treasurer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let us take some of those remarks as read from now on.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes. Well I am just copying the hon. member. He has been saying all of these nice things.

There is a very simple historical fact here. It was possible for the present Prime Minister to handle the Department of Education and the department of what is now known as Colleges and Universities, because the latter grew up under his jurisdiction. In fact it emerged embryo-like and grew under his jurisdiction. How it grew!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): It gave birth.

Mr. MacDonald: But once the Premier moved from the minister who had accommodated himself as it grew, very wisely he appointed two ministers—one who is in Education and one who is in Colleges and Universities.

Now let me carry the analogy to the instance of the provincial Treasurer. The provincial Treasurer may be able to do something approaching justice to such a massive portfolio—I do not think he can do justice because he is not superhuman; even he, I suspect, maybe recognizes that he is not superhuman. He can do some justice to Municipal Affairs, but he cannot do full justice. But he can do it only because he was in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

But suppose, sometime a year or two from now, or five years from now, the Prime Minister wants to put in a different minister who does not happen to have had the experience in Municipal Affairs. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the task he will have will not only be difficult, it will be impossible. So there is a basic flaw in the structure that the Premier is building and I would hope that that structure is something more than just an accommodation to the needs of one man.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do not want to, as I say, prolong this any further. It is not really exactly the way I am going to explain it, but over a period of time, shall we say, the delivery of service functions of the new department that is being created will tend to diminish. As regional governments are established, obviously they will assume greater responsibility for the delivery of their own Stewart fulfils the job that a deputy would policy-setting area because it does involve itself in matters of finance—the amount of money for the municipalities.

But once again take the very time-consuming and difficult administrative area—the whole field of assessment. It has been given to the Department of Revenue, and this was a very major part of the former Department of Municipal Affairs. That is a revenue function, given to the Department of Revenue and is no longer the responsibility of the Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

One could look at the Ontario Municipal Board, which is a quasi-judicial board reporting now to the Attorney General. While this in itself was perhaps not as time-consuming as other areas of responsibility, nonetheless that has been transferred to another department of government. So that while the work load is onerous, it is really not a combination of the former department of Treasury and Economics and Municipal Affairs in their totality. A good part of the responsibility has been given to other operating ministries, or to the chairman of the management board.

Mr. Chairman: Shall part 2 stand as part of the bill then?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, the section that immediately follows the one that we were just discussing, the subsection, refers to the appointment of parliamentary assistants and the allocation of their duties. It has become known that the parliamentary assistants already appointed have certain specific duties. But surely if the system is going to work properly, these duties should be part of either a ministerial statement or some specific order relating to it.

For example, the member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett), I am told by certain of my colleagues who have met with him, has the responsibility under the old Department of Municipal Affairs for the community planning branch. I believe that is correct.

I think it would be quite useful if the assignments for the parliamentary assistants were made known quite formally. I do not know whether it requires an order or a statement, but if the parliamentary assistants are going to have the kind of role that I would wish for them and, surely the Premier does as well, they have to be backed up with some kind of a statement giving them an area of operation and responsibility that is understood.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this is very valid. Sometime quite shortly the individual ministers will have a statement for the benefit of all members as to the, shall we say, as comprehensive—and it will never be totally comprehensive—areas of responsibility for the parliamentary assistants. It has not been possible to do this up to this point because we never had parliamentary assistants before. We are still experimenting. But I would think sometime within the next two or three weeks we can have that formal statement available so that the members will have some understanding of their responsibilities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One further point before we leave this whole section, in the discussion pertaining to the role of the Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, I presume, we'll have a bill on this matter before us a little later today, so that we can perhaps discuss it there, but it almost puts the incumbent in that office in a position as "Deputy Premier."

Let me just show the Premier my reasoning, because surely the traditions—if he'll pardon the use of that word, Mr. Chairman—would put the Premier in a position which would in fact be the job that the Treasurer is now operating in an even more expanded capacity. The present Treasurer is developing, in what would perhaps be an old-fashioned term, his own department. He is going to have two parliamentary assistants who are already functioning. In other words, he is trying to maintain a certain independence from the actual day-to-day administration of certain aspects of his department and taking a policy responsibility.

It's a funny inconsistency in the whole Reorganization Act, because by tradition we hire administrators, and I think we have had very good ones, but all members of the cabinet share the important policy and supervisory responsibilities. But as it is now the inner cabinet, as we might put it, with regard to the Provincial Secretariat for Natural—

An hon. member: Natural Resources!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —Natural Resources? I don't think that is right!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Economics and Municipal Affairs): Resource Development!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Resource Development—is in fact the cabinet minister and the present Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) fulfils the job that a deputy would have filled in the past.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no! That is wrong.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's a fact. Because the broad overall policy is going to be developed by the policy minister and the ministers—when this of course gets into its swing, when you're not bothered with the personalities of present incumbents who would not stand for that sort of thing, of course, and should not—are going to be in a secondary position subject to the policy decisions of those persons ahead of them.

We've had a discussion on this and I don't intend to repeat it, but it seems to me that the concern we feel in the lumping together of so many powers—albeit related powers—under the designation of the Treasurer, means that this bill does designate a "Deputy Premier", whether you admit it or whether he accepts it in such a term or not; that he is the operating arm of government; that he is the fount of substantial policy and that the other members of the administration are there to administer their little sections. On the next bill that comes up, the man there is going to deal with lightning rods and the police; but as far as we're concerned, with this bill the bill does designate a "Deputy Premier", a man who is second only to the chief of government in power and authority in both administration and policy.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I won't dwell on this either. This is categorically wrong and indicates to me a lack of appreciation of what is being attempted within the report and within this legislation. Hopefully, this will become more evident to the—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But in fact that is what it accomplishes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, this will become more evident to the Leader of the Opposition as time goes on. There is no point in really beating this bush again, because we have already done it. It is interesting, really, because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I didn't ask a question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —on occasion when I am not here, because of his very long experience and great capacity, the Chairman of the Management Board has in fact been acting Premier on those few occasions when I am not always within this jurisdiction.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Would I be out of line if I said that was not apparent?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I am just making this observation and this has been the practice.

Mr. Chairman: The member for St. David.

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr Chairman, I rise to compliment the Premier upon the content of this bill and to note with appreciation that on page 27 he has included a paragraph to the effect that he can expand the ministries at some future time as he sees fit. I am pleased about this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! We're on Bill 27. We're in committee of the whole House now. We're not speaking generally to the principle of the bill.

Mrs. Scrivener: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: That has been passed. We're on part II. Did you have something on part II?

Mrs. Scrivener: Yes, I do. It seems to me there are two areas of activity in this bill which are not covered in the existing structural setup. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that in the first instance we should have listed before us in this group of ministries a ministry of cultural affairs. Although we do have an influence on cultural affairs through our certain passive participation—such as grants to the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Royal Ontario Museum, through the adornment of our public buildings—although we do participate in a certain way, it seems to me this is an exceedingly important function in which the province should be participating more closely, more actively, and that these functions should be gathered together within the sphere of one ministry of cultural affairs.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I observe that some members of the opposition have commented on the matters that are handled by the Department of Municipal Affairs. I don't really agree with their concept of this matter, but there is a function which is not covered—or which is being covered but not in a true organizational manner—and it is the whole function of land use planning in Ontario.

It appears to me that we have a scattering of the planning function through the Department of Transportation and Communications, through the Ontario Water Resources Commission, through Ontario Hydro and other departments, boards and commissions. If we could establish a ministry of planning, to co-ordinate and integrate these functions with the functions of the Department of Municipal Affairs—such a ministry, of course, to be responsible to the Department of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—this might be a more direct way of executing the function for which we are responsible.

Mr. Cassidy: Give her a secretaryship, Bill.

Mr. Chairman: Shall part II stand as part of the bill?

Part II agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Part III, beginning with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. Are there any questions, comments, or amendments in this part?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want some clarification on this matter of policy development. The matter was alluded to be my my leader a few moments ago.

The primary responsibility, as I understand it, with respect to policy having to do with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food as it will be constituted under this bill, resides with the designate Provincial Secretary of Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence). Really, what I can't understand is to what degree does the minister of that particular department contribute to the actual policy development in that area.

Let's take the present incumbents of those offices. The Minister of Agriculture and Food is obviously the man who holds the expertise and experience in this particular field. The hon. member for Carleton East (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), a man whom I respect—I don't mean to reflect on his ability not for one moment—doesn't have the experience or the background in matters agricultural.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, he cut a lot of sugar cane.

Mr. Gaunt: Well other than sugar cane; he has a little experience there, but other than that—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: —he really doesn't have any background or experience—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, the hon. member used to think Joe Greene wasn't bad.

Mr. Gaunt: Well he got better as time wore on. I am not so sure that our friend from Carleton East will get better as time wears on. As a matter of fact, it seems to be heading in the opposite direction.

The point I make is that the degree of participation in policy development is certainly not clear under this reorganization. Now I know that the Minister of Agriculture and Food, the present incumbent, will not stand for any policy development which doesn't coincide with the wishes of the farm community. I know him well enough; he just wouldn't stand for that. But I am wondering about someone else who may be appointed to that portfolio who may not be quite so knowledgeable and quite so strong. What happens then if we get a minister from the—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): The present minister is going to be here forever.

Mr. Gaunt: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The present minister is going to be here forever.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): No. He is not immortal.

Mr. Gaunt: I don't think he's immortal. He looks pretty young, aside from the grey hair, but I don't think he is immortal.

Mr. MacDonald: Furthermore—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is as close to being immortal as one can be. Don't you agree?

Mr. Gaunt: Well, I was being charitable.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): You are too nice a guy.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You will have to get the record straight, you will have joined us by then anyway.

Mr. Gaunt: What happens when the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development says, with respect to pesticides or with respect to pollution: "This, in my view, is the direction in which policy should be headed," and the minister of that department doesn't agree? Who has the overriding responsibility? I take it that the policy development minister has the overriding responsibility with respect to policy development. If so, I think we're going to be in some difficulty with respect to this department and a number of other departments.

When I take a look over the benches of the government—and I suppose that this is a reflection of the fact that our society is now becoming more urbanized all the time—there aren't that many members who are knowledgeable and conversant with matters agricultural. It seems to me that this being so, the policy development and the administration of the department will become even more important as the years wear on. I feel that with the fact that rural members are declining in numbers in this House, there will be a real erosion of the agricultural influence under this particular setup. I would like the Premier's comments with respect to this matter—and perhaps even the Minister of Agriculture and Food's comments—because I think this is a very important matter and one in which I'm vitally interested.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture can reply? We will do this through the various parts of the bill, because the ministers are the ones who have been working with this now for a relatively short period of time. I think the Minister of Agriculture can assure the hon. member, and I think perhaps it would be in everybody's interests. If the individual ministers did this it would be most helpful.

Mr. Gaunt: Is the Premier saying to me that the real authority for policy development still resides with the Minister of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No. What I said, Mr. Chairman, was that the Minister of Agriculture, in that this section of the bill relates to his responsibilities, will answer the questions on this part of the bill and he will have his observations to make in answer to your questions.

Mr. Gaunt: Oh all right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought this would be more helpful to you.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Mr. Chairman, I don't know if this is exactly the place to raise this point, but picking up where my friend from Huron-Bruce left off, the part that bothers me is somewhat similar to the point just made, except for this fact: It seems to me that the policies supposedly will come from the policy minister; the administrative minister then has the responsibility of administrating or putting that policy into effect.

I recall my days of working for the federal government in Ottawa, and it very often happened that a great many of the programmes that came forth came forth primarily through the offices of the deputy or assistant deputy minister. Very often if the minister himself had a particular policy he wanted to have implemented, and it did not come itself from the civil service, that policy

either died a death of prostration, if I may put it that way—

Hon. J. White (Minister of Trade and Development, and Tourism and Information): That's Ottawa you are talking about; that's Ottawa!

Mr. Reid: Well I'm glad you're listening, anyway. But I can foresee the same thing happening here, particularly because we now have another layer of government and these things are going to get lost in the shuffle. I have a great fear that what is going to happen is that these policies as laid down by the policy minister—policies that may not come in particular from the civil service—are going to get lost in the shuffle, because some particular civil servant somewhere down the list doesn't agree with the policy and doesn't want to implement it. Now I can give you chapter and verse. I saw it myself when I worked in Ottawa.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): What department?

Mr. Reid: Department of Industry in those days!

I wonder if the minister, the Premier or whoever, can indicate what safeguards or checks and balances there are to ensure that the policies as laid down by the policy ministers in fact will be administered both in the spirit and the letter laid down by the policy ministers?

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a reply?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, first of all, in reply to the member for Huron-Bruce, I would like to say that, in my humble opinion, in the number of years that I have been in this Legislature, as a private member and as a member of the cabinet, there has been nothing done that has more greatly strengthened the position of government through the co-ordination of policy than the establishment of these policy ministries.

As a participating minister in the policy field of resources, I feel it has done more to co-ordinate the thinking, to avoid any duplication and to strengthen the position, not only of government but of the wishes of people embodied in government, than anything that has been done in this last few months. I say that from the experience of participation on a regular basis in that committee.

May I assure my hon. friends that as far as policy-making is concerned, each policy minister, including the Minister of Agriculture and Food, comes to that resources committee meeting with ideas that he may feel are important to be implemented as policy. They are discussed to see that the implications of his policy fall into the proper category and proper use and do not conflict with the other ministries represented in that particular field.

If there is agreement reached there, then the policy simply moves on to the Policy and Priorities Board and from there to cabinet; from there it is implemented into policy, just the same as it would be now. But we have the additional benefit of having zeroed in on the particular policies from all of the relative fields in that particular area.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Would land use be a good example?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say that land use certainly is one of the examples—exactly—and I think that is perhaps one of the things we have to recognize as one of the most important things we have to face in the 1970s, I have said this from the public platform and I see no reason why I shouldn't say it here—I really believe it is. As time goes on, I think it will become even more important.

Now let me assure my friend from Huron-Bruce that there will be no more difficulty in the implementation of that policy at the ministerial level within the department than there ever is, as far as I am concerned. It's simply determination of policy on a broader spectrum than perhaps it had been previously, to some degree. Certainly more attention is given to that individual policy. But the minister—and I presume the member is referring to Part III where it mentions the Minister of Agriculture and Food—once the policy is determined, then it is up to the minister to implement it through the staff.

As far as the remarks made by the member for Rainy River are concerned, it may well be the policy of the federal government to let the senior civil service create, generate and implement policy at the federal level—I have often wondered how it could be so, incredible as it is; maybe that's the reason—but I can assure him that is not the way it is done in the government of Ontario.

Mr. Reid: The question was what guarantees are there that the policies, as laid down by the policy ministers, are in effect going to be carried in the spirit and the letter that they were laid down by the policy ministers?

Hon. Mr. Davis: They lay down policy.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no problem there whatever—no problem at all!

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): They don't understand it.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet): No, they don't understand it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: As I explained to my friend from Huron-Bruce, there is no real problem at all. I can assure him that any policies—and, quite frankly, I welcome suggestions from staff in our department; I think that people who are genuinely interestd in the department should be coming forward with ideas and suggestions to make to their minister—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's covering your tracks!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and then if we can implement those policies, all well and good and we carry on from there. But as far as a policy that may not be in full agreement with the civil service is concerned, I have never run into any difficulty whatever. Never have I experienced that in 10 years in this portfolio.

Hon. Mr. White: Mr. Chairman, if I could just have a moment, I won't take long. I want to second what the Minister of Agriculture said and I have observed the member for York South, a student of history and a student of politics, following this. It is absolutely astonishing to find in the policy deliberations how many departments are affected when a particular ministry or minister comes in with a proposal.

This morning I had occasion to take a matter before my policy committee. It directly affected the Department of Transportation and Communications; it directly affected the Department of Natural Resources; it directly affected the Department of Labour; and indirectly touched on Environment and indirectly touched on Agriculture.

So it is with every one of these policies! So now, for the first time, we collectively have an opportunity to explore these matters and the ramifications and consequences affecting other areas of government. I must say that I have been tremendously encouraged as we have evolved this new procedure and I am perfectly sure it is going to be an enormous improvement over the previous organization.

Mr. MacDonald: Well Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief comment. I think it is misnamed and that's why it is confusing, not only to the hon. member for Rainy River in terms of the concept but also a lot of people in the public. They are not policy ministers so much as policy co-ordinators.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right! This is why we use the term provincial secretary—

Mr. MacDonald: Well, provincial secretary! You see, that confuses it at first with the traditional concept. It is going to take five years to sort that out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: A year!

Mr. MacDonald: Because, let us be realistic on where the policy is going to come from. It may, on occasion, come from the so-called policy minister—if he is an imaginative sort of fellow. But if he has got a ministry —and I am not going to use any names here so that it won't get invidious if he's got beneath him at the head of a ministry an individual who is an aggressive, hard-hitting guy, make no mistake about it that minister is going to be making the policy for that department, for the most part. There will be a co-ordination and the policy minister, so-called, will be chairing a committee which is a policy co-ordinating committee, and they will be brought together to co-ordinate it; but they are misnamed. They are policy co-ordinators—they are not policy ministers.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Can't you imagine the fun the hon. member would have if we were called "the co-ordinating ministers"!

Mr. Gaunt: That may explain my difficulty in understanding the matter of co-ordination. The point the minister makes is well taken. I can certainly understand that, because many of these issues embrace a number of departments, and when he and his people go to the natural resources committee I can see how the matter of co-ordination is better undertaken, under those circumstances. But my question was: Who has the overriding authority when it comes to policy development? Now isn't that the provincial secretary?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Cabinet! Cabinet!

Mr. Gaunt: But I am talking in one specific area. Sure, ultimately the cabinet has; but I am not taking it at that level for the moment.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Do you take votes in cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes!

Mr. Gaunt: If in fact the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development is the co-ordinator—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: —then what you are telling me is that the ultimate responsibility for policy development in any given department still resides with the minister of that department —and all the provincial secretary does is simply co-ordinate the policy of the number of departments under his jurisdiction. Is that a correct interpretation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I would suppose that was one way of interpreting it. I think probably it is. I think the description given by the hon. member for York South of the chairman of the policy field as a co-ordinator is probably the most apt description, with great respect, sir, that one could apply. Because really that's what it is.

Certainly I think I would be expected to come forward with policies affecting the field of Agriculture and Food. But when I bring that policy before the policy committee, of which I am a part, then I think every one of the six ministers who sit around that table with the chairman have a right to look at that policy to see how it affects their particular field; to see whether they agree with what I have proposed; to see whether or not it should be strengthened; whether it goes far enough or whether it goes too far; and make appropriate suggestions.

Mr. Gaunt: That's the co-ordination part.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's the co-ordination part! Having arrived at that consensus, after having taken a look at the policy, it goes forward to the Policy and Priorities Board of cabinet, if it is a completely new policy, and from there it goes to the cabinet. In the final analysis cabinet approves or rejects the policy. Certainly I think every minister of a department of that particular resources committee group has a right and a responsibility to develop policy as he sees it necessary for his particular area, and to take it forward to that co-ordinating committee.

Mr. Gaunt: Does the minister feel his policy development function has not been eroded?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would assure the hon. member and all members of the House and the public of Ontario, there has never been anything that has strengthened the making of policy as much as these recent developments, which we are talking about in this bill.

Mr. Chairman: Does Part III stand as part of the bill? We come to Part IV, the Ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr. Renwick: I have a minor question on Part IV. I notice that there are a couple of changes in the Ontario Municipal Board Act, which substitute the Attorney General for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. They appear to be relatively minor substitutions, but I would like an explanation why it is that the board will now make its annual report to the Attorney General rather than to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Why is it that the power of substitution which is set out in clause 11, or the power to designate a person who will be the vice-chairman, who will chair the board in the absence of the chairman of the board, is now to be given to the Attorney General? It seems to me to be appropriate to have left it with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Chairman, this board is a quasi judicial board and it was felt that it might more properly be brought into the Attorney General's department and be situate there and dealt with in that way. As you will appreciate, this is a board for which we have administrative responsibility but none in reference to their decision-making powers. The matter of designation of a vice-chairman of the board would be administrative under the Attorney General and that power goes with the legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Does section—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A point of clarification: Perhaps the Premier can explain why it is necessary to have the bill that we are presently discussing and then a number of separate backup bills which may refer to new ministries, but they're referred to also in this bill. It seems to be redundant to have the backup bills if this bill does what is is purported to do, reorganize the government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I used to suggest this to my clients—I now accept what I used to say—I take the advice of learned counsel and the legislative counsel has said this is the way it must be done. Mr. Chairman, this is the way it's being done.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part IV stand as part of the bill?

Part IV agreed to.

Part V, the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, just one question on Part V: Is it the intention that the Minister of Colleges and Universities will, in fact, be the minister responsible for the archives of Ontario?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part V stand as part of the bill? The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I would like to ask the minister if he could explain the reasoning and the effect of the transfer of responsibility for the maintenance, development and promotion of historical institutions, which formerly I believe came under the Department of Tourism—now defunct—to his department? Particularly where these historical institutions may in fact be essentially historic parts of Ontario's past, which we maintain as tourist attractions, it just doesn't make sense to me to see them put under the Ministry of Colleges and Universities.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Well Mr. Chairman, all I could say is that this was a recommendation, of course, of the Committee on Government Productivity. The ministry will include, as the hon. member may know, all the museums now in the province, as well as the public libraries. So that all facilities of a cultural nature, shall we say, will be within the ministry. I would think that the archives branch, the historical branch, and generally all those facilities that include records and maintenance of manuscripts and programmes, should be under one department, and mine seems to be the most logical one.

Mr. Cassidy: Just to pursue this, is the taking of all these institutions under the ministry's wing to some extent an implementation of the recommendations which were made also in the Wright report, in the sense that any institution which remotely bore on education was to be considered an instrument of post-secondary education?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There may be some coincidental implications, Mr. Chairman, in this particular bill to those in the Wright report. The Wright report indicated there should be an open sector whereby all these facilities would be under the one ministry.

Frankly, I always did question the placing of the archives branch under Tourism before. I thought it was more appropriately an educational facility and I think that whether or not it is a following of the Wright commission report, the recommendation was made, really, before the interim report was available from COPSE, so I think possibly this is here on its own merits.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister had better consider asking the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells).

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part V stand as part of the bill?

Part V agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any comments, questions or amendments to any section in Part VI of the bill, the Ministry of Community and Social Services?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Part VI, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In Part VI, the function the community centres branch and the award of grants for the development of community centres is now moved to the direction of this Ministry of Community and Social Services. The sections are fairly elaborate in laying out the responsibilities, and in comparing the two it appears that there has been no change in policy but in fact it is simply a change of administrative function. Is that correct? I see the Premier is nodding.

As we bring together a variety of functions pertaining to the community, and let's say change the concept of the department which has evolved over the years from the old Department of Welfare to one which has a much broader base, I can't help but say that I approve of this and think that this is a very important step.

The minister, however, in this new department has quite different responsibility. Instead of having to spend his time and sort of the emanations of his humanitarianism in bringing forward programmes to help those unfortunate people in the community who don't have the facilities to deal with their problems, whatever they might be, financial and otherwise, the minister now has to deal with the broader aspects of community development.

It appears to me that while it was always convenient to get in touch with the community centres branch in the Department of Agriculture in this connection—the branch there, I thought, was well staffed and had

developed a method of procedure that seemed to be fair—still we must assume that this whole group is coming into the new department and that they will be transferred holus-bolus. If the minister would indicate whether that is so; can he indicate it? Perhaps the minister might give us some information on that. I see he is getting signals.

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Social and Family Services): Yes, it is being transferred, Mr. Chairman. We hope that the same services will be continued, that there will be no lessening of the services that have been provided before under my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Starr might well be transferred as head of that branch, is that so?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the minister could give us more detail as to just how the administration is going to be carried out under his ministry as it is removed from Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I will have it, Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes from now.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, the other day during the second reading of this bill I raised the question of the change indicated here, removal of the youth and recreation branch from the Department of Education to this department. The Prime Minister did not comment on this, but it seems to me that this is a part which perhaps should have some attention, because there is a great deal of concern about it among people who are in the recreation field. The other day I read into the record a letter from one of the recreation directors, a vice-president of the Ontario Recreation Society, although he was not speaking as that vice-president. He was simply speaking as a person and giving his personal views. But of course before that and since that, some of us have had discussions and correspondence with other people in the recreation area across the province. There is a great deal of concern about this.

I wanted to raise this with the Prime Minister this morning. As he knows, over the past years there has been an increasing tendency toward unification around the schools in the community; that is, in the summer time particularly, recreation programmes are carried on in the schools. Some of us have been very interested in seeing that schools are used outside of school hours as dressing rooms for adjacent rinks, that the gymnasiums are used, the libraries and others for community projects, so that the community centre is in that school. I know there has been a great deal of opposition to this concept on the part of many school boards, because they think of the school as something in which formal education should take place and they don't want some other authority coming in to use those facilities. This kind of a marriage of recreation and education, which has occurred up to this point, I think makes this unity possible and, more and more, recreation is centring on the schools.

There is a feeling that with this change there will be a division of authority here and a division of jurisdiction which is going to make for difficulty in the community. I think the minister and the Prime Minister ought to take a very close look at this section to see whether or not this function should not remain, with the Department of Education. I raise this matter at this point because I think it is causing very great concern among recreation people across this province. While there may not be complete unanimity in this matter, certainly I think the majority feeling among people who are spending their lives in the field is that this is a regressive move and that it should not take place at this time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would like to reply to this briefly.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, does the member want to speak on this?

Mr. Reid: On the same point, if I may, Mr. Chairman; not to prolong the debate, but I would agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member. It is my understanding that the Council of Recreational Directors of Ontario have for some years been pressing, really, for complete integration of the recreational facilities of the community with the Department of Education. This is my understanding.

The recreational directors in my area certainly feel this way. I think that this is a concept, and a good one, and that it should really remain with the Department of Education to give a unity to the whole system of recreation and educational facilities that we are building up within our community.

I would commend that to the Premier for his consideration, and I would also state that there is a select committee of this Legislature studying the "after-4", for want of a better word, or after-school-hour use of the school facilities across the Province of On-

tario. I would suggest that this particular move might be a little premature in light of the study that this select committee is doing, because you haven't yet had the recommendations of this committee, that could very well recommend exactly what the hon. member previous and myself are suggesting, that the recreational branch remain within the Department of Education.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make a few comments on this. I am pleased to see that the activities involving youth seem to be concentrated in one department. Now whether it is this department or not leaves one with a bit of doubt.

One of the things that does concern me is that the feeling I find among communities is that they would like recreation departments to become adjuncts of boards of education, because generally the recreation department uses most of the board of education facilities. As a result, they consider recreation as being sort of leisure-time education, so that recreation directors are more or less associated indirectly today with boards of education.

Putting this programme into the Ministry of Community and Social Services now might mean that recreation directors in a community would have to go to the community's department of social and family services, or social services, or welfare, or whatever it is called in that community. They may no longer be associated with education, but might be associated—or in their minds would be then associated—with welfare.

One of the other points that I would like to make is that I can't understand why, if the concentration of certain youth activities is made in this department, why the reorganization did not include other youth activities or other summertime activities. Among the activities I could refer to are those of Programme 72 which the government announced some two weeks ago. I could specifically make mention of the junior forest ranger programme, which likewise could have been or should have been included in this same package.

As I said earlier, I do not know whether it should come under Community and Social Services or whether it should come under another department, but I think all of the youth activities should be concentraated under the one ministry.

I think the move of the athletic commissioner from the Department of Labour to another department is a forward step. I think it was misplaced when it was put in the Department of Labour, and I know we on this side of the House, for as many years as I have been here, have criticized the government for associating it with that department and not putting it with some type of department associated with youth activities.

So Mr. Chairman, I am concerned with the association of the recreation branches of communities with this department as opposed to the Department of Education and the effects it could have. Then, likewise, I am concerned that all youth activities and summer activities should be in the one department rather than scattered as they are today in the Department of Health, in the Department of Natural Resources and in the Department of Education.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to very strongly associate my remarks with the remarks of the three previous speakers, because it seems to me that the Premier has had correspondence from various municipal organizations in Toronto. I won't go into those, but I think the major concern of the recreation people in the province is that over the last three to five years there has grown up a good development of community programmes, because the parks and recreation departments of the municipal governments were associated with the youth and recreation branch through the Department of Education, as were the school boards, and there was a liaison there they could work through.

I would like clarification, if I may, of one particular point. As I understand it the responsibility for the development of community schools and the use of school facilities by community groups and school-community relationships, will be removed from the youth and recreation branch and will remain with the Department of Education. It seems to me there is a danger of fragmentation there. Perhaps they should wait for the report of the select committee.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, just to reply briefly, I would say that this is one area that gave us great concern in arriving at a decision. Having had some experience in this field for a period of time, I can understand the representations that have been made from the directors of recreation across the province and I am sympathetic to their concerns. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, we are attempting in this restructuring to give what we

think is an important "thrust," as was used in the budget papers the other evening, to the new Department of Community and Social Services. This, to me, is very important.

One of the members opposite referred to the concept of welfare. This is not the basic philosophy of the department any longer. It is a community service department. The recreational service, the creative use of leisure time, is to me one of the very important aspects of any community service function. While there may be a period of time needed to shake down and to establish relationships, it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that even now the recreation directors are, by and large, responsible to a committee of the municipal council.

While I think we have had a great deal of success in the past three or four years in bringing the recreational committees and the boards of education much closer together, we still have not achieved the optimum here by any means. There is a lot yet to be done. As the Leader of the New Democratic Party himself pointed out, it is not so much the structure that is relevant, perhaps, on issues like this, it is basically a philosophical consideration. I am really quite optimistic that the rapport can be improved. The community use is important to the school system, but there are many other aspects of recreational activities within our municipalities that are not directly related to the school plan and the functions of a school board.

I would think, looking at it as broadly as one can, that there is great merit in moving in this direction. I don't minimize for a moment some of the difficulties we may experience.

The Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Mr. Welch) has been in touch with the recreational directors. We will be having further meetings with them, because we want to make it abundantly clear to them that we will, as a government, under the direction of the department, see that their work is given further impetus as time goes on.

As I say, I appreciate the views expressed by the members opposite, the member for Yorkview and others, and can only assure them that we are as concerned as they are. We think this is the logical way to do it and this is the direction that we are suggesting we go.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part VI then stand as part of the bill?

The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I would be interested to have the Premier reply to a point raised by the member for Windsor-Walkerville about the fact that the select committee is studying this matter now. Would it not be wise to await their report because of the possible conflict that can arise by shifting the branch over to this minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, this should in no way inhibit the activities of the select committee which is studying the community use of schools. I can almost guess some of the recommendations the select committee will be coming forward with. I am sure we all can. I am sure that they can function within whatever structure is developed.

What is needed, to reply to the hon. member, is a very close degree of relationship between the people responsible for recreation, the community service aspect, and the school authorities. Very frankly I think this can be developed, no matter where the responsibility is structurally placed. I see no problem in fitting in any recommendations from the select committee into the kind of structure that is being suggested here. If there are, we can always take a look at it.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, perhaps one solution that the Premier could think about is changing the structure at the community level to the same sort of structure we have here. We have a single body that is responsible for both educational and community activities. If we consider in time the merger of school boards and councils, then we could eliminate the possible division that arises at the community levels.

I think there is a definite need for the division of these responsibilities in provincial departments but we do co-ordinate activity through this Legislature as well as the cabinet. I would feel, at the community level, if we change the provincial function to be a resource function available to assist the community activities and we do what we can to eliminate the present division at the local level, which is only an historical division and is not necessarily one that is applicable today, we could eliminate the potential problem which this change in structure presents.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Port Arthur have another comment on this point?

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I don't quite know how to phrase it, but I would certainly not like to see this particular structure inhibit the future use, the possible use, of

schools as community service centres, and the co-ordination between the departments is such that it can happen.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I want to express my fear in this regard. I have already done so. I think the Premier has had a number of representations, written or otherwise, from the Ontario Municipal Recreation Association people expressing a similar fear and expressing the hope that the Premier and his cabinet would reconsider this move.

I beg to differ with the Premier on this matter. I feel that the recreation people and the educational people were just starting to achieve a degree of close working relationship.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I agree with that. I never disagreed with that. All I am saying is that need not, in my view, come to an end.

Mr. Gaunt: I certainly hope it won't come to an end. My point is simply that it will be much harder to achieve under the new department than it would have been under the Department of Education where it presently resides.

Now if the Premier has other information and if he would tell us exactly what thought processes went into this particular decision, perhaps it is a rational one which can be justified; but on the surface it certainly doesn't look like it. What actually did go into the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the rationale and the logic really are very apparent. I think where the reservations of the hon. member really should be would be in the practical implications of it.

I think the logic of having recreation as part of the Ministry of Community and Social Services is really self-evident. Where the difficulty may be will be in the practical application of the relationship between the school systems and the recreational authorities, who traditionally have been responsible to the municipal council and still are. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is the relationship that has been developing need not be altered. In my view it will not be; it will be further enhanced and philosophically there is great merit here if this government and the hon. member, if he feels he is on occasion part of this government, is really interested in community and social services in the very broad sense of the word, how do you divorce the very important aspect of recreation, the creative uses of leisure time, that aren't always directly related to the educational system or educational facilities, or young people even?

Mr. Gaunt: Not always, but quite often!

Hon. Mr. Davis: How can you divorce this from the total approach to community and social services? As I say, I think the logic is there. The difficulty may be in the practical implementation of it. This is something we will have to sort out.

Mr. Gaunt: I am interested in the practical aspects. The name would indicate that perhaps the branch should be moved to the Department of Community Services, but I am talking about the practical end of it.

How does one undertake the ultimate in co-operation, satisfying the educational authorities, who have the responsibility of operating the schools from 9 o'clock to 4 o'clock, at the same time ensuring that the recreation people, who reside or will reside under another department, have full use and can make full use of those facilities after 4 o'clock? I think there is a practical problem there and maybe you can work it out. I hope you can.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister of Social and Family Services.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, I have an answer to the question raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. There will be no transfer of personnel, but the administration that the director of the community centre branch has been doing, along with another staff member, was only on a part-time basis. They were doing other work under the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. They will remain with that ministry, because their other duties are with that ministry. However, at the same time, we will add complement to our staff to take over those same duties. I would also like to assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we hope we will continue the excellent services that they have received in the past under the former department and that we will provide them under our new ministry.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for the information. It means that the complement in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in fact is going up without the numbers being changed.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It is my understanding that the complement in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food will remain the same, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, but they won't have as much work to do, so they'll be given other jobs.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I can't answer for that ministry, but I wish to assure the hon. leader again that we will add personnel to our ministry, and we will provide the same services as have been provided in the past.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Since it is a part of the reorganization of government, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture and Food can tell us what assignments will be made for the staff that formerly looked after the Community Centres Act and its regulations—for those who will be left in his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the staff will be left in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. It was really an administrative staff. The applications, with their invoices, came in from the various community centre boards across the province, they were considered—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Starr would do that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, heaven only knows he's got enough to do. He's head of the agricultural and horticultural societies branch, which looks after all the fairs in Ontario. He also has the responsibility of the horticultural societies, the International Ploughing Match, and all of the local ploughing matches that are held in all the counties and districts across Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! It might be appropriate to say that I felt he did a particularly useful job in dealing with groups not only all across the province but in my own area where I was familiar with the way he dealt with them in a very effective way. There's got to be more than putting the regulations down and saying this is what we can do. There was a very thoughtful and helpful approach by Mr. Starr, even though he did have these other duties—something that I'm sure will be carried on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think for clarification it could very well be said that he did go out and visited community centre boards; he explained the regulations and helped them to get the plan on the road. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend, who now assumes the responsibility for this as a minister, will see to it that the staff can do those kind of things as well. I think it's most helpful to the local people to thoroughly understand the regulations and how they can qualify for these community centre grants.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I might also point out in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that the feeling that maybe all the community centres have now been built would be a very erroneous one indeed, in that many communities are now looking for a second and even a third community centre. I would also point out to him that when the costs for these community centres are examined, you can't get much for less than about $200,000 and that's going very thin indeed—yet the grants available have not changed for the last three years, I guess. If in fact we're going to be serious about the promotion of this sort of recreational centre in the communities, we're going to have to give a lot of thought to this.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the Premier. In the reconstruction of the responsibilities of this ministry and assigning it youth recreation and leadership training, why weren't the junior forest ranger and the SWEEP programmes put under this ministry so all of these programmes would be a responsibility of the same minister?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Chairman, if one assesses it, perhaps there could be some merit in including, say the SWEEP programme. I haven't analysed this, but without very deep thought, I would suggest that the junior forest ranger programme is related directly to the activities of the Ministry of Natural Resources. I really don't quite see the logic there, but these are things we can always take a look at.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, I have one further point I would like to bring up relating to the community services programme which has transferred to this ministry. It relates to the method of financing the community services, and I'm pleased that the provincial Treasurer, who has to deal with the Municipal Act, is here, and if he would listen to this point.

Mr. Chairman, I feel when the construction of community services in rural areas is completed—especially in areas where there is a small community in the same municipality as a large township for instance—the payment for these community services, after they receive their grant, is based on the as-

sessment of that particular community or designated area. Where the designated area includes both residential and farm property there is presently a much heavier weight on the farm property since they, of necessity, have a much higher assessment because of their large amount of land.

I think it would require an amendment to the Municipal Act to look after this problem. The result is many municipal board hearings throughout the province because of objections of the rural community in an area that is being assessed for this community centre. I think this problem should be looked into now that it is in the new area.

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part VI be included as part of the bill?

Part VI agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Part VII?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Before we start into Part VII, there seems to be some misunderstanding as to the intention of the House leader in continuing the discussion of these bills. It was my understanding—and we questioned the House leader once or twice about it a couple of days ago—that we would be adopting Friday's hours today for reasons of convenience for all concerned, and certain arrangements have been made based on that.

It may be that you are concerned about the passage of this legislation by a certain deadline. The implementation date is April 1 and I am quite sure that that would be legally binding even though it didn't receive the final approval of the House and the consent of His Honour until some time next week. I am not sure just how imperative this is, but I would ask him if he would consider abiding by what I thought was an agreement that we would sit early today and adjourn at 1 o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition and say I think, in regard to the sitting hours today—and I don't want to become argumentative, I just want us to have understanding—that there was not an understanding among the whips in regard to the sitting hours. I had hoped that we would conclude Bill 27 today and I think that I had that undertaking this morning. I can say that.

We had also anticipated dealing with Bills 28, 29, 30 and 31. However, I will ask that we have the co-operation of the House to finish Bill 27. We can do the others on Tuesday.

Mr. Stokes: On that point, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the House Leader that there was unanimous agreement among the whips that we would adopt Friday's sitting hours to today and we would rise at 1 o'clock. If he wants to renege on that, that is fine and dandy, but there was that commitment.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I implore you, I do not want to become argumentative on the subject. I agree that that happened, subject to the short discourse that took place in the House. Again, I simply say to you that I appreciate the point of view and I would ask that we co-operate just to the degree that we can conclude Bill 27.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it your intention to give it third reading and ask for royal assent as well?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, I thought we could give it third reading and then royal assent perhaps on Tuesday. As far as Bills 28, 29, 30 and 31 are concerned, I understand there will be no problem if they are held over until Tuesday but there is some urgency if we can't get this bill completed today.

Mr. Chairman: On Part III, the member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Premier has found any problems in people's interpretation of the placing of the Marriage Act under the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I was asking about the Premier's relationships as well.

One point that I find missing here that was shown in the diagram books that were sent out, as well as in the report, is the responsibility for the athletic commission which was formerly under the Department of Labour. I don't see anything in this section which moves that responsibility into the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations. I also am questioning whether the grant functions of the athletic commissioner would stay here or go under Community and Social Services. Would the minister be able to clarify this point on the athletic commission, as it was included in the diagrams we were sent and also in the recommendations of the Committee on Government Productivity?

Did the minister hear what I was asking him about the athletic commission?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Chairman, may I reply? The athletic commission is coming over to the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Chairman: Order please! There is too much side noise in the chamber. Will the minister repeat?

Mr. Deacon: What is the decision with regard to both this government committee recommendation and the one we got at the beginning to outline the areas of responsibility that the athletic commission would come under this ministry?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: That commission will come under the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Deacon: The next thing I was sorry not to find in this section is something which eliminates a very serious fault in the operation of the Securities Act. At the present time the minister will be responsible for the administration of the Act, as well as the Ontario Securities Commission, but the Ontario Securities Commission not only administers the Act but judges their own actions.

It is the only area in the operation of the government where I have found the government to have failed to eliminate that conflict position, where the administrator is judging the appeals of those who are appealing the decisions of the administrator. I think it is a serious mistake in not correcting that in this bill which changes the administration of the commission to this Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: If the member wants me to respond to that, I would simply say that there is no change from what the circumstances were before and I think that the matter might be more properly discussed in the estimates.

Mr. Chairman: Part VII; shall it stand as part of the bill?

The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: I would like to ask the government one question related to this.

Most of the responsibility for Acts which is put under the new minister is rather the routine housekeeping sort of thing. In relation to the Securities Commission though and the Securities Act, the responsibility is not firmly fixed with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations but in fact is left to the discretion of the cabinet to switch into the hands of another minister.

I don't quite follow the sense of that. I would have thought that the responsibility for public protection in the field of business rests with this particular ministry and I don't see why the Securities Act should be left free to float. It would make no sense to have the Minister of Agriculture responsible for it, and yet that is the kind of absurdity which this loophole leaves open.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think I would disagree with that. However, the member is entitled to his opinion.

Mr. Chairman: Part VII.

Mr. Deacon: A point about the athletic commissioner: Didn't the athletic commissioner have some responsibility for protection of the public in the same way as under the Theatres Act, where it is not just a matter of giving out assistance to community activities? Was there not a public protection function the athletic commissioner has had in the past that would more properly be divided and brought under this Act?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I would think not. We believe that is a community activity, and we think it is properly located.

Mr. Chairman: Shall part VII stand as part of the bill?

Part VII agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Part VIII.

Part VIII agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Part IX. Part IX is the Ministry of Education. Does this stand as part of the bill?

Part IX agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Part X. The Ministry of the Environment.

The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, I would like to ask the minister, under Part X, section 70, about the powers given to the Environmental Hearing Board. I would like to find out from the appropriate minister how these hearings will be held. I notice they will operate by resolution, and I am wondering if the resolution section of their powers will be done in open hearings or whether they will be done in camera. I would just like the minister, if he can, to assure me that all of the hearings will be open as they have been in the past with regard to this.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Yes Mr. Chairman, very briefly the board will perform the same hearings functions as the commission did. However,

instead of making a decision it will make a report and a recommendation. I would say also that there will be amendments to the Environmental Protection Act which will also refer to this board which is going to be holding hearings, particularly in cases of establishment of municipal waste dumps and so on, which are sometimes a problem, as the hon. member knows, when one municipality has to go into another one.

Mr. Stokes: One other question—

Hon. Mr. Auld: They will be holding public meetings too.

Mr. Stokes: Yes. I have one other question in the same section. At the top of page 35 it says:

> Notwithstanding any other Act, it is the function of the executive director, water supply and pollution control, of the ministry, and he has the power to control and to regulate the collection, production, treatment, storage, transmission, distribution and use of water for public purposes and to make orders with respect thereto.

Those are pretty broad powers, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Auld: They are powers of the OWRC.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, and I am wondering if those powers give the minister or the executive director the right to determine the use of our water. I am not speaking generally of municipal treatment plants; I am talking about the overall use of water as a resource.

As the minister knows there is a great deal of concern in many parts of the country, and certainly in northern Ontario, that decisions may be made unilaterally, or without prior consultation, with regard to a use of water that might not be generally acceptable to the people at large.

I am concerned, particularly, about the export of such a valuable resource. I am wondering what safeguards there are, so that if any decision is ever taken as important as the export of water, that it will not be hived off to an executive director but will be a direct policy decision that will be made by this government after consultation in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Auld: As I understand it, the commission has never had specific power to regulate, say the amount of water taken out of Lake Superior.

Basically, these powers are the ones that the commission itself had in the past. I refer the hon. member to the explanatory note at the beginning of this whole bill. Referring to my ministry, he will note that there are appeal procedures both to the environmental hearing board and to the courts and the cabinet. There are now appeal procedures for a number of powers which the commission had for which there was no appeal in the past. So, in effect, we have widened the scope of appeals against the department's decision, if I can put it that way.

Mr. Stokes: So nothing in section 70 will give this executive director the right I spoke of that I feel he should not have?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. That is right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, would the minister clarify this. As I understand it the environmental appeal board has been in existence for appeals against orders or programmes under the air management or waste management. Then we formerly had the pollution control appeal board and now that is being replaced by the environmental hearing board. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No. I can understand the possible confusion on the part of the hon. member. The environmental hearing board will take the place of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and carry out the hearings that the commission used to do, but will not have the decision that the commission had. It will be an advisory body to the ministers rather than an entity with its own powers.

Mr. Good: They will make recommendations to the minister and the minister is the final appeal?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No, there is an appeal to the environmental hearing board on the decisions of the stated officials in the departments and to the cabinet, and in some cases to the courts.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Good: An appeal to the courts is on administrative procedures and not on the actual facts. The appeal to the court would not be on the actual—

Hon. Mr. Auld: It would be on points of law as I understand it.

Mr. Good: On points of law? That is what I am asking.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the minister a question. This is not by way of criticism of the way in which it is done in the bill, but a problem of public information.

On page 32 of the bill, the minister is given extensive powers of delegation of his authority with quite valuable safeguards that they must be in writing and they must be subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. But it is an omnibus power, subject to those limitations, to delegate all of his authority to various officials within his department. Somewhat in contradiction to that delegation from the minister there are embedded, on page 31, certain statutory delegations in the statute itself where orders formerly made, or decisions made or privileges given or discretions exercised, by the Water Resources Commission may now be done by the assistant deputy minister, water management—

Mr. Stokes: That is what worries me.

Mr. Renwick: —the executive director, water supply and pollution control; or the executive director, water resources of the ministry.

We appear to have first of all an omnibus provision for the minister to delegate his powers, subject to those restrictions. In addition to that, actually embedded in the statute, authority is granted to specific persons within the department who have authorities by reason of the statute, which in my view would mean that they are authorities which are not devolved from the minister but are given expressly to stated persons in his department.

I think first of all that that's a contradiction which should not exist. Again I am not arguing for the purpose of an amendment at this particular time but I'm asking the minister to look at that kind of embedding in the statute a statutory delegation and bypassing the minister, when the minister is being granted this overall power with proper protections to achieve the same result by delegation.

My principal concern, regardless of the way in which it is carried out from the niceties of the methods by which the delegation should take place, is that the very extensive powers given under this statute to specific persons who are officials in the department must be very clear to the public because of their rights to intrude upon citizens' positions and citizens' rights.

It would appear to me that in the information techniques of his department there has got to be a very simple, clearly stated brochure setting out exactly the authorities that a person such as the assistant deputy minister, water management, or the executive director, water resources of the ministry, has to make orders. So that when an order is made or a discretion is exercised or a privilege is exercised under the ministry by a person other than the minister, a person does not have the problem of trying to locate in the statute whether or not that power has been properly exercised

I think we all agree that there has to be wide delegation of authority within the department itself for the purpose of combatting pollution and protecting the environment. On the other hand, I do feel that it should originate with the minister; that the delegation should be clearly and precisely stated and that the public should be clearly informed as to which junior officials within his department have the specific authority which may be exercised. It would seem to me that its important for the efficient administration of a very difficult statute.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, I just want to—not to prolong this—to make one comment. I think that the hon. member's comments are very well taken.

I might point out to him that the procedure that I intend to have followed will be similar to that of the Department of the Environment under air and waste management. In essence, when a notice goes out—and I just signed a couple of them this morning—along with that notice is an explanation of the powers of the director and the procedures that a person may take to appeal or to comply. I think, though, that we can expand this; and I think we should do it, as the hon. member said.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I just have one other comment. Would the minister give consideration to tabling in the House, or publishing in the Gazette, any exercises by the minister of his power of delegation—of the wide power of delegation? He has to give it in writing. He has to have the approval of the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. It would be most helpful if it either appeared in the Gazette or was tabled in the Legislature as a matter of public information of the wide delegatory powers granted to the minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I would like to very briefly make a statement and ask if the minister would give proper priority and consideration to the supply of water to our small municipalities in the province?

Now this bill gets rid of the OWRC, bringing it directly under ministerial control. So the new minister, and he alone, will be responsible as to whether or not our municipalities can get a proper and adequate water supply at a cost which they can afford. They are not getting this up to now.

We have had instances where the city of London pipeline is costing them 17 cents per 1,000 gallons. I think St. Thomas was about double that. We now have instances where small municipalities are having water offered to them at 51 cents and 52 cents per 1,000 gallons—and this is not good enough.

In our small municipalities around the province I think we have an opportunity now for the province to get in with its financial resources and its muscle and get good, adequate water and sewer supplies into these small municipalities.

We have got OMB hearings going on right now for people who just can't afford to pay over $300 a year for sewers and water in small municipalities. It's under the minister himself. The OWRC is gone. So he and he alone is going to be responsible. I sincerely ask, and respectfully ask, that he gives this top priority now that it is right directly under his ministry, to get water supplies and sewers into these municipalities at a decent price.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, one brief request for information here. I have looked at this bill, the government reorganization bill, and I have looked at the bill covering the establishment of the resources ministry. I do not see anything in either one of them about what minister will report to the Legislature on behalf of Ontario Hydro. Could he tell me?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Section 74!

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is still his ministry.

Mr. Stokes: Still this ministry?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Section 74!

Mr. Chairman: Shall Part X then stand as part of the bill?

Agreed.

Part XI, Ministry of Government Services.

Agreed.

Part XII, Ministry of Health.

Agreed.

Part XIII, Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Agreed.

Part XIV, Ministry of Labour.

Agreed.

Part XV, Ministry of Natural Resources.

Agreed.

Part XVI, Ministry of Revenue.

Agreed.

Part XVII, Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Agreed.

Part XVII, Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

Agreed.

Part XIX, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Cassidy: I wonder if the Treasurer could answer a couple of questions about this. I will be very brief because the time is late. One relates to the responsibility for housing.

It is a fairly routine inquiry, I think, as to whether in fact he has taken that over; as was proposed by the government, I believe, when the reorganization plan was first presented to us.

The second question I would like the Treasurer to answer is one which I have already directed to the Premier; and that is can he explain to us how, as the PooBah of the Ontario Legislature, he can do all the various jobs he has been assigned and do them effectively; and how he can have the direct contacts with municipal people, federal people and all the other people who will be wanting to get the responsiveness, not of a parliamentary secretary or an official, but of the Minister himself? We can debate this under your bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the first question, the Premier indicated in the House that there is a distinction here between housing policy and the

Ontario Housing Corp., and the responsibilities as tabled in the House—housing policy to be under the Department of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs—I think that is still somewhat of a fluid situation.

Certainly the government as a whole has to give some attention to the future direction of OHC and to housing policy generally; we will be doing that as a government as a whole. Within my department, work is going forward at the staff level developing various options and views which the staff hold and which will be coming forward to government. I think it is fair to say that we have not yet assumed that total responsibility.

Mr. Cassidy: Just on that point, we have always suspected in my party that the government does not have an overall housing policy. Are you saying in fact that although you might be acquiring that responsibility, in fact the responsibility for housing in general, excluding the OHC, is in limbo or has not been assumed by any ministry or by any part of the government right now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I might have put it better by saying the matter of housing policy is being updated.

Mr. Cassidy: Where is it now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Where is housing policy now? Really, with the Minister of Revenue. But obviously housing policy involves much more than the administration of Ontario Housing Corp. units. I think housing policy is one of those areas where no matter how hard we try or have tried to group into policy fields, housing policy has an enormous implication for really all three policy fields, particularly Resources and Social Development; and it obviously has enormous implications for the municipalities which are now part of my area.

It may well have implications in terms of government services, in terms of who should be the builders of these houses, government or the private sector. I cannot think of any one subject which transcends nearly all the departments as much as an updating of our housing policy. And I think the document to which you referred—which was tabled in the House and which indicated that housing policy was being updated, that it needed to be looked at by the whole government—at the present moment left it with Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs to bring forward and to update. Has that been answered?

Mr. Cassidy: I believe we understand each other; we are not talking about the OHC, which may go into another department as an administrative matter. But I believe what the Treasurer is saying is that the government at last, maybe 10 or 15 years after it should have been active, is finally deciding to take an overall umbrella responsibility for the state of housing and the future of housing in this province. I would congratulate you more had you done it sooner, but at any rate at least you are doing it now. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At 1.25 p.m. I won't defend the very notable and proud record of this government through OHC in the field of building public housing and providing senior citizens' accommodation. The member has raised some questions, particularly in terms of work loads, if I can put it that way, in being one—

Mr. Cassidy: I am sorry, it is late. Maybe that could be raised in—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In a separate bill? Fine.

Parts XIX and XX agreed to.

Bill 27, as amended, reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

Bill 27, An Act to provide for the Reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, March 30, 1972

Management board estimates, questions of Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. R. F. Nixon 725

Student assistance and tuition fees, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deacon, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Foulds 725

Name of company fined for bad safety record, questions of Mr. Guindon and Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 730

Presence of OPP in Legislature building, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Lewis 734

Distribution of increases on alcoholic beverages, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid 736

Stabbing at York University, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Ewen 736

Expenditure on Highway construction, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deacon, Mr. R. F. Nixon 736

Presenting report, standing procedural affairs committee, Mr. Ewen 737

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Clement 738

Greater Niagara General Hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Drea, first reading 739

Town of Port Elgin, bill respecting, Mr. Reid, first reading 739

Game and Fish Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 739

County of Prince Edward, bill respecting, Mr. Timbrell, first reading 739

Town of Arnprior, bill respecting, Mr. Yakabuski, first reading 739

Town of Aurora, bill respecting, Mr. Yakabuski, first reading 740

City of Vanier, bill respecting, Mr. Ruston, first reading 740

City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Wiseman, first reading 740

City of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 740

Morton Terminal Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 740

City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mr. McNie, first reading 740

City of Brantford, bill respecting, Mr. Beckett, first reading 740

City of Sarnia, bill respecting, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 740

City of Oshawa, bill intituled, Mr. McIlveen, first reading 740

Reorganization of the Government of Ontario, bill to provide for, Mr. Davis, second reading, agreed to 740

Reorganization of the Government of Ontario, bill to provide for, reported 768

Third readings 768

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 768

No. 21

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 4, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us today: In the east gallery, students from Bayview Secondary School of Richmond Hill, and in the west gallery students from J. S. Woodsworth Senior Public School, Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon) posed a question last week—I guess a week ago today—and I said at that time that I was giving some thought to making a statement, so I shall today.

I would like to make a few brief observations on the subject of government air services and their employment by members of the ministry. I need not remind hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that the practice of using government aircraft by the ministry is not new, nor of course is the practice unique in Ontario.

In this province a government aircraft has been available to the Premier at all times for many years; as well, for many years, various ministers have made use of government air services. This has been, and continues to be the case with regard to the government of Canada and other provincial governments. That this practice has been established for some considerable time in a number of comparable political jurisdictions and that the use of government aircraft by government ministers is increasing, speaks for the obvious fact that it is recognized as being the most efficient and convenient means of transportation available.

As the capability of such aircraft improve and as those individuals in government are faced with increasing demands upon their time, I have no doubt the use of government aircraft will become commonplace and cease to be a subject of curiosity or concern, even among the most partisan critics.

As for myself Mr. Speaker, and in relation to the office I hold, may I say that I intend to make continued and extensive use of government air services so long as they contribute to the efficient discharge of my official responsibilities. While the Premier of Ontario may be absent from his office at Queen's Park, for whatever reason, he is not removed from the duties and responsibilities of his office. I believe anyone holding an office of comparable responsibility would admit that it is a full-time occupation. There are in reality no days off and no holidays from it.

It has been my experience, as I am sure it has been that of others, that one is invariably obliged to travel with office staff or government personnel; with government documents; official papers and correspondence; and that it is essential that communications in respect to ongoing government business be maintained daily. I say this not at all in the nature of complaint, but simply as a matter of fact.

The availability of government air services allows a substantial flexibility and convenience, as well as an appreciable saving in executive time and energy. Anyone familiar with the demands of executive office is well aware of this, which I would assume accounts for the considerable growth in the use of this means of transportation by private and public organizations alike.

These services which encourage efficiency and conserve executive time and energy are available to major corporations and industries and are being heavily utilized. The availability of such services means that the flight departures and arrivals can be suited to the demands and convenience of the office rather than the other way around.

There is a further consideration, Mr. Speaker, which I feel obliged to mention but which I hope will not need to be dwelt upon. As some hon. members may know, the Premier of Ontario, among others, is obliged to take the advice of responsible persons with regard to certain security precautions and to co-operate with security personnel assigned to him. This is a symptom of the age in which we live, a fact of public life today. While those of us who are affected do appreciate the concern and accept the precautions we are advised to take, we would

be more than happy to be without them, as would our families and others.

Nevertheless, the security and safety of not only myself and those accompanying me, but of the travelling public generally, are considerably less a problem, with less inconvenience to all concerned, when we employ government air services for travel rather than those of the commercial airlines.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed this matter with my colleagues and with others who should be appropriately consulted and I make this statement, because to my knowledge it is the first time the subject has been raised in this Legislature. Certainly it is the first time it has been raised in the life of this administration.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that a member of this Legislature charged with such responsibilities as those vested in the Leader of the Opposition and others opposite might themselves to some extent require such assistance and services as I have described. In that respect, I would await the opinion and the advice of the body which, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, shall soon be appointed to inquire into all matters in the interests of this Legislature and its hon. members.

In the meantime Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to make my own position, and that of this administration clear to all of those who have an interest in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

USE OF GOVERNMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, following up on the Premier's statement, I gather that the Premier isn't going to undertake to devise any formula or criteria related to the use of aircraft by himself and his cabinet colleagues, to set out in some precision the areas of work where aircraft can be used as opposed to pleasure trips and junkets which really have been causing all the trouble.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well Mr. Speaker, this was debated or discussed to some extent, I think, or questions were answered, if I can put it that way, on this subject last week. I think the statement speaks for itself, certainly as it relates to my own position as the head of this government and to the fact that one is always the Premier of the Province of Ontario —and that extends seven days a week, literally 24 hours a day.

It has also been my experience at least, as it relates to the ministry in this government, that the air services are used by and large for government business—there is no question about this.

I guess there is always the question as to when one ceases to be a minister and becomes a private citizen in this province, as well as when one is involved in political business as opposed to strictly governmental business or vice versa.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, I hold both professions, that of being Premier and that of being a politician in very high regard—and I make no apologies for being a politician. I think it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish those areas where one can say one is not involved in political business. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that applies just as properly to members who are in opposition.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I take it then, from what the Premier says, that the use of aircraft by the Premier and his cabinet colleagues will go along on the same lines as has been seen in the past?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think this is true by and large, Mr. Speaker. The policy has been that the aircraft are used almost exclusively for government business. There has been an occasion—yes, there has been and I make no bones about it—when the use of government aircraft by myself two weeks ago was not exclusively for government business. In fact it was, ostensibly, at least for members of the family, a holiday; although not quite to the same extent for myself.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, and I hope I make it very clear in this statement, there are reasons, one of the reasons being that a person who holds this position really never ceases to be Premier of this province.

NURSING HOME REGULATIONS

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Health had any communication from the so-called luxury nursing homes in the province from the point of view of suggesting to the minister that they cannot comply with the regulations as presently set out?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not. As I intimated before, 460-odd out of 480 nursing homes indicated they were in the programme defin-

itely. I had communications from only three—two small ones—that we contacted, saying they weren't. We have had one luxury home in Toronto which has intimated that it couldn't, and we are dealing with that.

Mr. Gaunt: Would that one luxury home happen to be Highbourne Lodge by any chance?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gaunt: In view of the fact that there is a $3 million investment there, and in view of the fact that apparently the administrator of that particular nursing home didn't have very much success in discussing the matter with Dr. Blake—in that when he was putting his case, Dr. Blake said: "I really don't care if you operate a hot dog stand," which doesn't suggest a very great depth of understanding—would the minister undertake to meet with these people and see if in fact some accommodation can be made?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No, Mr. Speaker, but I would be delighted to meet with the hon. member and discuss it with him. I am sure there are certain things which if he saw them himself, he would rather have discussed privately than have me mention them in the House. I would be delighted to do that with him at any time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): In the new legislation coming in, is it factual that the department is going to put a ceiling on the price, that is the allowable charge, for 25 per cent of the beds in homes; or is this still under negotiation with the Ontario Nursing Homes Association?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The ceiling on the rates will be the same for semi-private and private accommodation, both for those patients who require nursing accommodation and others who are there on a retirement basis.

At the same time we can appreciate, and I am sure all of us will feel the same way, that there are in the province those of us who are financially better off than others, and because they have to stay in an institution of this type for the rest of their lives they want something better than the average. It is my feeling that they should be in a position to negotiate with the owner of the nursing home to provide this type of deluxe accommodation which would be charged for over and above the rate set out in the schedule. This is being discussed with those involved in the programme.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Where the nursing homes have only semi-private rooms available, is there a greater charge to patients than the $3.50?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, the rates as set down are $12.50 a day for standard ward accommodation, of which $3.50 is paid by the individual and $9 by the insurance programme.

We have requested, to start with, that 60 per cent of the beds in a nursing home be made available for standard ward accommodation, because this is the figure that we derived in a survey conducted on a province-wide basis. We realize there are some areas in the province where there will not be a need for 60 per cent of the beds for standard ward accommodation. Of course we will have a levelling off period over the next few weeks to decide whether it needs to be 60 or 40 or 30, whatever the demand is in this area.

What we hope to do is to make available to the various communities the type of accommodation the people in that community want. Some people want private accommodation; some want semi-private; and some want standard ward accommodation. We must be sure the standard ward accommodation is available if the people want it; if they want semi-private or private on top of that, they can have it. If they want super deluxe and they want to negotiate on an individual basis, this is available to them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary question: If a substantial number of the smaller homes provide audited statements which show their inability to comply or to operate under the rules as now set up, with the $12.50 maximum, will the minister review the amount made available?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, I have already suggested to the nursing home operators that I would be glad to discuss with any of them the problems that might arise with an audited statement. So far I have not had any requests to review their statements.

Mr. Deans: If I may, one supplementary question: Is the minister not aware of the

audited statement that I put on the record of Hansard last Monday evening—and specifically asked the minister, on the record, to look it over?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, so far I am dealing directly with the nursing home operators, and I did not know that anybody had approached the member. I have not seen it; no.

Mr. Deans: As a supplementary question: The minister did not know someone approached me. I spoke to him about it and he told me he would look into it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps; I have had so many things on my mind, with so many people stopping me and asking me to look into things—I have not had an opportunity to, but I would be delighted to.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Well it is inexcusable that the minister should not read Hansard!

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have a supplementary?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I did.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in the instance of this particular lodge to which I made reference earlier there are some 250 patients, if the licence of this nursing home is cancelled is there any assistance available within the department to aid these patients in seeking other accommodation? Apparently there has been some difficulty in this area.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, there is no intention of moving anyone out of the nursing home until other types of suitable accommodation are found. I have had a letter from the operator of the nursing home in which he pointed out very emphatically that he was prepared to carry on on an interim basis until other types of suitable accommodation could be found. I really do not see any particular problem there.

Mr. Gaunt: And is the minister prepared to accept that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for High Park have a supplementary?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Yes.

In reference to Highbourne Lodge and the patients who are in there now, will the same rate be paid for those patients as is being paid in other homes? Will the families have to pay the extra rate that is now going to be required?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right. The patients who are there will be covered the same as any other individual in the province. They are there because they want a super deluxe type of accommodation apparently. If there are any in there now who want standard ward accommodation, we will be glad to arrange for them to be transferred as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary; the hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Does the minister now acknowledge that 40 to 50 audited statements were submitted to Price Waterhouse upon request of his department about a year ago in determining these rates? Does he now accept this?

Hon. Mr. Potter: No Mr. Speaker, I do not know anything about it.

Mr. Paterson: The minister's department is not informing him—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have a supplementary question?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I do. It is along the same line, but slightly different. Could the minister explain why a woman in Palmerston, 103 years of age, was not able to qualify under these regulations?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Two years too young!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Sure can, Mr. Speaker! The main reason she did not qualify is she does not need nursing care.

Mr. Gaunt: Does the minister mean a woman 103 does not need this type of nursing care for more than an hour and a half a day?

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member is quite right. Her application was filled out by her physician. In filling out an application for nursing care and nursing home, you add up the points, and when you reach the total of 10 points, they feel that they need care in a nursing home. We agree there is a grey area here where you get eight or nine points. She

had three points. The only thing she needs actually—

Mr. Lewis: The minister could get more points from most of his colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The only thing she needs is some insulin on a daily basis. She is very active. She is very bright.

Mr. Lewis: The minister wouldn't be more than six.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Just like the backbenchers!

Hon. Mr. Potter: She can get around on her own. She doesn't need any nursing care. As a matter of fact, the doctor who submitted the claim said she remains very stable. She has generalized arteriosclerosis and old age. He didn't recommend nursing home care or anything else.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Does the doctor give insulin outside his office.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): She could probably sit with the opposition party.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have a further question?

BEAVER VALLEY PLANNING BOARD

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Treasurer give a report of his meeting on Thursday with the Beaver Valley Planning Board people—what transpired and if the matters were resolved and so forth?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I left (prior to) the meeting's conclusion. I had a very satisfactory chat with them. I think there is undoubtedly, on their part, some over-eagerness to get on with the job. Planning such a large area is not easy.

On the other hand, I think there is certainly some frustration on their part, and some of it legitimate, because the province has not yet clearly defined the criterion by which we propose to protect the escarpment for the future, in particular the Beaver Valley area.

We were well on our way to doing this 10 or 12 months ago. Unfortunately, we had a royal commission and we had a provincial election and we have had changes in ministries and government organization in the meantime.

Mr. Gaunt: The wheels grind!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As a result there has been little progress until recently, towards a delineation having adopted the Gertler report in principle, of how we propose to proceed from there. I apologized to them for this delay.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier spelled it out in the election. It cost $4 million to $5 million a year, he said.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is only part of it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is to buy it. Those portions which will be bought are a very small portion of the total, as my friend from Huron-Bruce would be aware, and as my friend from Scarborough West, perhaps not being as familiar with that part of this great Province of Ontario, wouldn't be quite as aware.

Mr. Lewis: Just as familiar!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think we had a satisfactory meeting. I am given to understand that they have not in fact resigned, and that they will be working with our staff to see what parts of the specific plan—the Beaver Valley plan—can be approved.

As it turns out, something over four-fifths of the plan is not in what we consider to be the escarpment area. There are differences of opinion between the staffs of the various departments and the Beaver Valley Planning Board as to the language of the proposed official plan for that four-fifths of the area. I would hope within the next few months we would be able to sort out those differences and get a plan on the Beaver Valley, with the understanding that it may be five or six months before there are clear policies enunciated by the government which can be translated into their official plan for the escarpment area itself.

Mr. Gaunt: What about the Bruce Peninsula? Does the same apply to that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Bruce Peninsula people were not at the meeting on Thursday. I believe we or the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) or his staff are meeting with them shortly.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Huron-Bruce have other questions?

Mr. Gaunt: Was there any discussion with respect to the other part of the problem having to do with compensation? As the

minister probably knows, the tax base in a number of the townships, St. Edmunds township, for instance, has been eroded and its educational taxes have gone up 31 per cent this year because of the land the government is buying.

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would have to take a little bit of issue with that, subject to correction from my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells). But if land has been removed by reason of exemption because it is Crown property in St. Edmunds township or any place else, then the education grant schedule under the foundation plan will adjust to correct that. The fact that certain property taxes are not being paid, or grants are not being paid in lieu of taxes, would not affect the level of education taxes in itself. The foundation grant would take over. We had some discussion about—

Mr. Gaunt: Dollar for dollar?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sure!

Mr. Gaunt: Not dollar for dollar.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sure it should.

We had some discussion about that problem, however, The members will recall that we brought in legislation a year or two years ago to pay grants, in lieu of taxes on provincial parks, to the municipalities, and it may be that we should be giving some thought to the extension of that particular matter. It will be perhaps some time before that land is a provincial park, and in the meantime there is a tax loss, or could be, to the municipality. We did discuss that and agreed to have a further look at it.

The other point which was raised was that they felt some of the farmers in the Bruce Peninsula and in Grey county were not being adequately compensated by the government, and I would say to members of the House, and particularly to the Prime Minister, that it was great to sit there and listen to a group of people who said the government was paying too little rather than too much for land it was acquiring for park purposes. I said I didn't really think that was going to be one of the things I was going to lose sleep over, because I have great confidence in the people of Grey county; I was sure they were getting every last dollar they could on the sale of their land, and I think perhaps that is true.

Mr. Gaunt: As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is the government proposing to put a freeze on the land which it intends to acquire, particularly in view of the fact it is reported that a purchase was made by a private individual, and that private individual has resold that property for something in the neighbourhood of ten times his original investment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, not to my knowledge. There is no specific freeze. There have been no subdivision approvals for some time; and we are in the process of looking at some of those now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Would the minister be able to table in the House the breakdown of the $20.8 million, which is indicated on page 108 of the budget paper, to show how much of the money is being used for acquisition of land in the Niagara Escarpment and how much for the other undertakings, the Bronte park, the Wasaga development and so on?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is my understanding that the New Democratic Party phoned my office for that information last Wednesday and it was given to them. I don't think we could give any further breakdown beyond that which was given on the phone because, for example, I think the figure of $4 million was used for escarpment purposes; whether that will be used in Bruce county, Grey county, Wentworth county or in the regional municipality of Niagara, it is much too early to say. It is a matter which is sorted out from time to time by the Ministry of Government Services, the Ministry of Natural Resources and conservation authorities, as to where land up to a certain amount can be bought most propitiously at any given moment in time. But I don't think any further breakdown can be given beyond what was given.

Mr. Deans: The Treasurer will admit, of course—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! Is this a supplementary? Order!

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: How then does the government intend to implement the Gertler report, as the Prime Minister stated he would during the election campaign, and purchase all of the land that it has been suggested by Gertler should be purchased during the first two years? I am asking how—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The original question was for a report on the meeting that took place the other day—

Mr. Deans: It is about this very matter.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member's question is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Deans: Perhaps it is a supplementary to mine.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce had further questions?

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FOR TORONTO FARE PLAN

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, two more, Mr. Speaker, and then I am through. First, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer.

In view of the approval in principle by the government of the Toronto Transit Commission's proposed single-fare policy, which as I understand it will result in a loss of something in the neighbourhood of $8.4 million, will the government undertake to underwrite half of that loss, as they suggested they might do, I think during the October election campaign?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, without admitting the validity or the accuracy of the last part of my friend's question, I would just say that these are matters which are presently being considered by the government. In due course, no doubt, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) will be reporting to the House on the results of deliberations which are taking place within the government.

Mr. Gaunt: But the matter hasn't been ruled out?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

WCB TASK FORCE

Mr. Gaunt: I have a final question, Mr. Speaker, of the Premier. It concerns the letter that was written by Mr. Charles Caccia, MP for Toronto-Davenport. The Premier having received that letter, does he intend to set up a task force to look into these various points raised in the letter by Mr. Caccia?

Mr. Lewis: Right! Surely the Premier jumps when Charles Caccia speaks.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning about Mr. Caccia's letter to me, and I shall be replying to it.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It wasn't supposed to go to the press, he said.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. member for Scarborough West.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCREASES ON ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, questions of the provincial Treasurer.

On what basis, and with what submissions or representations, did he arrive at his increase in prices for alcoholic beverages in the Province of Ontario? And on what basis was the split calculated between the Province of Ontario and distillers, brewers or vinters?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well Mr. Speaker, many things are taken into account. Representations are made from time to time. We indicated—I indicated—that we wanted a certain dollar amount from this source; an increase in our revenues of approximately the amount which we ultimately achieved. At the same time, representations have been made and continue to be made, I suppose, as to increases.

I was conscious of the fact that increases in their selling price had not been achieved by this industry since 1968, and the increases which have been achieved would average out to something les than three per cent over the period—that is per year over the period—and that would seem like a reasonable increase.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Is it not strange to the provincial Treasurer that representation should be made for price increases from the industry, given the profits of Canadian Breweries in 1970 of $14.3 million, of Seagram's of $56 million, of Labatt's at $16 million, of Hiram Walker at $48 million? Does that make any sense to him in terms of granting the distillers yet further increases?

Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I read the Globe and Mail with great interest as well.

Mr. Lewis: I'm asking, how does the minister think—incidentally those figures are not from the Globe and Mail. The Globe and Mail is rather more up to date.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, what gave the hon. member the idea?

Mr. Lewis: Our idea was included in a memo which I didn't use, foolishly enough,

prior to the Globe editorial; but nonetheless the question stands. How does the minister justify those kinds of increases in view of the profit-structure of these companies?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well Mr. Speaker, of course the companies which the member mentioned are multi-national companies. They're doing business in many other parts of the world, many other parts of Canada other than Ontario, and their profits are not necessarily related specifically to—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They're losing money here, no doubt!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to what they may or may not be doing in this particular province.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: What representations is the minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh I receive representations from many people, as does the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton), as do all ministers of the Crown, suggesting that there should be increases in certain prices, that there should be decreases in certain taxes; those representations go on daily. Often we have representations to that effect from this House.

Mr. Lewis: Then can the minister explain to me, through the Speaker, the representation made to him on January 28, 1972, from the Association of Canadian Distillers, including all of the companies mentioned, in which the final recommendation reads:

> It is strongly recommended that any increases that may be required in taxation, and thus in the retail pricing of beverage alcohol products sold in Ontario, be restricted to beer.

Can the minister explain to me, by way of a supplementary to that, that the recommendation was preceded by a

> Whereas any increases in retail prices for spirits would almost certainly run into the law of diminishing returns in the present market.

Can the minister explain to me, by way of supplementary, the preamble which says:

> If additional revenues are required by the province, the only price increases in beverage alcohol products that would be effective or equitable would be in beer.

Now what representations of the distillers is the minister talking about?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well it doesn't surprise me, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sure on reflection that it wouldn't surprise the hon. member or any member of this House, that the distillery industry, for example, would like to see their prices left alone, both in terms of their cost structure and in terms of taxes and see all the increase loaded onto beer. That is not the view of this government, and we did not act accordingly.

Mr. MacDonald: So the government imposed a price increase!

Mr. Lewis: All right, all right! So that, by way of supplementary: Despite the brief of the distillers and the arguments they made on the basis of equity and pricing, the minister saw it as necessary to give $19 million to the industry over and above what they themselves had asked for, by and large. Can he explain that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm sure the member would like to get his figures straight: $19 million was the total for the three industries.

Mr. Lewis: Yes! How much was it for the distillers, I forget?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I recall, and I'm sure the member has the figures there in front of him—

Mr. Lewis: No I don't!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was $6 million or $7 million.

Mr. Lewis: Six or seven million dollars. Does the minister expect gratitude on their part? How does he think the gratitude will be manifest?

Mr. MacDonald: They have got it. It's not expected.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose the hon. member would appreciate this coming from the party that he does, but before they make that money they're going to have to sell it, and that's something which he wouldn't understand over there at all.

Mr. Lewis: As always, we rest with the conclusions of the Globe and Mail, since I know the minister is so appreciative of that paper.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): What would the hon. member do without the Globe and Mail?

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a further question of the provincial Treasurer?

Mr. MacDonald: What is the government going to do with the Globe and Mail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If there is ever a successful newspaper strike those fellows will be stricken dumb!

CORPORATION TAX CREDIT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask a further question of the provincial Treasurer?

How much of the corporation tax credit granted for the year 1971-1972 was actually received by them or exercised by them—how many millions of the $125 million was felt?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We won't know that, Mr. Speaker, until the Minister of Revenue receives all the returns and until that information, as it comes in on the returns, is computerized. It will be, I suppose, six or 12 months before we have a figure on that.

We did, through the Department of Revenue, undertake a survey, the results of which are still coming in, indicating what the investment intentions were in 1971 and what the investment intentions would be in 1972. We have not as yet received the results of those figures.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It isn't easy to count, you know.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, was not an estimate of $30 million used by the minister's department on the basis of the survey results thus far tabulated?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think the $30 million was the amount of the credit—well the reduction in corporation taxes—during 1971-1972.

Mr. Lewis: That would apply as a result of that tax credit?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes; and again, until we have the returns it is impossible to be specific. It may well be—and I think I indicated this a year ago—that some of the tax credit money, having been taken, has generated—and I don't know how you would ever prove this—but may have generated a higher profit. Therefore, if I may put it this way, if the figure is $30 million it may well have been $50 million, taking advantage of a recovery of tax of $20 million for a net of $30 million.

Mr. Lewis: So the Treasurer's estimate is $30 million for the original $125 million; and, despite that experience, he has again inserted $130 million in this year's budget. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Right. Now since there has been secondary manufacturing concerns across Canada, most of them concentrated in Ontario, showing a decrease in investment in machinery and equipment forecast for the next year, why has the Treasurer put in another $130 million when he only exercised $30 million of it last year? And if he is, on the average, $100 million out per year, why was it necessary to impose all the tax increases which he just imposed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we will know that at the end of the 12-month period rather than at the beginning of it, but I would just say that that was not a study which was just completed. That study was done from November through January—

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —rather than just recently.

We don't agree with all the results of that study. We have done some updating in our own shop, if I can put it that way, since January. Fortunately—and we say "thank heavens"— we think that was a pessimistic view. It was not an unsurprising view in November and January when there was still a certain amount of depression, if I can put it that way, in terms of business confidence and investment intentions. During the last two months those intentions seemed to have been firming up more positively than they did toward the end of the year, right after Mr. Nixon's October announcements.

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I could just say this—the budget paper, the forecast paper, indicates that we think there will be an increase, as I recall of 6.1 per cent, in investment intentions for machinery and equipment as compared to what the member read in the Globe the other day. Time will tell whether the federal department survey or our budget statement is correct.

INCREASED COST OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer was only $95 million out last year and who knows the prospects for this year? May I ask the provincial Treasurer another question, Mr. Speaker?

What amount of money will be afforded to the manufacturers of tobacco products as a result of the increase imposed in the budget?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no way of knowing that, Mr. Speaker. Those prices are set by the tobacco people, and if one goes down to any number of tobacco stores or outlets one will find the greatest variety of prices that ever was. Whether they choose to raise their prices now, or what price levels they finally set after tax is their concern.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, the Treasurer doesn't anticipate them charging a portion of a cent on a package of cigarettes, I take it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Lewis: No. Therefore it—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They may even take it off.

Mr. Lewis: They will take it off? Has the minister bought cigarettes in the last week?

Mr. Deans: When did that ever happen?

Mr. Lewis: They may? I see.

Presuming that they raise it—the improbable assumption that it is raised rather than deducted from the price—hasn't the Treasurer's department figured the increase which he has provided for the coffers of the tobacco manufacturers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

INCREASE IN URBAN TRANSIT SUBSIDIES

Mr. Lewis: One further question on the budget, Mr. Speaker, for the provincial Treasurer. What does he mean when on page 13 of the budget $12 million in urban transit subsidies is listed as increased support to local government, but on page 30 the statement is made "municipal transit subsidies will be doubled to $12 million in 1972-1973." Is it a $12 million increase or a $6 million increase?

Mr. McKeough: There is $6 million in the present—

Mr. Lewis: A $6 million increase?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's from $6 million to $12 million.

Mr. Lewis: I see. It's from $6 million to $12 million; $6 million more for urban transit.

Can the minister relate that to the government's philosophy of a shift to public transit systems? For instance, how much is going to be applied to rapid transit lines to replace Spadina? How much is going to be applied, and to which municipalities throughout the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question which the member and others will want to explore thoroughly at the time of the estimates of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. It should be pointed out, of course, that elsewhere in the estimates members will find the figures for assistance over and above the $12 million for capital construction of subway lines; not only the lines—the rolling stock, the land and so on. This is separate and apart from the $12 million, which is assistance presently being granted to various municipalities to help pay for their deficit, whatever deficit they may have, on transit operation.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister: In view of the rising indignation in northwest Metro, in respect of the failure of the government to maintain expectations of last year when the cancellation of the Spadina Expressway took place, would the minister state just how much the Spadina line can expect in the way of subsidy for building and operation, whatever the case may be, over the next budget period?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that's clearly, I would suggest, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I would further suggest it's what the estimates are all about.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a final supplementary: Am I to understand that the $12 million is to defray deficits?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: The entire $12 million announced in the budget, the $6 million increase is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not necessarily. It has been paid out on the basis of previous deficits; the $6 million was this year and the $12 million will be next year. It is not the intention of the government, as I understand it, to continue that particular form of assistance.

There are a number of formulae in the course of being developed; probably, ultimately I would suspect, they will be related to user miles. In the short run the only possible and reasonably equitable way of assisting municipalities in their transit operations was to relate it to the deficit which they are presently incurring.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND IN METRO CENTRE

Mr. Lewis: One last question, Mr. Speaker, of the provincial Treasurer. Is it the intention of the government of Ontario to quit claim to the 55 acres of land to which it apparently holds title in the midst of the Metro Centre development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which is being looked at by the law officers of the Crown, as I replied the other day. In due course we will have something to say about it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I take it that the province is in fact considering giving up claim to title of those 55 acres?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker. The member is assuming that we think we own them; we don't know whether we do or don't. The whole matter is under consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I might say there has been a sufficient number of supplementaries on this topic. I might also say that there are six minutes remaining for all other members, other than the leaders of the two parties.

Mr. Shulman: Something should be done about this; it has been going on now for months.

Mr. Speaker: I point this out—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

Mr. MacDonald: Speak to the Liberal Party, they are the ones.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I'm simply pointing out to the hon. members of the House that the leaders of the two opposition parties have taken 40 minutes of the 45 minutes of the question period. Now is there a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order—no, I will make it after the question period.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health has the answer to a question asked previously.

INFORMATION ON SAVINGS IN HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS

Hon. Mr. Potter: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Scarborough West concerning proof of savings given to employees in connection with the Health Insurance Registration Board.

It is true that under the Health Insurance Organization Act of 1971 an employer is required to give to the employee any savings from the reduction in amalgamating the various plans. There's nothing in the legislation that requires the employer to make this information available to a union organizer or the union itself, but he is required to do it to the individual. Now if there is enough evidence to suggest that this money isn't being returned, that the employer is taking advantage of it, then of course I would consider amendments to the legislation making it compulsory to discuss this with the union people.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Provincial Secretary has the answer to a question asked previously.

DEATH OF CLAUDE GERVAIS

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I speak as the Solicitor General-designate. The hon. member for High Park asked the question:

> Is the deputy chief of police of Sudbury exempted from the traffic laws of this province? If not, in view of the considerable evidence involving the death of Claude Gervais on February 8, 1972, what influence was exerted within the police department to prevent charges being laid?

Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to inform myself with certain facts on the matter and they are as follows: The deputy chief of the Sudbury police department, Mr. Hubert A. Guillet, struck Mr. Claude Gervais at 12.30 in the morning of February 8, 1972. The accident was investigated in the usual way by the city police traffic division. The investigation showed that the weather was cold, visibility was poor and the road condition icy. No charges were laid as a result of this investigation.

Ordinarily an inquest is not held in connection with a traffic fatality when no

charges have been laid. However, because of his position, deputy chief Guillet asked that a coroner's inquest be held. The inquest was held on March 9, 1972. The coroner's jury attached no blame in the incident and the matter was then closed.

Mr. Shulman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain why an eyewitness by the name of Paul Westcott—who gave a statement that the roads were not icy and this statement was not true—was not called, and why as a result of his statement, which was given to the police, charges were not laid?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I probably may have read that statement. It is probably in the file. I have no doubt that it was taken into consideration. As I say, no charges were laid as a result of the investigation.

Mr. Shulman: It was a straight cover-up and he knows it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was at one time a coroner and there was an accident in which the member for York South was involved, and this question reminded me of that incident. Quite frankly, I could discern no difference between the two situations without having gone into the detail of the thing.

Mr. Shulman: A further supplementary—

Mr. Lewis: I tell you that is why this man should never be Solicitor General of this province.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for High Park.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as long as the leader of the NDP does not assume the responsibility of leadership—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and lets that kind of behaviour go on—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! The hon. member for High Park was properly on his feet with a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, how can the minister explain his statement that this inquest was held at the request of the deputy chief of police when the rules given out to the coroners are that in such cases inquests are automatically held? What kind of nonsense is he giving us here?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for High Park is out of date. At one time there was such an order given. That order was rescinded and it is no longer necessary.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, could the minister explain, as a final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Reflecting, I think, the frustrations which are appropriately and widely felt on at least this side of the House, I would wonder, sir, whether you might not call together the whips or the leaders or a representative group, however it is arranged, within the Legislature, to consider the proposition that the leader of the official opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party be confined to one or two questions per day so that the question distribution in the House is rather more equitable than is presently the case.

An hon. member: We tried that three years ago.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Well I hardly think it is a point of order. Nevertheless it is a very valid point and I would be delighted to do exactly that, because I have felt for some time that this should be done. I will be glad to do that.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

COMMISSION TO EVALUATE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish a Commission to evaluate Government Programmes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill establishes a commission whose function is to study and evaluate provincial programmes, and whose findings and recommendations are to be submitted to the assembly on or before July 1, 1973.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, as the opposition critic of the Treasury and Revenue departments, in presenting my comments on this new budget that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has presented to us, it seems appropriate for me to review the initial paragraphs set out by my leader (Mr. Nixon) in his reply to the budget of last year. In his speech of April 29, 1971, he said as follows:

> The budget statement of the Treasurer confirms the rapid escalation in the costs of operating this provincial government and its programmes. Setting 1967, Centennial Year, just four years ago, as a base, when our net general expenditure was $1.79 billion, it is predicted that this year Ontario will spend $4.26 billion. This is an increase of 133 per cent in our general expenditures in four years, averaging 33 per cent each year. This uncontrolled rate of growth can be compared with the growth rate of the gross provincial product, that is the ability of this province to develop goods and services, estimated for this year at 8.9 per cent—a rate which, I bring to your attention, has never exceeded 10 per cent during these last four years.

Mr. Speaker, the mismanagement of the provincial economy continues at the same accelerated pace in this coming year as it has done over the past five years. While the Treasurer calls for a substantial but manageable deficit, he in fact has accepted the increasing expenditure rate within the province while paying lip-service to the need to involve the private sector at an increased and accelerated rate within the provincial economy.

The Treasurer refers to his deficit, which will apparently stimulate economic recovery, and he calls for the approval by this House of expansionary programmes, as he refers to them. It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this budget is anything but expansionary. Taxes have been increased and government spending has been increased; the mere fact of a large budget deficit does not make an expansionary programme. As the Treasurer plans for a further deficit of $600 million it is apparent that this budget will not create jobs and that there is nothing new or positive in this budget that even relates to jobs.

The Treasurer apparently fails to understand the most fundamental concepts of economics. He also seems to have blind faith in presuming that the inelasticity of demand for goods and services will not trap him, as persons decide to make changes in their consumption patterns over this next year. It is apparent that the consumer will curtail his consumption of goods and services which cost more. As a result, it is unlikely the revenue from these sources of taxation which he has increased, will be as large as budgeted.

The government of Ontario has made much of programmes that it intends to implement during the summer of 1972. They have catchy acronyms for their names, such as SWEEP and RSVP; it is almost as though the programmes are being designed solely to fit into someone's ideas for the need for catchwords in government. I suggest that an additional programme for summer employment could well be useful to the people of the province. Its name would be spit. The cost for Project SPIT will not be large because only one student will be involved. But this Summer Programme to Inform the Treasurer will provide the tuition fees necessary to send the Treasurer to the University of Toronto in order to take a freshman course in economics.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The member is talking about the school of economics.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, having taught such a course for five years, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the comprehension level will not be too great for the Treasurer; he should be able to assimilate all the facts that are put out in front of him. The cost, of course, will be higher this year than it would have been last year, since tuition costs have unfortunately increased generally—

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Pay his grant, the same as last year!

Mr. Breithaupt: —but I still think it would be well worth the expense. The people of the province would benefit if the Treasurer had a greater grasp of economic theory, and I am sure that the additional $100 which might be charged because of tuition increases could be arranged through public donations or perhaps through the efforts of Mr. William Kelly. I am certain that, as he searches all year round for funds for the Conservative

Party, he might be able to come up with the additional amount that would be needed here.

In the Globe and Mail of March 28, 1972, an exceptionally lengthy article chronicled the comings and goings across the province of "Darcy the Regulator." Like some mediaeval knight entering the lists of championships around the province, he appears here, he wanders there and occasionally visits the city of Toronto to preside over his growing personal empire.

Perhaps a few brief quotes from that article would be of value to those members who have not already received embossed copies, which no doubt will eventually be coming through the office of the Treasury.

I quote:

> Darcy McKeough is riding a dilemma. The trite phrase is "quality of life"; the disturbing factor is rising expectations—the rising expectations of a constituency that is not, to a large extent, getting what society is telling it it should get.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it would appear, from the budget that has been brought down to us, that the sector of society that is to have rising expectations is the corporate sector. This is the sector that Mr. William Kelly will be visiting. The portion of society that is not getting what it should get appears to be the Conservative Party. The intentions here, no doubt, are to ensure that corporate donations are going to be beneficially received by that party so that private enterprise remains the enterprise that pays.

In spite of the pleas by the Treasurer and his reactionary conservative approach to economic theory and practice in this last part of the 20th century, he remains, it appears, the oldest young man in Ontario with perhaps the finest 18th century economic mind still extant.

Mr. Bounsall: Sixty years old at age 12.

Mr. Breithaupt: The comments with which the Treasurer opens his budget address in reference to federal-provincial relations remind me of the story of the young man who had just celebrated his 21st birthday. He commented that when he was 18 he was certain his father knew nothing of the world, but by the time he became 21 he was amazed how much his father had learned in those intervening three years.

Such is the position of the Treasurer at the present time. In the year or 18 months before the last provincial election, he was quick to condemn the activities of the federal government, but he now finds in the past half year that that government is being much more reasonable and acceptable to his point of view.

The Treasurer states that he waited until he was reasonably confident of the workability of the new federal corporation tax provisions. In his view, federal legislation is cumbersome and intricate, but he nevertheless sees some need for uniformity and, therefore, opts to follow the federal scheme.

Does the Treasurer really believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government sees in his attitude anything but politicking at the provincial level? This just appears to me to be a thin and shallow justification for following a line which has been put out and found to be acceptable in many other sectors of the community.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Breithaupt: If the Province of Ontario does have a plan for a less cumbersome and complex corporate tax system, then these rules and views should be presented to the federal authorities. Indeed, it may be that other provinces also would benefit from the wisdom of the Treasurer and of his assistants in this matter.

This government which the Treasurer effectively heads has been reluctant to concede anything of benefit to the federal authorities over the past few years. Even when the Ontario government went along with the three per cent income tax reduction of last winter, the Premier (Mr. Davis) was quick to point out that he suggested the tax cut first, so that some benefit would not be seen to rub off on the federal authorities. I do not know whether Mr. Benson, as the Minister of Finance for Canada, remembers such a suggestion or not. But, in any event, Mr. Speaker, the Premier remembered it and was quick to point out his recollection to ensure that praise would continue to flow to Queen's Park.

Mr. Speaker, there will be some particular references to the Treasurer's budget that I shall be making, and my page numbering, I should remind you, is that of the text which he used last week, not of the newly-printed budget document. The Treasurer stated on page 17, and I quote:

> Ontario's tax credit will deliver substantially greater tax relief to low-income families and individuals . . .

Well, this new tax credit scheme was announced some six weeks ago by the Treasurer.

At that time he said he felt there would be a minimum tax credit of $10. That meant that even the wealthiest families in Ontario would receive the $10 tax credit toward the property taxes paid.

However, in the new budget he makes no mention of the previously announced minimum credit. We are delighted that he announced this new scheme ahead of time because it gave critics of the scheme a chance to air their views. We are indeed gratified that he may have listened to some of those critics who suggest eliminating that minimum credit.

We would only wish that more of the ministers of the Crown would follow this example of the Treasurer. In this case a scheme announced ahead of time could be corrected, rather than the usual approach of refusing any amendment or suggestions made by the opposition—or rather, outside parties—and bulling through the legislation, which, of course, could always be changed next year.

It is regrettable that in the past several months we have seen two examples of situations where reports have been received and proposals implemented without the opportunity for further discussion. The first example is that of the ministerial commission on French language secondary schools, known as the Symons report; the second example is the proposed plan of organization of the Department of Education which also has been announced as a fait accompli.

There are repeated references throughout the budget to various federal-provincial financial arrangements. On page 3 the Treasurer stated that an unsatisfactory course of these arrangements has led to a detrimental impact of federal policies on Ontario. Now he seems to have greater confidence in the direction and impact of these policies.

He stated that he ponders the problems of shared cost programmes and said, and I quote; he is "encouraged" in the "response to Ontario's arguments."

He also hopes, and I further quote, that "no objections to the principle of moving to full provincial responsibility and accountability in these spending areas" will be made.

Obviously Ontario is very concerned about all of the federal-provincial arrangements. The Treasurer indicates a willingness to judge the federal policies, and that, of course, is his right. He also indicates his continuing unhappiness with cost sharing, and his pleasure that Ottawa appears to be willing to allow the provinces to virtually take over the earmarking of federal funds in cost-sharing programmes. Even further, the Treasurer appears to want the federal authorities to go to the ultimate step of allowing the provincial government to judge the cost and benefits of regional redistribution, relocation grants, tax concessions and regional development subsidies.

And yet, throughout all of this, the Treasurer argues his belief in the tax principle of public finance, that the government responsible for spending should also be responsible for raising the necessary revenues. How can the Treasurer argue, Mr. Speaker, that the Ontario government has the right to the material and then the judgement of federal programmes? Cost-sharing, in his opinion, should be replaced by full provincial responsibility and fiscal equivalence. It is apparent that close to $2 billion, collected federally through income tax and cost-sharing programmes, is already passed on to Queen's Park without this principle to which he refers.

Of course, we do not argue with the right of the government of Ontario to question any programme affecting Ontario. We, further, do not argue with reasonable efforts to have some control over the use of federal moneys applied to the various provincial responsibilities under the constitution. But is it not pious, on one hand, to argue that the government spending the funds should be the government raising the funds and then to demand, not only that the federal government take the responsibility for raising the funds, but also that it allow the spending responsibility to be entirely within the function of the province without any federal judgement?

Then, the Treasurer turns around and further attempts to judge the federal government on its responsibilities. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial Treasurer has taken a more moderate tone toward the federal government, and that is encouraging. However, his arguments for doing so appear to me to be confused. He argues, on one hand, for independence of spending by the province of federal moneys; on the other, he argues for the provincial right for full knowledge and the power to analyse and criticize federal spending. While the provincial Treasurer speaks piously of the principle of the government spending being responsible for collecting, yet he asks Ottawa to continue to collect while Queen's Park will be responsible for spending.

Surely this inconsistency greatly weakens the Province of Ontario's bid for greater cooperation from and with the federal authorities. This gap in the thinking of the Treasury

is even more apparent when we turn to the relationships between the provincial and municipal authorities within Ontario. As I have stated, while the Treasurer calls for the assumption of provincial responsibility for the spending of federally collected moneys, he then further calls also for the right to criticize federal programmes, such as regional redistribution and relocation grants. He makes much of that principle to which I have referred, the principle that the government responsible for spending should also be responsible for the raising of necessary revenues.

Then, Mr. Speaker, what does he do? On page 22 of his budget, he proudly announces that the provincial government provides an estimated 50 per cent of revenue spent by municipalities. If such is the case, how can one argue this basic principle of public finance? The government of Ontario raises more than half the revenues for the municipalities, and yet those municipalities, apparently, will spend the funds without having the responsibility of raising them. Where is the Treasurer's formula then for readjusting the municipal tax base to live up to these principles?

The provincial Treasurer argues that there should be open discussion of the total cost and benefits of federal programmes. If that is the case, is the Treasurer prepared to allow the same open discussion and analysis of provincial programmes by the municipalities? Is he prepared to accept the view of the city of St. Catharines which has looked for secession from the regional government of Niagara because of this very breach of the principle of finance?

I would ask the Treasurer to show us where his government has shown any willingness to openly discuss and allow analysis of regional government costs? He has refused them in the Niagara region. He has also refused the request of the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) with respect to the proposed regional government costs which will soon be imposed on Waterloo county. All in all, it appears what is good for the goose is apparently not good for the gander and it is certainly obvious that within Ontario the municipalities are not being gandered.

It is with great interest that we look at the comments that the minister has made concerning his municipal tax credit system. Tax relief, he tells us, is going to be confined only to a principal resident and will be only available to Ontario citizens. I wonder what an Ontario citizen is? Is the government contemplating a citizenship Act on its own? We already have an Ontario air force and we, apparently, are prepared to send diplomatic missions to Cuba, so I guess this third step may not be out of question. Perhaps the Treasurer's dissatisfaction with the federal government has gone further than we had all expected.

What is the definition of an Ontario citizen? No matter how the Treasurer attempts to work his system, he is once again hitting at the middle-income wage earner. Cottages are certainly no longer reserved for the wealthy. By far the largest number of cottages is owned by middle-income groups. The wealthy people are relaxing by their pools or being jetted off to their ski vacations or scuba diving vacations outside of Ontario. Like the Premier and the Provincial Secretary for Resource Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) there is apparently some place where some citizens of Ontario would rather be. By disallowing tax credits on all property taxes paid, in our opinion the government is creating a climate of disincentive for individual betterment.

One of the greatest achievements set out in this budget is the view which is now clearly before the citizens of Ontario as to the growth and the power structure of the provincial Treasurer. The Treasurer refers to too many municipalities with too many special boards and committees. He refers to too many decisions made by separate towns affecting the same planning.

He states that we must ensure a proper co-ordination of the planning decisions and it would appear that the co-ordination will be done by the Treasurer. He has accepted the responsibility to integrate federal-provincial relations and regional planning and, as well, he works on the basis of general budgetary strategy and economic policy for all concerned.

At page 25 he comments, and I quote, "so many decision-makers distort local decisions." It would appear to be his view that there should be, in effect, only one decision-maker in the province so that every one else can take a rest. At page 36 he sets out in particular the various responsibilities for this ministry of his.

In addition, rather than even getting one day's vacation in eight—which the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development managed in Cuba—the Treasurer accepts the responsibilities to perform service and advisory functions to the cabinet and all ministries.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that in the government opposite we have set up a series

of six levels of decision making. First of all we have the new members; this level of government could be called the yo-yo level because the responsibilities of these members seem to begin and end with the need to jump up and down on cue. This is the group that has been backbenched. This is the group that must react and salivate on cue just like Thor, nothing is expected of them and as the phrase goes what you see is what you get.

The second level is that of the parliamentary assistants. For $5,000 per year they grace head tables and sit in for their masters but they have no apparent duties or authority.

At the third level we have the ministry; that is, the garden variety members of it. Just like a deck of cards they are shuffled and dealt with and asked to take a trick when they can in this game of politics that is being played across the floor.

At the fourth level we have the provincial secretaries. I agree, Mr. Speaker, with those who have argued that the four men in these posts are not powerful policy superministers but are actually rivals who have been kicked upstairs. In the parlance of the Premier these men have been frontbenched. Alas, there is one rival from whom we hear nothing. Whatever happened to Robert Pharand? At least the Premier could have employed him by using him to get a job driving one of these new fancy black cars that we see parked out in front of this building.

With these four levels then, Mr. Speaker, we have the know-nothings, the say-nothings, the do-nothings, and the think-nothings. That leaves but two levels and apparently only two persons to fill all the jobs. They appear to have to do all the work. In this House each day, Mr. Speaker, we don't finish our prayers by asking "that Thine be the power and the glory" but, as I have stated, the hon. member for Chatham-Kent has referred to "my ministry" at page 36 of his budget and this is a definite step up from the kingmaking role he had just a year ago.

But wait! The Globe and Mail reporting on Thursday last in its reference to King Billy and his phrase "my government" questions indeed even the functions of His Honour in this province. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, which has the power and which has the glory? It would appear that the provincial Treasurer has the power and one might presume therefore that he, with the first, may soon act to take over the second. And so the McKeough-Davis ministry prospers.

In his presentation of the 1972 Ontario budget the Treasurer listed three primary principles for effecting the Davis government's attempt at, and I quote, "improving the effectiveness of local government organizations in Ontario." The second of these principles asserts unequivocally that there are far too many special purpose boards and commissions. They obscure the accountability of councils and impede comprehensive priority setting. This problem must be studied to ensure the proper co-ordination of planning positions.

On November 28, 1961, during the third session of the 26th Legislature the Municipal Affairs minister of that day, the Hon. Fred Cass, in reply to a question put to him by Mr. Edwards, the hon. member for Wentworth, relating to a decision by the Ontario Municipal Board made the following statement:

> I would say that I in my short time as minister of the Crown have found that there was neither desire nor authority vested in a minister of the Crown to order an autonomous board set up to administer the laws and regulations of this province. I do not propose to exercise such authority and I do not believe that I have it.

On April 12, 1962, in volume 2 of Hansard, page 2265, the Municipal Affairs minister of that day, the Hon. Mr. Warrender, made the following statement:

> The Ontario Municipal Board is for administrative purposes directly responsible to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. However, the board is an autonomous body and not subject in its decisions to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Decisions of the OMB are subject to appeals as set out in the relevant statutes.

In referring to the aforementioned statements by these two gentlemen, excerpted from Hansard, it would seem clear that successive Conservative governments have taken a firm hands off position with respect to the operation of the Ontario Municipal Board. However, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech brought down by the government during the current session of the Legislature, the present government has presented a diametrically opposed position regarding the operations of the OMB and I quote:

> My government, recognizing the significant role of the OMB and believing it now appropriate to examine the relations of this board with the municipalities, will conduct a review of the function, responsibilities and practices of the board, including consideration of appeals and petitions from its decisions. Municipalities, municipal organizations and the general public will be invited to participate in this review.

Where is the consistency and credibility in successive Conservative governments? Can members of the Legislature rely on the Davis government's position outlined in the

current Throne Speech as to the review of powers and functions of the OMB, in view of its complete reversal over previous ministerial policy in this regard?

Why the sudden change of heart? Have the government planning and priority mechanisms been changed after due deliberation of the problems they have encountered as a result of board activities and decisions? What are the people of Ontario to expect from this government in the future? Can they expect that the role, function, and powers of the Ontario Municipal Board will be transferred to the direct jurisdiction of the Municipal Affairs department and made directly responsible to the people of this province through the Legislature? It is interesting to note that an apparent move now exists on the part of this government to erode or diminish the powers of the board and this, in fact, has taken place prior to the reference in the present Throne Speech calling for a review of its powers. Resulting from several telephone calls to the board's office requesting information from its staff, the executive assistant of the Leader of the Opposition received a call from the executive assistant of the Minister of Municipal Affairs to ask if his department might assist in providing information concerning the OMB. Obviously, the assistance and information should come from the board.

Do members of the board staff now have orders from the omnipotent member for Chatham-Kent to relay directly any and all calls received from the opposition to the minister's office? What is the current function and status of the OMB, vis-à-vis the provincial Treasurer?

Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer has prided himself in his budget in trumpeting what he believes to be conservative economic philosophy. I believe that those philosophies even antedate, the Conservative Party. They are more closely akin to a neanderthalic approach which continues to prate about the virtues of the distant past, while not being aware of the realities of the present. The Treasurer had stated on page 51 that this government was committed to:

> Unprecedented expenditure restraint, with growth and expenditure only slightly in excess of the expected rate of inflation.

How can the Treasurer say this with any pride? Such a policy must surely be inflationary of itself.

The Treasurer is setting an example for business which allows it to increase prices only slightly in excess of what is required for reasonable profit. Labour will ask for wage increases only slightly in excess of what is warranted by the expected increase in productivity.

This budget is a shambles. On one page the Treasurer is presenting us with an expansion budget. On the next, he creates employment without telling us how. On another page the budget is inflationary. On yet another page we are an austerity programme with government cost cutting and holding the line on hiring in the civil service. Then another page creates unemployment by barring access to post-secondary education.

What we have seen, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than a juggling of the books. The Treasurer has taken money away from the students by reducing grants from $50 million to $34 million, as well as asking them to pay more money in tuition.

He has $135 million from the average wage earners while handing out a few goodies for business. Even in a non-election year, business seems to get something. Perhaps this is in keeping with the Tories' new policy of viewing the raising of election funds as an ongoing process. The Treasurer's theme song would appear to be, "I get by with a little help from my friends and making good on government promises."

The Premier has kept all of his election promises except the one not to raise taxes. Since he made no other promises, the score is 100 per cent failure.

This budget is committed to a policy which has not existed since the time of the Middle Ages. Here we see the Treasurer dressed as Robin Hood but working a reverse twist on that man's economic theory, for our Treasurer is committed to robbing the poor in order to benefit the rich. Throughout the corporate board rooms of the province he hopes that his praises will be echoed in the ancient words, "The Treasurer giveth and the Treasurer won't taketh away; blessed be the name of the Treasurer."

I had referred earlier, Mr. Speaker, to the supposed government austerity programme which is in effect. Let us look at that in depth as we study the increases in the Premier's office. While the Premier's own staff continues to mushroom into an unprecedented mass of bureaucracy, all other departments of the Ontario government are feeling the squeeze of a financial belt-tightening policy at Queen's Park.

There are now 74 employees in the office of the Premier and the office of the cabinet, and

all of them report to the great man himself. There are 57 men and women in the office of the Premier and another 17 in the office of the cabinet. There were about half that many under his predecessor, John Parmenter Robarts. Indeed, today, Mr. Speaker, during the question period there were so many hangers-on under your gallery that there weren't enough seats to go around.

The Treasury Board officials admit that the Premier's staff costs are raising havoc with efforts to hold the line on government spending. Since taking office a year ago, he has steadily built up a battalion of administrators, policy ministers, speech writers and aides, to the point that some Conservative backbenchers' offices have been taken over to make room for his closer confidantes. These people make the decisions and reduce the role of the elected members. Ask the five parliamentary assistants who the person was who gave them notice of their job success. I am told it was James Fleck.

There are complaints in many departments of government that they are understaffed. Meanwhile, some of the Premier's top aides admit they are not exactly sure what many of their colleagues are doing or what their role is in the Davis bureaucracy. There is even some doubt as to how large that bureaucracy is. An official in the office of the Premier, asked this week for an up-to-date count on the total staff replied: "I haven't checked yet this morning. It was 73 yesterday but someone new may have been added overnight." One wonders if the Premier has been reading about sacred mushrooms and their psychedelic effects. The official suggested that "just to be safe you had better just say 75."

While the Premier's own staff has increased by about 100 per cent since he took office a year ago, there is a freeze on hiring in the civil service. The provincial Treasurer announced in his budget last year that the civil service would be permitted an overall increase of only 1.6 per cent in the fiscal year ended this past month. Many departments were permitted no increase in staff the past year, and the Treasurer has continued this freeze in his 1972 budget. There are also indications that we may see even tighter controls on hiring within the civil service, with the phasing out of several programmes and the use of employees in these areas to fill vacancies in other departments.

One of the latest additions to the Premier's staff is G. Campbell McDonald of London, who is paid $36,000 plus living expenses—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's $26,000.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is correct. He is paid $26,000 plus living allowance to act as the Premier's communications co-ordinator.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): How much is the living allowance?

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, he hasn't been living here very long, so we don't know.

Mr. McDonald, who was director of information at the University of Western Ontario, an alma mater which both the Treasurer and I happen to share, has worked in radio and as communications co-ordinator of national political conventions. He arrived complete with his own secretary and, of course, perhaps by now he may have another one—who knows?

One of his first plans is to install a national news service receiver at a monthly cost of about $400. This way, Mr. McDonald said in an interview, he will be able to keep the Premier and his cabinet "in instant touch with the news."

While the Premier is putting more money and manpower into communications within and between his office and those of other government departments, other areas have been ordered to cut back their spending on information services. All but one department, Tourism and Information, have been ordered to slash their publication budgets by 50 per cent this year.

To balance all this we have such things, in the Treasurer's need for increased revenues, as the announcement that admission prices would be raised at Ontario Place. This government showplace on the waterfront went $2.2 million into debt last year in its first year of operation.

Mr. Speaker, the 50 per cent cutback on publications is part of the government's total re-examination of the communications system at Queen's Park. The Queen's Printer and Publisher, government films, the government telephone switchboard and information services in general are part of the present ongoing and costly study by the Committee on Government Productivity — COGP — whose recommendations on the reorganization of government were implemented in large measure by the Premier.

In its fourth interim report the COGP indicated it wasn't very happy with what it had found out so far about government information services. Co-ordination and co-operation between departments have been lacking and I quote. "Under the present system of budget allocation it is difficult to

determine the full cost of government information activity or its relative effectiveness," the committee reported.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated the only department exempt from the 50 per cent cutback in publications is Tourism and Information, and this, of course, is now in the process of being combined with Trade and Development to establish the new department of Trade and Industry. In the fiscal year ending March 31, the department had a total promotional budget of $3.5 million, most of which was spent on films and television advertising.

While the main thrust in communications is now within the Premier's office, and between that office and other departments, an effort is being made to communicate better with the public, but that effort which began last November hasn't yet got off the ground. A former Toronto Telegram executive editor, Andrew MacFarlane, was hired by the Premier's office to head a citizen's advisory bureau and information service, but Mr. MacFarlane admits that after four months of study he is still in the stage of deciding how the bureau should function and when it can open.

The government admits that it is not communicating well enough with the public. The province has studied the advisability of a citizen's information bureau since 1964, but until last October it made no move to set one up.

Mr. MacFarlane says the purpose of the bureau is to advise inquirers to which department they should direct their problems. Mr. MacFarlane stated in January that he hoped to have the bureau in operation some time this month. Last week he admitted that he honestly didn't know when his staff could go into business.

The citizen's advisory bureau and information service, it seems, is caught up with government red tape itself, waiting for the go-ahead from the powers within the Premier's ever-growing inner group. While we have watched the office of the Premier expand in its activities and expense, it is also of some note to see how the government members have increased their share of sources of revenue. Of course, the leader of all this is the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root). To use an example which he would understand, he must be seen by the people of Ontario to have both front feet in the public trough.

You may not be aware, Mr. Speaker, but the information I have is that the hon. member, in addition to his seasonal indemnity of $18,000, may draw this year perhaps a sum close to $36,442 which the chairman of the OWRC received last year. Just to make sure that he doesn't go short on his income, his expenses on the job will be added to that figure.

If such is the case, I think that this figure alone, which is almost $20,000 more than the Premier himself would receive, is little less than astounding. No wonder the member for Wellington-Dufferin is always such a smiling and affable man. He has much to smile about.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Yet he falls asleep half the time up there.

Mr. Breithaupt: In addition, the other leading backbench lights who receive additional government revenues are the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), who picks up an extra $5,000 as chairman of the Niagara Parks Commission, and the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), who acquires $7,000 as a member of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. Outdoing these two is the member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) who acquires an extra $10,000 as the vice-chairman for Ontario Hydro.

The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) receives an additional $6,000 as a commissioner with the Ontario Hospital Services Commission and the member for Hastings (Mr. Rollins) gets $5,000 as chairman of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

There are many others, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the members of the cabinet and the parliamentary assistants, who receive additional funds from the public purse. In order to benefit the members of the House I am having attached to my comments on this budget what I shall call budget paper "A"—a list as complete as I am able to furnish it, of all the additional benefits which all of the government members receive.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): It will be nice to have a list like that.

Mr. Breithaupt: Of course, Mr. Speaker, there are benefits which some of the government members receive because of their continuing involvement with municipal government. For example, the best known member in this field who is serving as the newly elected member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) who continues as a controller of the city of Ottawa. He is the gentleman who had a few thousand visitors on his front lawn yesterday, I understand.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He is acting mayor.

Mr. Roy: Lots of signs, my good man.

An hon. member: I hear there was a burning.

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes, burning an effigy, I am told. The member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) continues as an appointed member of the Scarborough health board, and the member for Wentworth North (Mr. Ewen) continues as a member of the Ancaster school board. The member for Timiskaming (Mr. Hawrot) serves as the reeve of the township of Teck, and the member for York West (Mr. MacBeth) continues as a member of the Etobicoke Hydro Commission. The member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. Nuttall) serves as the warden of his county and the reeve of Pittsburgh township, and the member for Don Mills (Mr. Timbrell) continues as an alderman on the North York council.

Then we get to the well-publicized and advertised member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott). I'm told that he continues as a member of his city council, as a member of the board of education, the industrial commission, the traffic commission and a member of the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority.

In spite of the additional press which we have seen concerning the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mr. Wardle) he appears able to continue to serve as an alderman for ward nine in the city of Toronto and, of course, is also on the Metro Toronto Legislation and Planning Commission.

There may be others who are involved in this sort of additional benefit and commitment, but we have not been able to ferret them all out.

We on this side of the House certainly hope that the implementation of legislation promised by this government is quickly brought to pass to make it impossible for members of this Legislature to serve on other elected or appointed bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I have referred on several occasions to some of the savings which I believe could be implemented through a proper view of government expenditures and staff. The most obvious example, of course, has been the Premier's office. But there are other examples where savings have supposedly been attempted without particular success.

In a conversation with an official of the residential section of the municipal assessment office in the Department of Municipal Affairs, the opposition office was informed that as of Friday, March 24, some 150 municipal assessors were to have their employment terminated. The verbal announcement of this decision was communicated by Mr. A. D. Phillips, who is the valuation manager of the commercial section, and Mr. P. Rivers, who is the valuation manager of the residential section. Two days before the termination date the announcement was made to those staff members concerned.

The 150 individuals concerned had been hired as casual employees by renewable written contract which provided for termination of employment with reasonable written notice, and we find that this layoff comes at a point in time at which 65 per cent of the assessment project has yet to be completed. Some of the individuals in this group have been with the department on a casual basis for periods ranging from one to two years. We presume that the real reason for the termination of this area was in order to provide summer jobs for students as part of the proposed Summer '72 project.

However, in the interval between employment termination and the availability of students for employment the assessment projects already underway will, of course, have to be suspended. It will be worthwhile to hear eventually from the Treasurer as to his views as to the reasons for this kind of upset within a provincial government department.

There are other projects which we believe are wasting the funds of the taxpayers of Ontario. In May, 1971, Heritage Ontario was created, and this we presume will be defunct as of June 5 of this year. It is a one-year project to co-ordinate and sponsor a three-day conference. This conference will be held on June 2, 3 and 4 at the Skyline Hotel in Toronto and has the virtue of bringing together various ethnic groups in Ontario for the first time.

Of course it will be presided over by the Solicitor General-designate (Mr. Yaremko). His sole function in the cabinet appears to be to take a patronizing approach to the various ethnic minority groups within our province to make sure that they are well fed and well entertained. As a member of one of those groups I must say that I resent this kind of attitude on the part of a government which I believe pays only lip service to the fine cultural traditions which can be brought into our Ontario scene.

In any event, I cannot see how a secretariat of three clerical and three administrative

staff can work for an entire year on a full-time basis in order to set up a three-day conference. In addition, an advisory committee is even available and staff members from three branches of the government are lending their assistance to that project.

Mr. Speaker, the Treasurer's mind seems to be filled with a grab-bag of unmatured economic policies, some of which date from periods older than his years. On page 31 he begins his reference to certain problems with respect to the labour market when he says:

> Members will recall that when governments were hit by the tidal wave of the postwar baby boom they were obliged to step up dramatically their capital investment in education facilities. Now these young people need jobs and housing. It is absolutely essential, therefore, that fiscal and monetary policies recognize this demographic and economic fact. Over the next several years government policies should be geared to stimulate investment and consumption in the private sector. Only in this way can we create the jobs necessary to absorb the rapid expansion in our labour force.

It is extraordinary that the Treasury has taken 27 years to recognize that its planning and co-ordination of provincial government fiscal policies have been obsolete. What a confession that in their concepts they have not met the needs of an increasingly growing population and expanding labour force.

It would appear inescapable that the Davis government—and in particular the present Treasurer has only this year, by his own admission—recognized that government economic planning is 27 years out of date.

How can the provincial Treasurer and the government of this province justify the erosion of job opportunities for the people of this province? How does the government plan to acocunt for their criminally obsolete economic policies that have failed totally to meet the ever-increasing expansion of the labour force in this province? It is small wonder that the young people place no credence at all in the policies of this government.

Not only has the government failed to keep current its economic and planning priorities, but its policies have thus far failed to provide any modicum of incentive for the young people. There are few jobs available in the private sector. And it would seem, according to the constraints placed on job creation in the public sector—according to the current budget—that employment opportunities will not be forthcoming. Where are these people, and in particular the young people, expected to find employment in this province of opportunity? Midway through his budget presentation, the Treasurer stated as follows and I quote:

> The step-up in expenditure levels achieved in 1971-1972 amounted to half the growth in expenditures that otherwise would have occurred in 1972-1973. Thus, in this budget, we are moving back on the expenditure side while maintaining an expansionary overall fiscal thrust.

As a result of this latest incoherent and frantic outpouring from the Davis government, it would appear that the people of this province can look forward to a hasty retreat from progress in the field of economic and fiscal planning and priorities.

A key word found throughout the current budget is the word "back." We are moving "back" to planning and priority concepts. We are even "returning to normalcy" in the field of economic planning. It is a very telling indictment of this government that in explaining their plans for the province, they would use a phrase utilized by President Warren Harding of the United States in 1920.

Perhaps it is fair to conclude that the present government of this province has found the economic policies of the Harding regime adequate and applicable to the needs of the Ontario economy in the present day. Perhaps this government in its own inimitable and cynical way even finds these policies attractive.

The Treasurer has attempted to make much of the cutting of government costs and expansion. In spite of his deficit of $600 million, it has been apparent to those of us that have looked into the estimates for the coming year that there are certain specific areas which are expanding beyond all rhyme or reason.

Of course, the most important example and the most flagrant situation is the tremendous increase in staff in the Premier's office. I have referred to this, and of course it has been documented in various press comments within the last week. I think it is enough to point out the estimates of the Premier's department for the coming year, which we see will move from last year's figure of $418,000 to this year's figure of $975,000.

An hon. member: That is efficiency?

Mr. Breithaupt: More than 100 per cent increase in order to prop up the flagging

image of the member for Peel North. And how does this compare with the decision of the Department of Public Works to lay off 70 employees locally, some with as many as 25 years' service?

Mr. Roy: Why didn't they take them in the Premier's office?

Mr. Breithaupt: The member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) has commented on this in the House and I believe it is worthy to repeat some of the facts of the situation.

These employees were hired as casual staff and as such were being paid union rates of pay. In order that the department could cut costs, it was decided that these employees be reclassified and hired as permanent staff. This change of employment status would necessarily involve a reduced salary scale.

The government has encouraged these employees over the years to establish certain standards of living; some of them for as much as two decades. Now it requires that they take a substantial salary cut under the new status as permanent employees, thus reducing their living standards. They quite properly rejected this cynical government manoeuvre and have in the process suffered the consequence of losing their jobs.

How can this government claim that it is setting policies for people and that it is stimulating economic growth by creating new job programmes? How do they explain this abusive and arrogant treatment of long-term employees from within the public sector?

As we approach the necessity of raising revenues within the province, it is only natural that we must stand up and admit the sorts of things we would do if given the responsibility of government.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to review just two particular areas in order to show the sort of programme which the Liberal Party would put into effect, and the sort of savings and intelligence we would use if it were our responsibility to raise the revenues necessary for running the Province of Ontario.

One quick example that comes to mind is the operation of training schools by the provincial authorities. We note in the budget on page 45:

> The Ministry of Correctional Services will commence operation of the Oakville Reception Centre which will provide a highly advanced system of guidance of juvenile offenders.

Training schools are presently under the jurisdiction of the Department of Correctional Services. Young people age 16 and under are sent to a training school by a provincial court order. Under the Canada Assistance Plan, training schools would be eligible for federal aid if they were switched to the Department of Community and Social Services.

The first stage of rehabilitation takes place when the juvenile is in residence at the training school. The next stage, of course, is placement in the community. Aftercare officers enlist community resources to assist and support the student in his adjustment back into the community. On March 31, 1970, there were some 1,404 young people in residence at various training schools and there were 2,550 on placement.

In the estimates for 1972-1973, some $20,447,000 was allocated for the rehabilitation of juveniles. In other words, the government of Ontario could have saved half that sum by taking training schools out of the Department of Correctional Services and placing them in the Department of Community and Social Services.

Another point is that juveniles age 16 and under should not be considered criminals like the older offenders handled by the Department of Correctional Services. It would seem logical that these young people be handled instead by a welfare department. The provinces of Manitoba and Alberta have already switched their training schools to take advantage of the Canada Assistance Plan. We do not know why the Province of Ontario has not done the same thing, not only for the saving of funds but also to better deal with young people who need the help which this government should be giving them.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breithaupt: A secondary area with which we are involved is of course that of the continuation of grade 13 within the Ontario secondary school system. This party has gone on record, and remains of the opinion, that we must phase out as soon as practicable the operation of grade 13 within the Province of Ontario. As we look over the administrative costs of the various county boards of education, it is apparent that substantial savings could be made with no loss in the educational standard within our province. We have estimated that a possible saving of some $50 million could accrue to benefit the people of Ontario if we moved

to change our secondary educational structure in order to eliminate the unnecessary grade 13 situation within Ontario. Not only would we accelerate the students whose ability to comprehend is much greater now than it was 20 years ago, we would also avoid the continuing high costs of the educational structure catering to that grade.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, from the comments made in this House last Thursday, the Leader of the Opposition and the members of this party have strenuously opposed the increased tuition costs which have been levied on the students of this province.

The provincial Treasurer on page 45 of his budget said:

> The total programme for the summer of 1972 will provide employment for 18,500 students at a cost of over $21 million.

There are some 180,000 full-time post-secondary students in Ontario and 100,000 part-time students, for a total of 280,000 post-secondary students in the province. The government of Ontario was providing employment for 18,500 students or 6.6 per cent of the total number. Students obviously seek summer employment to help finance their education. The government of Ontario is spending $21 million on summer employment for students, but is expecting to raise $23 million from increased tuition fees. They are taking away more than they are giving.

Another point worth mentioning is that the government is employing only 6.6 per cent of students, but penalizing 100 per cent of students with higher fees.

Student unemployment is a very serious problem. With decreased grants and increased fees what are students expected to do to raise the money for a post-secondary education? This is probably the most tragic example that we can cite in the budget of the arrogance that has been shown by this cabinet and all the other members of the Conservative hierarchy within this province as they have trampled on the hopes of many students and of their parents who want a better standard of living for their children through the benefits which higher education can bring.

It is of exceptional interest to note the comments made by the Treasurer with respect to the costs of education. On page 46, he says:

> Costs have been controlled and the education mill rate has been reduced in many municipalities. Moreover, this has been achieved with positively no reduction in the quality of education in Ontario."

If costs have been controlled with no reduction in the quality of education, what was happening previously? Did the member for Peel North, as Minister of Education, squander money unnecessarily to achieve a standard of education that could have been achieved at a significantly lower cost?

Not only does the Treasurer chastise the former Minister of Education, he is also apparently prepared to take a round or two out of his good friend, the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton) of this province. On page 38 he attempts a few backhanded compliments to the new Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, but he also refers to "the strictest constraints ever imposed on provincial spending."

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): They were pretty sloppy back in Charlie's days.

Mr. Breithaupt: It would appear that only he has been able to overcome many of the laxities of the present Premier when he was Minister of Education.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board). That is what the member said before. He is consistent this time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer agrees with me.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They both go through the motions anyway.

Mr. Breithaupt: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I say, it would appear that only he is able to overcome the laxities, if they existed, of the present Premier when he was Minister of Education. It would appear that only he is able to overcome the weakness of the former Treasurer of Ontario, who perhaps was spending too much time sitting white-lipped and trembling in the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They'll have to watch that Management Board.

Mr. Breithaupt: He seemed to be unable to keep constraints on provincial spending—at least, the constraints—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I recall the Leader of the Opposition got red-faced and purple—almost apoplectic.

Mr. Breithaupt: At least, the constraints the present Treasurer sees as necessities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We will back up the Treasurer.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, the changes in the tuition costs are one of the greatest and most dismaying of the actions the provincial Treasurer has taken in this budget.

In British Columbia there have been no increases in fees for post-secondary education for the past three years. In Saskatchewan the last increase was $40 for technical institutions in 1969. Manitoba has had no increases in the past three years; Quebec has had no increases. And community colleges there, indeed Mr. Speaker, are free. They are not subject to the cost of $250, as they will now be in Ontario.

In the Maritime provinces, governments are either not involved in tuition costs or they have not chosen to increase them, except for the situation in New Brunswick where teachers' college tuition fees have been imposed.

Is this then to be another example of where Ontario leads the way? The government members, especially those newly elected members, are being called upon to follow that slogan, "Good government deserves your support." This is clearly not good government and this particular item does not deserve the support of any of the hon. members of this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Breithaupt: On page 47 of his budget address, the Treasurer said: "The students who benefit directly should bear a large part of the cost of their post-secondary education."

Well Mr. Speaker, here is a breakdown of how some of these costs will affect students: at Ryerson, from $260 to $350; in the community colleges, up to $250; in the nursing diploma schools, increased to $250; teachers' colleges—not affiliated with universities—formerly no charge and now up to $585; agricultural schools, from $100 up to $150; nursing assistants' schools, from no charge to $150; and of course at the university level, tuition fees are going up by $100.

The Wright report recommended the increase of tuition fees, but along with that it suggested an expanded programme of grants to students from lower-income families and loans open to all students.

Well the government implemented one of Dr. Wright's recommendations—that is they raised the tuition fees—but they did nothing to facilitate the payment of those fees. As a matter of fact, they made it more difficult for students by decreasing the grant and award portions to students from $51 million last year to $34 million this year.

Another thing they did was to raise the ceiling on loans from $600 to $800.

In other words, previously if the student needed $1,000 for his education costs, he was required to repay only $600 and $400 was a grant. Now he will have to repay $800 and will receive only $200 as a grant. This will surely keep students from low-income families out of university and increase the difficulties for students from middle-income families.

Mr. Speaker, all students can't find summer jobs. Tuition fees have gone up; loan ceilings have gone up; grants have decreased. You can be certain students will not take this situation lightly. The situation as it existed in Ottawa yesterday is proof of this, and I am sure we will have students visiting this building in a very short time.

The Hall-Dennis report on education and the Wright report both recommended the elimination of Grade 13. In 1970 there were 51,665 grade 13 students in Ontario. The cost of educating one student per year is $1,251. If we multiply the number of grade 13 students by that cost we get the figure $64,632,915. I believe it would be incorrect, of course, to say the province would save this entire amount by eliminating grade 13 because such things as administrative costs would still be incurred by the other grades. But certainly Ontario would save a great deal of money.

In my earlier remarks I had suggested, Mr. Speaker, that we could save approximately $50 million on the costs which are now being assumed by the people of the Province of Ontario for the operation of grade 13. I believe those remarks are correct from the calculations which I have just given you.

In the February 16 edition of the Globe and Mail, Kenneth Bagnell wrote an article comparing the Wright report on post-secondary education in Ontario to the American report on higher education. There are many similarities in the two reports, but one major difference. The Wright report cost $1.37 million while the American report cost $35,000. Another detail worth mentioning is the American study cost the taxpayer nothing as it was financed by the Ford Foundation.

Many of the ideas discussed in these two reports are the same. For example, both reports discussed the lowering of credential barriers by giving credit for off-campus experience and establishing equivalency exams. They both see making a conscious effect to

get rid of the barriers that block the progress of women in the educational system. They both envision the creation of a regional university which would provide, via television, educational services at the post-secondary level. They both seek to make the universities and colleges educational institutions for all ages.

Another point worth mentioning Mr. Speaker, is that the Wright report was only a provincial report while the American report was a national one. Remember that it was produced at 2.55 per cent of the cost of the Ontario report!

In the words of Mr. Bagnell, and I quote:

> And on and on. I don't claim the commission has leaned too heavily on the American study. After all, there are only so many novel ideas; but since the Ontario report is to stimulate public discussion why didn't we just pass the American study around, saving $1.37 million?

In the words there, of Mr. Bagnell, I think we would have found a saving of Ontario money!

I echo the remarks that Mr. Bagnell has made in this article. Here is another example of the kinds of savings that could occur to the people of the Province of Ontario if efficiency in government was sought more than headlines.

Much of the routine work has been done time and time again by persons in other jurisdictions. It is not necessary for someone like the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) to visit Australia in order to know what the benefits of offtrack betting might be. It is not necessary for the Wright commission to have completed its report at such an exceptional cost in order for us to know what savings could exist. It is not necessary for the government to waste funds of the Province of Ontario in examples such as these, and in the many other inefficiencies that come to light from time to time, for us to know that this government, in spite of its public relations image, has in effect lost control of Ontario.

On page 28 of his budget, the Treasurer states: "I do not expect a quick end to the problem of unemployment." It is certainly our opinion that the budget he has brought down will do nothing to upset his expectations.

In 1970 the number of unemployed increased by 39,000 in Ontario. This caused a sharp rise in the percentage rate of unemployment from the average 1969 level of 3.1 per cent to that of 4.3 per cent average in that year, 1970. The Treasurer predicted in his presentation of the 1971 budget that in order to bring the percentage rate of unemployment to the level of three per cent, which is the definition of full employment for the Davis government, 150,000 new jobs would have to be created. In his presentation of the 1971 budget, he boasted:

> The 1971-1972 Ontario budget is designed to provide maximum stimulus to the economy and to move unemployment down toward the three per cent level by early 1972. However, its full impact will be determined by the degree to which federal policies create a favourable financial environment and encourage a reduction in the external value of the Canadian dollar.

The Canadian dollar has been stabilized by the decisive actions taken by the federal government in relation to international markets and rates of exchange.

However, the member for Chatham-Kent still finds cause to wail and bemoan his government's inability to plan and co-ordinate the Ontario economy in his budget this year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is stable at a somewhat higher rate than one would hope, I hope the member will agree?

Mr. Breithaupt: I would agree, somewhat higher than one would have hoped!

He complains that we cannot expect a quick end to unemployment, and I agree with him on that point. It does seem likely to persist, but if the Ontario government persists in its imposition of fiscal nightmares on the taxpayers of Ontario, the Treasurer has every reason to see no end in sight to the problem of unemployment.

Still we labour under the unbelievably inaccurate and unrealistic predictions that pour forth. Having claimed to be setting up fiscal mechanisms for growth and expansion in Ontario's economy throughout the 1971 budget, he has reported to this Legislature in a rather blatant display of unrepentance that the level of unemployment in Ontario in October-November, 1971 reached 5.6 per cent.

The yearly average level of unemployment for all of 1971 was 5.2 per cent. And we are informed, Mr. Speaker, that the present level of unemployment stands at about 4.5 per cent seasonally adjusted. Continuing on in the patter of seemingly erroneous predictions and poor judgment, we received the forceful

assertion that the average level of unemployment for 1972 should reach 4.8 per cent. Pouring more unctuous oil on the wounds of our provincial economy, we have asserted to us unequivocally that experience of the past shows that we can realistically expect month by month fluctuations around the basic employment trend.

How much longer can this Legislature and the people of Ontario suffer these outpourings by a government obviously ill-equipped to handle the economic affairs of its citizenry? Can the people of this province afford the spiralling costs accrued from mismanagement, from ill-conceived planning and priority setting, and from the erroneous judgement of this government? I think not!

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Or a laissez faire mentality. Which, by the way, the member's party shares.

Mr. Breithaupt: Is the Treasurer prepared, on behalf of the government, to accept the seasonal trends and the percentage rate of unemployment in Ontario without making any attempt or giving any commitment to alter them favourably? He seems content to confidently predict that through 1972 the current levels of unemployment in the province will, on the average, rise appreciably to a level higher than the present rate.

If the provincial secretaries are supposed to spend their time thinking, as the Provincial Secretary for Justice informed us, then just what does the Treasurer do with his time? He seems to be too busy running his three-ring circus of departments to do more than present an image of reaction in place of any attempt at action.

It may be, with his attitude toward the economy of this province and his apparent lack of knowledge of the basic principles of economics, that he may already have gone too far in setting the forces of mismanagement of our economy in motion. He continues to fiddle with minor taxes while the people of Ontario burn with resentment.

In his pretence at worshipping at the shrine of free enterprise, the Treasurer is too busy taking up grateful collections from his adherents to realize that they are worshipping a god who is 30 years out of date. His actions belie his own words, and those who welcome him or his minions into their corporate boardrooms in order to provide the necessary funds to oil the Conservative election machinery might ponder some of the actions that stand out in greater depth than the words of the Treasurer.

On page 30 the Treasurer states:

> The private sector is still the dominant part of our economy and I believe it now has to take up the considerable expansionary momentum we have provided and carry it forward.

This government, Mr. Speaker, talks about the continuing role of the private sector—

Mr. Lawlor: Suppose it doesn't?

Mr. Breithaupt: —but at the same time it introduces legislation that prevents the private sector from operating in the nursing home business. Under the new regulations of the Nursing Homes Act, nursing homes can charge only $12.50 per diem. Furthermore, they must provide wards for their patients.

There are, Mr. Speaker, several luxury nursing homes that may be closed down as a result of the new regulations. One example that was mentioned in the question period today was that of Highbourne Lodge in Etobicoke. It is, I am told, a $3 million nursing home that was opened only last October. It has only private and semi-private rooms. Its 240 beds are filled and there is a great demand for beds in that home. The home charges $15.50 a day and will stand to lose $720 per day under the new regulation.

Well one of two things will happen. Either the government will allow the home to continue its operation until it goes bankrupt, or the government will take its licence away for failing to provide the necessary wards.

If Highbourne Lodge is closed, 240 patients will have to find new nursing homes. One man involved has called a dozen nursing homes, all of which have refused to accept new patients. If the government is so interested in encouraging the private sector, why are luxury nursing homes not allowed to operate? If patients are willing to pay the extra cost, why are the new regulations set not to allow them to do so?

This, surely, is not free enterprise!

The government has imposed a freeze on licences to new nursing homes. According to the Toronto Star:

> Some Health Department officials also admitted, however, that the freeze was a deliberate attempt to limit the number of homes and allow the department to stay within its budget for nursing home coverage during the first year of the plan.

Mr. Lawlor: It could undermine the whole system, however!

Mr. Breithaupt: Is this another example of encouraging the private sector?

In the past 20 years we have seen a great shift of provincial government expenditures as a percentage of the gross provincial product. In 1950, 3.5 per cent; in 1960, 5.4 per cent; in 1965, 5.9 per cent; in 1970, 9.3 per cent; in 1972, 12.1 per cent.

At these rates of increase the private sector will not be the dominant part of our economy for very long. The nursing homes are being swallowed up by the government. There is a freeze on construction.

Mr. Lawlor: It will not be, anyway.

Mr. Breithaupt: The operators are told what to charge, how many beds they can have and that they must have wards. Not only does the operation become less efficient when government takes over, it also becomes less personal. And this from a government that hyporcritically praises the supposed virtues of unrestricted free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, since the Treasurer has made so much of the increase in admission cost to Ontario Place, I think it would be worthwhile just to review briefly the various items concerning this situation that are recorded in Hansard. As you will recall, the original estimated cost was $13 million, and this was raised in a later estimate to $19 million. The actual amount that was spent on this white elephant on stilts, we are told, was $28.7 million. The total capital cost was $24,157,000; and the non-recurring costs, which included Cinesphere films, exhibits, startup and promotion, were $4,584,000. Surely one of the more costly erections in the history of the province!

The actual loss last year was $2.2 million, almost a dollar per head for each of the 2,316,000 visitors. Now the estimated loss for this year is from $275,000 to $650,000, even including a 50 per cent increase in admission rates. A full-time manager is to be hired at $25,000 per year and an additional $1.9 million has been spent on improvements, including a $700,000 playground for children. There are, of course—

An hon. member: Must be a couple of sandboxes, I suppose.

Mr. Breithaupt: —other expenditures planned this year. Additional site services such as washrooms at $350,000, other buildings at $270,000 and parking at $110,000, are all to be added on. Modification to the existing facilities, which are only one year old, is rated at $120,000. Landscaping is at $200,000, and new exhibits and films at $150,000.

It is rather sad to watch the Minister of Trade and Industry (Mr. White) blaming losses on the newness of the project and the fact that costs were not rigidly controlled. But then to have the officials in charge of the project blaming losses on the fact that pensioners were admitted free, together with children under six years of age, brought it all from the realm of the sacred—at which level I am sure the cabinet wanted it to remain—down to the profane.

The Minister of Trade and Industry estimates that Ontario Place will break even on its operation by 1975. I am sure that this proposal already is being written into an election manifesto for that year.

Mr. Speaker, we can expect, of course, that attendance will drop as the prices of admissions are raised. The government admits that the former figure of 2,316,000 will fall to 2.1 million. Adult admissions are up 50 per cent as we all know, as are student admissions.

Ontario Place was to have been a lasting monument to such as Stanley Randall, who foresaw the growth of the city of Toronto, as more and more of the harbour area was encroached and built upon. Ontario Place was to have promoted development in the waterfront area and its whole focal point, as I recall, was to cause the people of this city to look to the waterfront as a future source of pleasure and economic development.

However, this has not occured. We have, once again, a situation where government by headline has fallen to the advancing problems of economics. Harbour City is no more; those plans have been quietly scrapped, in a great difference of approach from the manner in which they were trumpeted at the beginning.

Not only does Ontario Place stand there forlorn and lonely for most of the year, but we even now have a proposal to shut down the government of Ontario pavilion at the CNE because of a possible conflict of interest with this new location. Of course, Mr. Speaker, there will be much backing and filling as various minor amendments are made in order to stimulate people to attend Ontario Place, but in the long term we once again see the results of government actions which are much different from the public relations blurbs thrown out to lull the citizens of this province into some belief that they are being well governed.

In addition, of course, the Ontario Science Centre has seen its rate of admission for adults raised by 50 per cent, and we have increases in provincial park fees; all of which have been documented in recent press articles.

According to the Treasurer, the increases will bring changes which will result in the charges being closer to the cost of providing the services to which they relate. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the increased rates at the Science Centre and at Ontario Place and in provincial park fees all indicate the determination of this government to make leisure time and recreational facilities accessible only to the privileged few.

What kind of government would claim to be providing goods and services for people and at the same time remove these facilities from within the easy reach of the majority of Ontario's people? I believe this is a deplorable philosophy of government action. How can this government think for one moment that it is sensitive to and representative of the needs of the people of this province?

In its misguided approach to some of the more despicable tenets of free enterprise, why must this government give greater emphasis and priority to the profit return from these facilities than to the enjoyment of the average citizen? How is it that this government, which claims to be interested in people beyond all else, can in such a cavalier manner force increased costs and burdens on the average citizen as all of his recreational and enjoyment facilities within this province become more and more expensive?

It is sad to watch the increased tax burden on the average citizen being balanced by the favours given to industry, finance and the other corporate giants within the province. The minister has made some minor changes in paid-up capital tax, and he has abolished the minor irritant of the logging tax and the fire marshal's tax; but, Mr. Speaker, these items are the only ones which will affect corporations. Even when the Treasurer warns us of the belt-tightening we are to expect and warns us of the expansion of services which must be curtailed, he is able to find a few small cases of tax relief for his friends in industry.

When the Treasurer wants to introduce a tough budget it seems that the best he can do is to ignore the industrial sources which are available to the citizens of this province. Who are the people who have to pay the price for the lack of economic policies of this government? They are certainly not those who will be visited by William Kelly as he searches for Tory funds all the year round.

He was, we are told, the least visible of the backroom boys; but the lengthy article which exposed his machinations in the Globe and Mail on March 27th at last sets out this man and the cynical government he serves. And while he is quoted as saying, "Mr. Davis needs the advice of many, many people, individuals and corporations," I think what he really meant is that the Premer needs the money of many, many people, individuals and corporations.

Mr. Speaker, when you are organizing the Province of Ontario on the basis of robbing Peter to pay Paul, we can at least see that you are able to achieve one thing, and that is the loyalty of Paul. The provincial Treasurer has chosen to ensure that the loud hosannas sung in the boardrooms of this province will reflect themselves in increased financial contributions to the Conservative Party. In his cynicism he completely rejects the approaches which were so well publicized in the 1971 election by which the citizens of Ontario were encouraged to believe that people came first. Now they are well aware that the kind of people who come first are those who have the Treasurer's ear and those who will be contributing financially to the Conservative Party.

The Globe and Mail has well documented, in a series of recent editorials, the benefits which are going to be accruing to the wealthier classes of this province. On March 29 its editorial was headed: "Check Your Avoidables"; on March 30 it was headed: "The Middle Gets It Again." On March 31 it says: "Silent Partner in the Budget," and refers to the benefits which have been given out to the brewers, distillers and vintners in this province, all of whom we imagine will be assiduously canvassed by Mr. Kelly as he seeks more party funds.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Year by year!

Mr. Breithaupt: There are several parts of these editorials which I believe to be worthy of repetition. They should be included in the permanent record of this Legislature, especially so that the average citizens of the province are reminded once again as to the priorities which the Treasurer has set. In that editorial, "Check Your Avoidables," we have the following:

> Those who thought they heard the government promising no tax increases during the election will be discomfited. Those who knew that Premier William Davis promised

an end to the Spadina Expressway and aid for Spadina rapid transit will wonder at the modesty of $12 million in grants to municipalities for public transit systems, even though the amount will be double that of last year.

In the editorial, "The Middle Gets It Again," we find the following:

It is also disconcerting that while his budget helps the poor man with one hand it hurts him with the other. Was it really necessary to tax draught beer? Was it really necessary to shove up the cost of a marriage licence? Was it really necessary to charge families another $1 per day to camp in provincial parks while hotel rooms suffered no increase in tax. And why that hiatus until April 17 before liquor taxes rise? Only the rich can afford to stock up.

Mr. McKeough's budget will do nothing that the really well-to-do will even notice. It leaves corporations untouched, and particularly it leaves untouched the non-renewable resource industries, which ought to carry at least as much of the tax burden as secondary industry, which provides far more jobs.

And why, when he was trying to discourage the use of cars on almost every other front, did Mr. McKeough not require municipalities to apply realistic taxes to parking lots, especially in the large urban centres where they are often used by land speculators to evade taxation. [Further, the editorial adds:] we need entrepreneurs to create jobs. These are seldom the sons of the rich, but the ambitious climbers from the middle classes. What Queen's Park and Ottawa are establishing is a climate of disincentive in which the climbers will go south to climb.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, instead of encouraging by intelligent tax policies, the kinds of persons who should be involved in the future development of our province, the Treasurer prefers to tax the poor and allow the rich to continue their present avoidance, as well as carrying a lesser burden than is their fair share.

Perhaps one of the most telling editorial comments is that of March 31 in the Globe and Mail which was headed: "Silent Partner in the Budget." We heard some of the comments made about that today in the question period. As the Treasurer moved to increase the cost of alcoholic beverages, it was presumed that the prices of spirits would be increased in order to provide additional revenue. But that is not fully the case.

From the increase in the price of beer the province will receive $28 million while brewers will receive $11 million. From the increase in the price of liquor the province will receive $8 million and the distillers $6 million. From the increase in the price of wine the province will receive $2.3 million and the vintners $1.5 million.

Then comes perhaps the most damning comment of all:

What makes it plain that deception was intended is that from all the price increases the federal government will also receive $2.2 million in increased excise tax. Only to protect its trade friends would the Conservative Ontario government have neglected to mention that $2.2 million was really going into Liberal federal pockets.

The government has truly concealed the price increases within the tax increase. Once again the cry will go up: "Has anybody here seen Kelly?" Mr. Kelly will appear on the scene—

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The "big blue machine."

Mr. Breithaupt: —to visit the boardrooms of the distillers and the brewers and the vintners in order to arrange a little additional financing for the party.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just like passing the hat after the medicine man finishes.

Mr. Breithaupt: Let us make it clear that there are no examples of which we are aware that these various parties are in dire need of any increased profits. The amount of their profits has all been spelled out in their annual reports, each of which seems to be better and happier than the next.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the saddest results of this whole budget is that it makes a shambles of the comments made by the newly elected member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Drea) in his contribution to the Throne debate on March 9. He was reported in Hansard to have said as follows:

We are either going to have a government for people or we are going to have a government for programmes, and there is a mile of difference between the two. I think it is extremely significant that not only were the first words uttered after the mandate of Oct. 21 on behalf of people, but those very words were echoed over and over again in the Speech from the Throne delivered by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor. If there is anything certain in the Speech from the Throne, it is that we have embarked upon a course that is for the benefit of the people and not for that awesome thing mentioned so often by the academics, the pundits and the others—programmes.

It is sad to see those words come back to haunt the member for Scarborough Centre. It is the average person to whom he is referring who is going to have to pay the increased burden costs which are being imposed upon the citizens of Ontario by the present government. He may now view the Speech from the Throne as being of somewhat less significance than he thought in the first place.

There was one more rather telling point he made when he suggested to the members of this House that one cannot buy liquor on credit. He has now found out that you can tax liquor on credit and call in your credits from the people who are benefiting when the next election comes around.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. Roy: How much does he get for the "big blue machine"?

Mr. F. Drea (Scarborough Centre): Does the member want to sell it on credit?

An hon. member: Quit drinking!

Mr. Breithaupt: And what about the average man for whom the member for Scarborough Centre and the other Conservative backbenchers express so much interest?

Let's take an example of our average Ontario citizen. He lives in Oakville and has two children, one of whom is at the University of Toronto and is living at home. He works in Toronto and uses GO Transit, and his wife's family lives in Hamilton. Our average citizen drives a six-cylinder car and puts about 12,000 miles on it each year—fortunately getting about 20 miles to the gallon. He smokes a pack of 20 cigarettes per day and consumes three bottles of liquor and a case of beer each month.

His pleasures are simple: The family like to go to Ontario Place on occasion and they take a camper to the provincial park about five times per year. They visit his wife's family in Hamilton about once per month and use the Burlington Skyway.

How will the tax burden on this average man now be increased?

Well Mr. Speaker, first of all his son's tuition has gone up $100 this year, and the student grant has been decreased from $400 to $250. This latter appears likely, since in total we have $16 million less available this year for grants and loans than was available before.

GO Transit now costs $21 per week for him and his son to travel to and from Oakville each day; this is going to go up by about 10 per cent or $2 per week. That's $104 per year—and he is tempted to start taking his car to work.

He knows that cities are for people and that the automobile will add to the pollution problem, but $104 is $104. And if he knows where he can park free he finds that to pay for parking is not going to have to be a consideration.

His car will cost him $10 more for licence and gasoline this year; and his cigarettes, beer and liquor are going to cost him $17 more. The additional trips over the Burlington Skyway will be 10 cents each, or about $2.40 per year, and the trips to Ontario Place and his camping costs will probably cost him about $10 more this year.

So his total out-of-pocket expenses are going to be about $400 because of this budget. Two hundred and fifty dollars, of course, is toward his son's education costs, and this is important and acceptable to him.

Mr. Deans: On top of that he just got laid off!

Mr. Breithaupt: You see, when this average citizen graduated from high school he couldn't go to college because his family couldn't afford to send him there.

And what does he remember, Mr. Speaker? He remembers vaguely the promises of the Premier of this province during the last election campaign, six months ago, not to raise taxes. He wonders what went wrong.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Wait till he gets his property taxes.

Mr. Breithaupt: One particular item to which the Treasurer referred unfortunately continues to lower the morale of the members of this Legislature. This is his request to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) to establish a special advisory committee to undertake a thorough examination of the existing Succession Duty Act. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, there should be a select committee of this Legislature to work on this subject. Surely we can do more than just study the problems of snowmobiles!

I recall that in the summer of 1968, when I was a member of the select committee on taxation, how beneficial the work of the committee was to me as a new member of this Legislature. I am sure that many of the other new members, and indeed some of those who have been here for a number of

years, would find it of great use to be involved on select committees dealing with important subjects.

Mr. Speaker, in the Treasurer's summation of this budget, he says on page 63:

> The package of revenue changes I have proposed will be neutral in terms of equity, appropriate in terms of economic impact and positive in terms of provincial financing.

If the Treasurer means by this that the taxes are not regressive but apply equally to everyone regardless of income, then I must agree with the correctness of that statement. But don't you see that while this may be neutral in some economic terms of equity, these taxes are not equitable.

A recent Statistics Canada survey revealed that the $15,000-plus wage-earner spends three per cent of his income on smoking supplies and alcoholic beverages, while the under-$3,000 wage-earner spends 3.8 per cent of his income on the same goods. To say that these taxes are avoidable is to slap this poor man in the face. Why must we deny the less wealthy a few small luxuries in life; and is the Treasurer so naive as to believe that people will deny themselves these luxuries?

The middle- and lower-income wage-earner once again must bear the brunt of this "equitable" budget. He loses the tax rebate on his cottage. He must pay more to take his family to Ontario Place and the Ontario Science Centre. He must pay more to take his family camping in our provincial parks.

His daughter was going to teachers' college next year, but what was going to be free will now cost her $585 per year. Hopefully, she can find work somewhere; and besides one more unemployed person will have a negligible impact on the total unemployment figures.

But the budget is appropriate in economic terms, says the Treasurer. After all, there have been no tax increases for corporations. In fact they continue to enjoy the $125 million tax credit gift they had last year.

Is the budget really positive? It certainly has a positive effect on the provincial debt, with a deficit of $600 million to be added this year. It certainly has a positive effect on the number of people who will not be able to afford post-secondary education.

In recent days we have noted in the press the reports of a study made at the University of Connecticut which showed that politicians are trusted by the American people only slightly more than used car salesmen and less than plumbers, TV repairmen and car repairmen. Of 20 occupational groupings politicians ranked 19, just above used car salesmen.

While it is true, Mr. Speaker, that this is only a survey of 396 persons in one of the United States of America, it seems apparent that the reasons for the distrust of politicians by the public are based on the sorts of activities that we have seen in this budget presented to the people of Ontario. It is no wonder that politicians are mistrusted when governments go to the electorate promising one thing and five months later provide something entirely different. As well, they have done this with all the open cynicism and arrogance that we have seen here.

As the Legislature is avoided and the members are not used to their full capacities, it makes it an even more difficult matter for all of us. If politicians have lost some of the trust which many people believe should be theirs, the reasons lie in documents such as this budget. It is clear to me that the Treasurer of Ontario has lost control of the financial operations of this province. He has lost his sense of priorities and he has certainly lost the confidence of the electorate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. R. F. Nixon, that all the words after "that" be struck out and the following added:

This House regrets the regressive and inequitable increases in taxation proposed by the government in an attempt to pay for the programmes and increased expenditures announced prior to the election, in particular the imposition of higher post-secondary tuition fees which together with the decrease in the financial assistance available to students seriously restricts the availability of continuing education; and this House regrets the bad judgement of the government in continuing the tax rebate on production machinery which has been shown to have no significant effect on the availability of employment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, the most incisive comment on the budget that I have seen is a contrast in a couple of headlines. By mere chance I happen to have them with me here this afternoon. The first one is a headline from the late lamented Toronto Telegram, Sept. 22. It

is datelined Belleville, and it reads: "Davis Kickoff with Pledge to Keep Taxes Down." The next one is a headline the morning after the budget in the Globe and Mail which screamed at us: "Something Bad for Everyone."

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): The headline in the earlier edition was much better than the headline in the late one.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): That is the news media again.

Mr. MacDonald: I don't know what the significance of that comment is, Mr. Speaker. But there is really a breath-taking mixture of hypocrisy and self-righteousness and cynicism in this whole approach of the government.

For example, let's go back to this headline. The first paragraph on the kickoff by the Premier (Mr. Davis) down in Belleville last Sept. 22 read as follows:

> Premier William Davis officially opened his election campaign here last night with a charge that the two platforms of the two opposition parties would increase taxes and promised that the Progressive Conservatives will keep taxes down.

Now that comes from the man who today, on the basis of his first year in office, has doubled the costs in his own office, and now we have estimates indicating that he is going to treble it in the second year in office.

He went on even better. He claimed the NDP had promised new programmes that would cost an additional $400 million but he did not say how he arrived at the total. That, Mr. Speaker, was before he had enlisted the support of the Treasury Board. He used the Treasury Board when he needed to wade through the vagaries of the Liberal programme, and suggested, as I recall, that it was going to cost $1 billion.

But the hypocrisy and the cynicism!

This is the Prime Minister again in Belleville:

> "All those who have eyes to see, ears to hear, bills to pay or families to support, are aware of the pressures of inflation and rising costs in our economy," the Premier said.
>
> "The people of Ontario would, I believe, be the last to say that what they want to add to their burden is increased taxation to finance increased government expenditures and to cover increased government debt."

That is precisely what they have got in this budget; increased taxes for increased government expenditure and, to boot, $600 million increased public debt.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that this isn't new. It's bad enough that it should have happened once but it is a familiar pattern. Indeed, it is the traditional approach of the Tories. If you go back to 1963, you will find that they fought an election in which they said there would be no tax increases. After the election, there were tax increases.

In 1967, they fought an election in which the Premier explicitly assured the public that there would be no increase in taxes. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? In 1968, the first budget after the 1967 election, taxes in the Province of Ontario went up $234 million —the largest single jump in new taxes in Ontario's history.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I was a piker last week.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we will see how much of a piker. Let me remind the hon. members—some of them are newcomers around here; they may have forgotten what happened following that last mass deception of the electorate back in 1967: Tobacco tax, $36 million; gasoline and motor vehicle tax, $38 million; racetracks, $2.5 million; motor vehicle registration fees, $23 million; park fees, fishing and hunting licences, $5 million. They took that one off before the next election came; now it's back on—half of it.

LCBO price increases, $20 million; OHSC Premiums raised 69 per cent, $101 million; OMSIP premiums raised 18 per cent, $9.3 million. That's what the government did after the last election in 1968.

That wasn't the end of it, Mr. Speaker. In 1969, taxes went up another $138 million. In this instance, tobacco, once again, $16 million; gasoline rebates and purchases for boats and snowmobiles were cancelled, $1.5 million; liquor, hotels, meals and films, $57 million.

Finally, they got around to a little from the corporations. A rather belated effort—$17 million from the corporation tax increase, capital tax increase, and a five per cent sales tax on production machinery of $38.2 million and a year later they took $7 million of it off. How quickly they can take it off from the corporations! And from the mining tax, $8.1 million, for a total of $138 million.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the government that was elected in 1967 on a promise

that it wouldn't increase taxes, put on taxes which were there for three years in the instance of the 1968 budget, for two years in the instance of the 1969 budget, for a total of new tax of nearly $1 billion. In short—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): What happened?

Mr. MacDonald: —the fascinating thing, Mr. Speaker, is that what the Premier in the last election with the assistance of the Treasury Board accused the Liberals of doing is precisely what this government had done in the last four years—to put on close to $1 billion in new taxes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How does the hon. member get that $234 million?

Mr. MacDonald: —$234 million for three years. Do a little bit of mathematics! You did not tick them off! And then $138 million for two years. A little bit of mathematics, and it comes to about $978 million.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Then the million-dollar figure was per year?

Mr. MacDonald: No, I did not—was it per year? Well, the minister can settle his differences with the Liberal party. I use it by way of passing illustration, and nothing more.

So, Mr. Speaker, what happened last fall in light of the experience down through the years, was a case of calculated deception. Now, the provincial Treasurer has the incredible face to come into the Legislature with his budget statement and call it responsible financing. Calculated deception becomes responsible financing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Last year it was full employment.

Mr. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The minister should make his promises ahead of time.

Mr. Stokes: The minister is a fraud.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A calculated one, too.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The minister should have told the people what he was planning to do.

Mr. MacDonald: The net result is this—because it is interesting, I think, to get it translated into terms of the what the impact will be on the average family, and I have done a little bit of calculation. It is somewhat different than the hon. member who has just taken his seat on behalf of the Liberal Party.

I have a table here, Mr. Speaker, and with or without your attention I am going to suggest, if I may, that it should be put on the record so that it can be examined with some care. This has been done within the last two or three years and therefore I hope that there is no objection as to it being put on the record.

What it does is examine the incidence of the tax increases on three levels of income. A low-income worker of about $5,000; a skilled or white collar worker of about $10,000; and a professional of about $20,000. And it covers to each of the tax increases: cigarettes, gasoline, draught beer, bottled beer, liquor, wine and car registrations.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not cast my net so freely as to catch every tax with this one family. The GO trains do not happen to run north of this southern part of Ontario, or in eastern Ontario. I have tried to make my calculations somewhat more credible and therefore in first blush they do not look so impressive as those of the hon. member from Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt).

The total that this works out to includes, incidentally, a distribution of the $10-million discontinuance of collectors' fees for sales tax, and the fees for GO trains, provincial parks and others that the minister is holding over our heads for some time later. The total I come up with for a low-income family is $51. For the middle-income family, $65. For the professional, $82.

But you have got to add to that for the coming year, Mr. Speaker, the $70 on the residential tax rebate which the government is going to load back on to the homeowner in the municipality for this calendar year. So that, for the low-income person you get a total of $121.

However, of course, if this low-income family perchance has a child who is going to be sent to a university or to one of the community colleges, there is an extra $100. So it will be $221 that this family is going to have to pay in extra taxes. If perchance they send one of their children to a nursery school, it will be $371. And if perchance they should send one of their children to a teachers' college, the total bill will be $706.

While you were engaged a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, I requested your permission and the permission of the House, that this table might be published in its tabular form—rather than in a rough summary—in Hansard. (See Appendix.) I hope, with your approval, that this might be done.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there are precedents for doing that.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! Now, having set the figures, Mr. Speaker, there is another point here that is worth noting. That is the highly regressive nature of the tax changes. They become immediately apparent.

The low-income family pays $121 in increased taxes to the provincial government in 1972. The middle-income family, with somewhat different spending patterns, pays only $14 more than the low-income family, in spite of having an income twice as great. And the high-income family, which may have an income of four or five times as much as the low-income family, pays only an extra $31. In fact, this amount might be eliminated entirely, given the more generous nature of the gift taxes than the succession taxes.

In short, what you have got is not only an imposition of taxes, which is a greater burden in itself, but from a government which preaches ad nauseam its introduction of greater equity into its tax structure, you've got a further burden of inequity.

I was interested in sharing a studio at CFTO with the minister, since he had barred us from earlier closehand acquaintance with him that afternoon, to discover that the provincial Treasurer's plea was that these tax increases should be put in perspective. Said he: "Last year there were tax cuts—the cut in health premiums; the three per cent cut in income tax"—and he said you should take a look at them in total, in perspective.

This is where the cynicism jumps out at you. In other words, what the minister is saying is that "we cut taxes last year, we bribed the people with their own money and when they obliged us for voting for us and returning us to office now we are slapping the taxes back on," almost in the same quantity as he took them off on the eve of the budget.

I want to put in another perspective. That might be described as the "McKeough" perspective. Forgive me if I juxtapose it with what I would describe, in all humility, as the "MacDonald" perspective. I have here in my hand a study that was published in the July-August 1971 Canadian Tax Journal entitled, "An Examination of the Tax Burden Changes in Ontario, 1960-1969," by W. Irvine Gillespie. It is a very close-knit analysis in keeping with—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: —a theory he is advancing with regard to provincial government pressure on the federal government for further tax abatement. But his analysis of the taxes is summed up neatly in one paragraph. Let me read it, Mr. Speaker. It is to be found on page 356:

> From these observations, it is possible to derive several conclusions concerning the effect of new taxes on the distribution of income.
>
> First, the effect of the Ontario budget tax changes in the 1960s has been to inflict losses upon families in the very lowest income brackets and to generate gains for the families in the very highest income brackets.
>
> Second, the differential tax rates for the new taxes introduced during the 1960s have been regressive for incomes at least up to $3,000, and possibly up to $5,000, and from $7,000 up.
>
> Third, the 1964 and 1968 tax changes [and if I may just interpolate, those were the tax changes that came after the two elections fought with the promise that there would be no tax increases] were regressive throughout the entire income range observed.

Well, there is an academic analysis. But let's go one step further, because what this government has been engaged in for the last three or four years particularly, is the building of what I would describe as a welfare state for corporations; a corporate welfare state.

Let's take a look at what has been happening for the last three or four years as the sort of crown piece of this government's persistent regressive taxes throughout the 1960s, which Mr. Gillespie has just documented.

First, you had the investment tax credit—$250 million over two years ending 1972-1973. Well, we have found that it isn't quite that. I'll come back to that issue a little later.

Second, pollution control equipment. We've no figures on the tax saving except $3 million in 1970-1971 and since the concessions for water pollution have been in effect since 1968 and were extended to air pollution in 1970, we could guess that it has cost the province at least $12 million—another $12 million in the corporate welfare state structure.

Third, retail sales tax lifted from some production machinery. Loss to the province, $7 million a year.

Fourth, beer producers. A year ago, the government equalized beer prices between

the north and the south and in the course of this belated effort to establish justice for the people in the north, they handed over the $2.5 million involved in the deal to the breweries of the Province of Ontario.

I was fascinated to look in the supplementary estimates, in the Treasurer's mini-budget in December last, and to discover that despite increased output there had been no increase in resources revenue from mines and forests. In fact, the mini-budget in December 1971 showed a sharp drop from $24.5 million from mines profits and acreage gas levies to $17.6 million.

What is the net result over the last 10 years? These are ingredients of the picture. But let's get the overall picture.

The overall picture is that in the last 10 years corporate taxes in the Province of Ontario have dropped from approximately 19 per cent to 7.9 per cent of provincial revenues; meanwhile, the average person's personal income taxes have gone up from 15 per cent to about 26 per cent of provincial revenues. There is a magnificent example of the corporate welfare state structure that has been built by the provincial government.

Now they had a choice—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is also, my friend, if we want to be fair, an example of the greater elasticity of an income tax point than a corporation tax proposal.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the Treasurer is introducing a nice red herring here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I'm not.

Mr. MacDonald: If he hadn't cut his taxes then we might be able to assess what the elasticity is. But the significant point is that he is cutting corporate taxes throughout, and to drag that red herring into the trail and say it has some relation to elasticity—well, it hasn't.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It has a great deal to do with it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, the point I was about to make when the Grand Duke of Chatham interrupted—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I didn't really mean to interrupt.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. I not only understand, I have no objections.

Mr. Lewis: It is a pleasure that the Grand Duke was in court at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not have missed it.

Mr. MacDonald: My point is that the government has a choice between dismantling some of this welfare state it has built for the corporations in the Province of Ontario or adding more regressive taxes. And having that choice, of course, what do they do? They have $134 million in new taxes, the great proportion of which falls on the little families.

They had an alternative: They could, for example, have eliminated the $125 million investment tax credit, and they would have totally eliminated the need for increasing taxes across the board in such a piecemeal fashion. That they could have done. And I will show why it should have been done a little bit later, because obviously it has been an abject failure.

Secondly, they could have avoided this $19-million quiet handout to the distilleries, the breweries and the vintners that went on in the process of raising more revenue from the consumers to make the debt "manageable"—to quote the provincial Treasurer.

What they did last year was to hand $2.5 million to the breweries under the guise of equalizing prices between the north and the south. This year, under the guise of raising enough revenue, so as to be able to handle our deficit somewhat more manageably, they have now handed them another $19 million.

I am not going to put on the record again what the hon. member for Kitchener has said with regard to quotations from the heads of the distilleries, the wineries and the breweries. But I will quote one phrase: "Our earning performance so far this year has been gratifying," said the head of Molson Industries. Comparable kinds of suggestions were made with regard to the vintners and the distilleries in terms of increase in dividends that were distributed over the last year.

So what the government has done is gratuitously forced upon these benefactors of the Tory party an increase in income, even when, as the leader of the New Democratic Party pointed out this afternoon, they had been specifically asked by the distilleries not to increase the prices. The provincial Treasurer has the face once again in this Legislature to indulge in the specious argument that he didn't want to narrow the gap between the breweries and the distilleries, because that would put the poor breweries at a disadvantage; people would be rushing off to buy hard liquor instead. Well, you know, the Globe and Mail draws a conclusion. Normal-

ly this has been drawn in the past by us, and it would be greeted with hoots and hollering from the other side of the House, but perhaps when your friends in the Globe and Mail—friends who sometimes take a critical look at you—say something, you may have a few second thoughts. I quote:

> The whole episode, in fact, raises again the suspicions of the public about corporate donations to political campaign funds and the government's refusal to make public the names of donors and the size of their contributions. If Premier William Davis does not think that Ontario will be asking what sort of contributions did the companies in these various industries make to the Conservative war chest from last fall's election, he will be stupid. And he is not stupid. Shame, shame, shame.

So perhaps, with a bidding from that quarter, somebody who knows about it will indicate how much the distilleries contributed. Is Scott Young, with his three per cent of all their sales that he put on the record after the last election—which adds up to some hundreds of thousands of dollars—correct? How much was it? How much from the vintners? How much from the breweries, since you've given them two handouts? They were very generous this year—Mr. provincial Treasurer and this Davis team. Usually they don't give a handout until after the election's over. This year, with the breweries, they did it before and they did it afterwards. They gave them $2½ million in the equalization of prices last spring, and now they've given them another multi-million-dollar handout. And the tobacco industry now also shares in it to an extent which the provincial Treasurer says he can't specify, but I would suggest must be in the range of some $5 or $6 million.

Well, so much for that, Mr. Speaker. I want to move on to deal just briefly with three of the areas of taxes within the overall framework with which I have been dealing. The first is wealth taxes. I was fascinated, once again, to read a speech that the provincial Treasurer gave to the Estate Planning Council of Toronto back last Feb. 8.

I might say, if I may pause here, Mr. Speaker, that I find these speeches of the provincial Treasurer as interesting reading as any that flows across my desk. He has a habit of sharing his innermost thoughts with audiences, particularly if they're audiences with which he has a basic ideological affinity. Sometimes the thoughts flow in rather dazzling fashion, they're most illuminating, and therefore I read them with great care. And I trust, having said this now that they're not going to be cut off, because if they are I'm going to call up and ask for one after each refusal to deliver it normally through the mail.

But on this occasion he was speaking to a very interested body—the Estate Planning Council—and his topic was inheritance taxes. And he starts out: "It is true that the federal government did vacate the field of inheritance tax, but it is equally true that this piece of good news was not wiped out by the Ontario government." Not completely wiped out.

And then Darcy, in his inimitable way, went on to say: "Look, we've got to have some degree of tax equity. We simply can't move out of the field altogether, that would leave such a glaring gap in our tax structure. But what I've done, boys is I'm not raising what the federal government has stepped out of. I'm going to raise the 75 per cent that came to the province, but not the 25 per cent, namely, some $30 million. We won't pick that up."

I remember this government and the previous provincial Treasurer browbeating the federal government for years for having inequity in its tax structure. Do you remember when they had a social security tax which they cut off at $60 per person at about $6,000? And the provincial Treasurer would come in and browbeat those awful Liberals in Ottawa for cutting off taxes so that a person earning $6,000 would be paying as much as a person at $15,000. And it never occurred to him that if he really believed what he was saying all he had to do was to put on a tax in the Province of Ontario that picked up at $6,000 and you would have some more revenue, instead of crying to Ottawa in the usual fashion. Once again it could have been done here. If the government is short of revenue, as it claims it is, then it could have picked up the whole of the inheritance tax—

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: —and not dropped this little $30 million nest egg and assured your friends in the Estate Planning Council that this was an element of good news which you weren't going to dispel.

Well, we in the New Democratic Party feel that a full occupancy of this field should be exercised by the provincial government. If they did, a minimum of $50 million—perhaps up to $100 million even, along with gift taxes—could be raised if this government

really wants revenue and really wants to put equity into its tax structure.

I realize that I am ignoring some of the basic theory that the provincial Treasurer expounds. He contends that a capital gains tax which is now being introduced is a double taxation and that what he is going to do is to phase out the succession duties completely as he introduces the capital gains tax. As phoney an argument as I have ever heard.

If a person has a great accumulation of wealth at death, even though there had been a capital gains tax on it, it means that by some means or other he has been able to escape a fair share of taxes. Upon his death, therefore, it is a fair proposition that some of it should come back into the public treasury.

If the provincial Treasurer hasn't seen it, I invite him to read another article from the 23rd annual tax conference of 1971—a speech that was made under the title of "The Case for Taxing Personal Wealth," by Richard M. Bird, Institute for Policy Analysis, at the University of Toronto.

Let me quote just two or three paragraphs here which will sum up all too briefly our approach—and I think the appropriate approach—to this kind of tax:

> There can really be no question that in theory estate and gift taxes are among the best fiscal instruments ever devised by man. In practice, however, they have had relatively less impact, either economic or social, than intended or desirable.
>
> In my view the answer is not to throw them out completely, as seems likely to happen as a result of public apathy and difficulty in understanding these taxes. Instead we should revise them, direct them more sharply on great concentrations of wealth, and perhaps supplement them by a low rate annual net wealth tax which reaches further down into the wealth structure. The only relevant economic argument is this respect is that capital will then leave the country to an excessive extent, but I am inclined to agree with one author that [and he quotes that other author] "Capital is not quite the shy bird, having no country but building its nest where it can rest in security, that opponents of high tax rates have described. Rather it is like a Greek chorus that cries out loudly that it will depart but rarely does so and then only behind the immedate scenery".

I suppose with the exception of E. P. Taylor, and now the great benefactor of the Atlantic provinces, K. C. Irving, these great red-blooded loyal Canadians who run off to the tax havens of the world, that is essentially true.

However, let me complete the comment from Professor Bird:

> The real difficulty, then, is political. Is it likely to be easier to reduce the concentration of wealth by indirect means such as taxation done by direct means? I doubt it, though there is no question that wealth could equitably bear a much heavier tax load if we collectively decided that it should do so. On moral, social and economic grounds, for the good of the country, estate taxes should be raised on large estates, not reduced.
>
> Further, given the interprovincial mobility of capital and the likely onset of a competitive tax reduction contest in which only the wealthy can win, there is a strong case for a re-affirmation of the national interest in taxing wealth.
>
> Whether the taxing agency be federal or provincial in nature is much less imporant than that they agree and, above all, that they continue to exist.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I just make the case that in this one area we in the New Democratic Party simply don't accept the rationalizations of the Tories. They make a mockery, a travesty, of all their so-called striving for equity in tax structures when they are willing to ignore these great accumulations of wealth and not make them share in the needs of the public treasury.

Now, I turn to a second point, camping fees. In 1970-1971 there were $2.9 million raised in camping fees in the Province of Ontario. The government has increased them by about 40 per cent from $2.50 to $3.50, so we have got an additional $1.2 million. What the government is doing, of course, is striking a blow at low- and moderate-income families, because the persons you find for the most part today in provincial parks are the $5,000 to $10,000 income earners—well enough off to afford a car and a brief holiday or a camping weekend but not well enough off to afford a week or two in motels. In other words, the little guy is getting shafted once again.

If the government was insistent that it had to raise revenue I just draw to its attention that it has a so-called transient accommodation tax. It is now at five per cent in the Province of Ontario and it raises, although

it is difficult to get from the government exactly what the revenues are, somewhere between $15 million and $20 million a year.

In the Provinces of Manitoba, B.C., Ontario and Saskatchewan it is five per cent today; it is seven per cent in Newfoundland; in New Brunswick and Quebec it is eight per cent. In other words, Ontario could have raised a tax on transient accommodation and raised two or three times as much as it has nicked campers for in the provincial parks. Or indeed five or six or seven times as much if it had come to the conclusion that it wanted to double its tax from five to 10 per cent.

However, once again, when the government has a choice between a regressive tax that is going to hit the low-and middle-income groups it will always choose that over a tax that is going to hit either the upper-income groups or those who are operating on expense accounts; or, if I may say it quietly and not shout it from the rooftops, those from outside the country who come and share the hospitality of our hotels and therefore might make a contribution to our Treasury needs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And our parks.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And our parks.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And our parks.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! Well, I might be willing to let them off just so that I wouldn't be hitting our own little people. The government has always got a good excuse to hit the little people. It really doesn't mean it; it hits them so consistently but its range of excuses is infinite.

I turn now to a third area, namely with regard to education. The government has boasted that it is now meeting 58 per cent of the overall cost of education. It is rather an idle boast, Mr. Speaker, because it happens also to represent another broken election promise. From 1970, back into its antecedents in the Smith report, the government was going to be meeting 60 per cent of the overall cost of education in this coming year. So it chisels by a few millions of dollars—exactly what it is I haven't taken the trouble to figure out—by saying now that it is going to be 58 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, even more of a worry is the elitist concept of education that one would expect from a Tory government and now it is full-blown, coming back into the picture. The Premier, as the Minister of Education and the Minister of University Affairs during the 1960's, built the educational system—nobody had more to do with it, in shaping it in an uncontrolled and unplanned sort of way.

He provided, so he said, equality of educational opportunity. He insisted, so he said, that there was going to be accessibility; the dollar sign would be taken off the places in the university. We even had some of his colleagues like the late Kelso Roberts who flatly asserted that there was no barrier at all to any child in the Province of Ontario who wanted to go to university—nobody was barred from the university for financial reasons. And now what the government is doing is reversing its position because of a situation of its own creation that has got out of hand and is taking it out on the young people.

You know it is summed up magnificently, Mr. Speaker. For two or three years the government has been providing summer employment programmes for students as part, presumably, of its general assistance to making it possible for the younger generation to get an education. $21 million is being spent in the coming year on summer jobs for students.

But what the government gives with one hand in summer jobs for students it is now going to take away with the other hand, plus another $2 million—$23 million is going to be taken away from students by way of higher tuition fees. To say nothing, Mr. Speaker, of the $16 million they have cut in student aid. So that they are really going to come close to taking back, as far as students are concerned, double the funds now represented in the summer employment programmes.

That's a pretty sad state of affairs. It's really not a revenue measure, Mr. Speaker, it's an attempt to downgrade post-secondary education. It's a clear admission of the failure of the educational policies of the government, the very policies implemented during the 1960s by the present Premier.

This is a class measure. The government can argue as much as it wants to the contrary but it is a class measure. It will not deter the children of well-to-do families from continuing their education, but it will be a final straw for children of many low-income and some middle-income families.

We in the New Democratic Party don't object to the principle that the student should bear a proportion of the cost of post-secondary education. But it is our conviction that

that cost should be borne after graduation in the form of higher taxes rather than in increased tuition fees, because increased tuition fees are both discriminatory and callous. Of course, that is not what the government does, because it won't introduce equity into its tax structure as completely as is necessary.

So much for that aspect of the budget, Mr. Speaker. I want to move on now to looking at fiscal policy and the province's role in it.

It must be acknowledged that the province's role in fiscal policy has changed very significantly in the last two or three years. I have very vivid recollections not more than two or three years ago, of listening to the provincial Treasurer's predecessors constantly resorting to the argument that it wasn't the province's responsibility. They didn't have the means and the weapons to be able to cope with fiscal policy. That was something for Ottawa to look after.

As I read the papers in this budget statement, I find a section in budget paper A that is headed, "A Stronger Provincial Role in Fiscal Policy", and it goes on to detail it. In fact, that was only a detailing of what had become the whole approach of the provincial Treasurer, because I was interested in reading the provincial Treasurer's remarks at the finance ministers' conference in Ottawa last November, when he advanced the argument that the province had been engaging in fiscal policies to compensate for the perverse approach of the federal government. The federal government, for example, had not moved as it should have into an expansionary policy a year ago, whereas this government did with its handout of $125 million to help the corporations boost the economy.

We'll get back to that in a moment, but this was the argument of the Provincial Treasurer. It's fascinating, Mr. Speaker, how things have gone completely into reverse. Because there was a day—I repeat, not too long ago—when it was always argued that the federal government would set forth a fiscal policy and then the provinces, rather perversely, would counter that fiscal policy, and nullify it to some extent.

What we had in the instance of our provincial Treasurer going down to Ottawa last November was the contention that the province was taking steps to counter the perverse action of the federal government. Well, that's a reversal; that's a "man-bites-dog" kind of approach in the fiscal world. But there was a certain element of truth in it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Throw the rascals out.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, that is one set of rascals—and I can think of one other—I would like to see thrown out. Don't force me to elaborate.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You've been trying for a long time but achieving little success.

Mr. MacDonald: However, there are a couple of basic reasons why this situation has changed so much in terms of the province's role in fiscal policy.

The first one—and I draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because quite frankly I suspect the average person doesn't really recognize that this is the case—is that today, once you have taken into account all of the fiscal transfers, 60 per cent of the money spent by governments in this country is spent by the provinces and the municipalities. Sixty per cent of the money is spent by the two junior levels of government. Only 40 per cent is spent by the federal government.

When you combine that with the fact that more than 80 per cent of public investment is made by the provinces and the municipalities and something less than 20 per cent by the federal government, then you have some indication of the fiscal clout that the two junior levels of government have today as compared with yesteryear. That clout can be used either negatively to counter and frustrate what the federal government wants to do or, alternatively, it can be used in a co-ordinated way to bolster and strengthen whatever fiscal policies the federal government wants.

And I will say here, in commendation of what the provincial Treasurer has been saying rather frequently down through the months, that it seems to me that there should be a place for the establishment of a joint economic council so that we could make sure that the co-ordination of federal and provincial policies was more complete and therefore the effectiveness of fiscal policy would be more assured.

However, there is a second basic reason why I think the junior levels of government can play a much greater role in fiscal policy. It is that another Canadian Tax Foundation study points out that 16 per cent of the gross national product of Canada—the total of goods and services—is produced because of the activity of the provincial and municipal governments and another six per cent by the federal government.

In other words, Mr. Speaker—and I want this basic fact to be noted, because I think

there are some lessons to be drawn from it—22 per cent of the wealth of this nation, in terms of its goods and services—the gross national product—is as a result of the initiative and the action of governments in the nation, including the provinces and the municipalities. The lesson to be drawn from that, Mr. Speaker, surely is that economic development and the full employment it engenders can best be achieved by an appropriate mix of public and private enterprise—but with a heavy emphasis on the public.

What we are getting now is a head-on collision with the doctrinaire position of this government and particularly that of the provincial Treasurer. His solution is constantly reiterated, particularly when he speaks to audiences like the proprietary association, the estate planners, the chamber of commerce, the manufacturers' association, the accountants' federation and all the rest of them—all these groups for which he has such an affinity.

The constant argument he is making is that we have got to reduce the role of government, we have got to expand the private sector—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hear, hear. And there were a lot of people who said so on Oct. 21 too.

Mr. MacDonald: —whereas obviously—the Treasurer is to eat some of his own words before this is all over, so don't become too perky.

Mr. Lewis: He can be demoted.

Mr. MacDonald: Whereas obviously both are needed if society's needs are going to be fully met.

Here's the point, Mr. Speaker—and I pause to make it—surely it is the objective of this government, unless it is being even more hypocritical than I can believe it to bet, is to try to achieve full employment by its definition, that is, three per cent unemployment. Surely what he wants to do is to achieve full economic development in the Province of Ontario. You cannot get it if you are going to downgrade the public sector and the government's role in it because the government's role in the Province of Ontario is 22 per cent of the GPP. What is the government going to do? Eliminate that 22 per cent when it has already got a sizable enough gap to fill and it is pleading for the private sector to move in and to fill it?

This brings us to some of these philosophic outpourings of the provincial Treasurer which—I don't know whether he heard me when he was out a few moments ago—I acknowledge that I read with very great interest. In fact, I got into a brief exchange with the Premier last week when we were discussing the government reorganization bill. I was drawing attention to and drawing my conclusions as to the significance of the so-called reprivatization tendencies of this government.

The Premier intervened and said that I was missing the fact that on Page 49, the page that I was quoting from, there was a heading to this section which said "Future Concepts." In other words, he was arguing this is a future concept but it isn't a practical policy at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, reprivatization is both a guideline and a blueprint for active consideration today as far as the provincial Treasurer is concerned because he is talking about it all the time. Let me give you one or two examples. I have here an article that was written by John Slinger a week or so ago, with the Treasurer's smiling face on the front page of the Globe and Mail—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): It's better than the Treasurer in person.

Mr. MacDonald: —there are two or three paragraphs that are worth reading.

> Government has reached the point where it can't realistically increase taxes much more, and at the current level of taxation they cannot afford to provide all the services people want. It didn't necessarily come in a flash but a year or so ago Mr. McKeough visited his old school, Ridley College in St. Catharines. He noticed that much of what used to be done by the college staff, cooking and cleaning, is being done by private companies on contract. The place is clean, the food is better, the school is saving money and a couple of private concerns are making money.
>
> Apply this to the government. There are armies of people in the civil service who are cooking meals and cleaning halls, and maybe it will be better to go down and buy that service because the private sector can probably do it and make money and save the taxpayer some money.

You see, it isn't a blueprint, Mr. Speaker. The provincial Treasurer—if I may take you back to the biblical days that I know you are familiar with, Mr. Speaker, where

Saul was on the road to Damascus and the light dawned. Similarly, we saw Darcy on the road to Ridley, back to the private school.

It didn't dawn all of a sudden—not immediately, says Slinger but it began to dawn on him "Here is the answer to our problem. All we have got to do is to contract out so much of this public business and it will cost us less."

Let's pause right there because where is the proof that it is going to cost us less? Private business doesn't provide a service. Private business is in the game to make a profit. Even if one assumes that you are going to get as good a service, you are going to pay a lot more for it. Go down and examine the contract for cleaning Ontario Place. I have forgotten the astronomical figure that they are giving some company to clean up the rugs and look after that place—

Interjection by hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: It's a false thesis, but this government is fascinated—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: False from the point of view of the socialists.

Mr. MacDonald: No, from the point of view of anybody who is interested (a) in efficiency and (b) in protecting the public treasury. The interesting thing here, Mr. Speaker, is that in this obsession of the government to get back to the contract mechanism, and get public business handled in the prive sector—this reprivatization process—I wonder if there isn't just a fortuitious association with another development.

I remember an article by the late Blair Fraser back in the 1955 period when he wrote an article called "Our Illegal Election." In the course of that article he made a flat assertion that nobody has ever denied, namely that the heart and soul and spinal column of old party funds at the provincial level come from those who have contracts from the government. Now is it just a coincidence that at the very time when the chief Tory bagman, Mr. Kelly of Consumers' Gas, is now, according to news reports, going to be raising funds for the Tory party on a continuous basis, year-in-and-year-out, rather than just at election time? Is it just a coincidence that the government is now bolstering the seedbed, so to speak, extending the range of contracts so that Mr. Kelly and his cohorts will have an even greater number of people who they go to to nick? Well, I raise it, and if perchance, as the Globe and Mail says, the government thinks we are being unfair, all it has got to do is to publish where it is getting its money, and that ends it.

However, I want to go on to another document that the leader of the New Democratic Party dealt with briefly in his Throne Speech. Again, it is such a fascinating and illuminating one that I want to touch on it in a bit more detail, and that is the speech that the provincial Treasurer gave to the Proprietary Association of Canada on Feb. 8.

The first quotation I want to give to you, from page 3 of the official release that the provincial Treasurer was good enough to send around to us, was that he was expressing some misgivings as to the future prospects with acceleration in the growth of budgets, and the warning of the Economic Council of Canada that if education costs and health costs were to continue to increase to the end of the century at the rate they have been increasing in the last 10 or 15 years, then by the year 2000 they would have gobbled up all of our existing budgets.

The provincial Treasurer found this a rather chilling proposition. He said there were two solutions. The first one, of course, was introducing greater means of a planning for implementing cost-effective tools. All that is a rather mechanistic approach, but then he said:

> The second, and more basic, far more major in its potential effect, lies in government initiating and encouraging the other sectors of society, business, labour and professions; it lies in providing them with incentives and possibly even new values or new value systems in order that they might do more of what has come to be considered the job of government.

A page or so later he elaborates—and here the provincial Treasurer is being rather cozy with his ideological friends:

> One thing that I suppose I am suggesting is that the best workbench for curing some of our social problems is the private rather than the public sector. For instance, if the incentives are there, if, in fact, social needs cannot somehow be reconciled with your company's profit-and-loss statement, then perhaps your company or your competitor's company would be a very appropriate vehicle for cleaning up a polluted river or for investing in and applying your efforts to a slum clearance programme.

Let me pause there, Mr. Speaker. The fascinating thing is that even the provincial Treasurer, while advancing this resouding conclusion to his friends in the private sec-

tor, had two big "ifs", one "somewhat" and one healthy "perhaps," that they might do it. But that did not daunt him. He went on—and I have not heard anything dreamier than this since Amos and Andy went off the air about 30 years ago:

> In other words, it is incumbent upon us, all of us, to think about and to design ways to make it more in the private interest to do public good.
>
> And right now, or perhaps I should say, historically, the good of society as a whole is not part of the equation with which we measure the success or the effectiveness of a unit in the business sector.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Treasurer has launched a crusade, something that many people down through centuries have launched. It is a crusade to persaude the business world to change its basic motivation, that it should place the public good as its top priority. He goes on, on page 6:

> It is my observation, and I am speaking personally [You can see Darcy cozying up to his audience here. "I am speaking personally"—I do not know what he was speaking otherwise] that society, by heaping more and more responsibility upon government and by taking programmes and activities out of the hands of the entrepreneur, will begin to lose the opportunity of harnessing incentives as it exists outside the government.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, if I may just pause here, is why has government had to take over so much of this. It is because there wasn't sufficient incentive in their terms for the private sector to do it and government, including Tory government, had no alternative but to do it.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Now he is going to rebuild this incentive.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: But, as I say, it is interesting what what seeps through the lines in the provincial Treasurer's speech. I pick up his speech.

> Are we not therefore making an implicit assumption that government has the greatest incentives and that it is the most efficient mechanism for solving social promlems? Under present circumstances, I suspect that the government probably is.

An hon. member: Where?

Mr. MacDonald: Let me pause there, Mr. Speaker. Let it sink in, because maybe this was ghost-written and the provincial Treasurer didn't know what he was saying.

What in effect he was saying is that the implicit assumption that the government is the most effective mechanism for solving social needs is a correct assumption at the present time. But then he goes on "and that central decision-making and administration brings with it a great deal in the way of economies of scale."

In short, once again, he is saying that the government can do it more efficiently. But then—and here is where he takes off, right out into orbit.

Mr. Gisborn: Who's that? Who is the Treasurer talking about?

Mr. MacDonald: Listen to this. This is to that proprietary association—the provincial Treasurer is off into orbit with his fellow ideologues of the proprietary association.

Mr. Gisborn: That is what I thought.

Mr. MacDonald: "Think, however," said the Treasurer, "how different the situation might be if a few new components were added to the income statement of the private sector."

What does he mean? What new income components is he going to add to the private sector by way of an incentive that they should make public good the top priority?

Could it, by chance, be an incentive from the public treasury? A forgivable loan, or a grant of some sort of that nature? Is that what they are going to do?

And after you have dipped into the public treasury and added the profits that the private sector is going to ask for providing this service, is it going to cost less than the government would have been able to provide it?

The provincial Treasurer is still undaunted.

> I do hold to this view, however—that more of what is now government spending must be turned back to other sectors of society, to other work benches, if we are to be more effective in our spending unless we substantiate the rather chilling prediction of the Economic Council of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, that's not how you're going to cope with the chilling propect of the economic council's predictions.

Mr. Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: If you are going to cope with them you have to have greater efficiency in government, but you are not going to get greater efficiency in terms of providing at cost, or as close to cost as possible, if you are going to add incentive after incentive to get the business world to do what they have proven down through the years they are not willing to do.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: And when you add to that the profits that they will demand, you are going to add to government costs.

An hon. member: Some want to do it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I spent a little time on this because it is basic to the thinking of this government. Indeed, when I drew attention to it a few moments ago the provincial Treasurer confirmed it. He said: "This is the way a Tory government thinks, not the way the NDP thinks." So he confirmed that what I am talking about is valid.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, it is all very interesting and all very academic. It is a sort of an intellectual exercise. It is a therapeutic exercise to meet the emotional and the ideological needs of an unrepentant Tory. That is what it is.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: And certainly the provincial Treasurer is an unrepentant Tory, if nothing else. But it is not a blueprint for practical politics in the year 1972.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: When the provincial Treasurer's crusade to change the basic motivation of the business world has succeeded, when he has succeeded in persuading private business to place public good as its top priority, then and only then will the provincial Treasurer's infatuation with reprivatization be an appropriate kind of programme for government action.

But you know Mr. Speaker, the significant thing—and I have alluded to this down the way because it leaps out of the pages—the interesting thing is that even the provincial Treasurer himself is playing games. He recognizes it may not work; he recognizes he may be tackling an impossible task.

Then they go back again for a brief quote from that John Slinger story carried in the Globe and Mail of March 28. He was speaking to 200 students at the University of Windsor business seminar, and the provincial Treasurer is quoted as saying this:

> If the reaction of the private sector does not continue to keep up with its external expectations, then I really see no other solution to the rather pressing problems toward the year 2000 other than government the regulator.

Well why has government gone into public business? I repeat, as I suggested a few moments ago, because the private sector was unwilling to meet the public good! There is no suggestion, no suggestion at all in these days of greater business efficiency through multinational corporations, that the business sector is going to place the public good as its top priority. And therefore what in effect the provincial Treasurer has said is that we are heading toward what he chooses to describe as "government the regulator." Well that is, government doing what private enterprise is not willing to do!

But you know Mr. Speaker, there is an even more illuminating quote—and I am so glad the provincial Treasurer has seen fit to be with us this afternoon, because I want to draw this to his attention.

When I was reading the speech he gave to his finance minister colleagues at Jasper in the meeting back in January or February, I was rather intrigued to note at the end of one of his presentations his contention he wanted to table a paper for consideration by the other ministers and I quote:

> In the hope that it will provide a useful basis for clarifying the scope for an orderly redivision of the income tax field. I shall of course be pleased to answer any initial questions you may have at this point. The staff paper I am tabling is entitled "Alternative Methods of Transferring Federal Tax Revenue to the Provinces".

This paper, and I draw this to your attention Mr. Speaker, this paper was originally presented to the tax structure committee in September, 1966. It was then published in this intergovernmental policy co-ordination and finance document in 1970. It was tabled by the provincial Treasurer to the treasurers and finance ministers from the other provinces out in Jasper; and so continually valid is it that the provincial Treasurer has even included it in the supplementary papers on federal-provincial finance tabled with the 1972 budget.

Okay, I thought this—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't get everybody to agree with it though!

Mr. MacDonald: Well as a matter of fact I am wondering if I am going to get the Treasurer to agree with it.

I went back to read this sort of time-honoured document from 1966 through 1970 and 1972—and I repeat, its argument is ways and means by which the federal government can share more equitably the revenues it has had. But in the course of making its argument — and I am quoting now from page 25 of the intergovernmental policy co-ordination and finance paper—listen to this Mr. Speaker:

> A steady growth in government expenditure to match the growth of the private sector can thus be seen as one of the main requirements for achieving a high and stable rate of economic growth in Ontario and Canada generally.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Who said that?

Mr. MacDonald: Have the members got it?

Mr. Young: Who said it?

Mr. MacDonald: This is the other Darcy. Not the political tub-thumping Darcy who was now engaged in so much posturing against the federal government. This is the Darcy picking up from the Charlie before him, and all his predecessors for the last five or six years. Let me read it once again:

> A steady growth in government expenditures to match the growth of the private sector can thus be seen as one of the main requirements for achieving a high and stable rate of economic growth in Ontario and Canada generally. Consequently, [and listen to this] any significant decline in the relative importance of the government vis-a-vis the private sector might involve (a) a decline in the effectiveness of the anti-cyclical fiscal policy as a function of reduced fiscal leverage, and (b) a failure to provide social capital required to facilitate increase in private economic activity.

An hon. member: A schizophrenic, no doubt about it.

Mr. MacDonald: In other words, it's a—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There's no thrust in that.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, as a matter of fact you're right—there's no thrust in it. But I'll tell you what the thrust of it is; it is that the Treasurer is talking out of both sides of his mouth, and it's about time that he talked as a provincial Treasurer who has the interests of the people of the Province of Ontario at heart, and not as a politician who is engaged in tub thumping. When he talks as a provincial Treasurer, and he tables documents that are five years old to the rest of the finance ministers, what he is saying is that we've got to have an expansion of the government sector, because if we don't have an expansion of the government sector, we're blowing that 22 per cent contribution to the gross national product that comes from governments today. And if you can't create full employment by entreating the private sector, why should you make the full employment situation worse by the government getting out of the picture?

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you know, that isn't the end of it. Let me go to the end of this document, on page 40. Yes, more of the Treasurer quoted to the Treasurer.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He's embarrassed.

Mr. MacDonald: The dissatisfaction —

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's a great contribution to a debate when you go back five years or seven.

Mr. MacDonald: It's not five years. The Treasurer quoted it. He tabled it to his finance ministers in February of this year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And I'll table it again.

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Well, I'm tabling it here so that the Treasurer can read it and—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member knows the main point of that document.

Mr. MacDonald: — even more important that he can grasp it. That's the point, because it contradicts the Treasurer's whole present stance and his whole present tub thumping across the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me conclude it:

> The dissatisfaction with existing federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements is really due to the fact that the total government sector is under-financed.

Get it, Mr. Provincial Treasurer? "The total government sector is under-financed." In other words, if you're going to have free economic development and full employment, governments have got to do more, and all this

gesture that the private sector is going to do it is so much Tory bombast. The Treasurer himself said so in the documents he tabled. Under-financed, and that the resulting deficit—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Would the hon. member look at the title of that paper?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What does it say?

Mr. MacDonald: The title is—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Staff paper—staff paper.

Mr. Lewis: Well, the Treasurer tabled it with his budget document last week.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Staff paper.

Mr. MacDonald: Does the Treasurer table staff papers he doesn't agree with?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Quite often.

Mr. MacDonald: Does he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Certainly.

Mr. MacDonald: Does he mean when they're five years old and he is going around repudiating them, and he goes to a meeting with his colleagues up in Jasper?

Hon. Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: You are pretty embarrassed, my friend.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —as the hon. member well knows, the main thrust of tabling that paper was to indicate that there was nothing magic seven years ago, nor is there anything magic today, in the view of the staff or the Province of Ontario, of the federal government—

Mr. Stokes: It was just another one of the Treasurer's thrusts.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —collecting some 77 points of personal income—or 77 per cent—and us collecting 23, and the thrust of that paper was to prove that we could go—

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): Does the Treasurer need the reason for it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —to 50 or 60 percentage points of personal income tax. That was the reason for tabling that paper. At some point I'll tell the hon. member about it. It was Premier Regan who brought it up again. He made the same old arguments. And that was the reason for tabling it; that's the reason for putting it in front of the House now. The argument that the member nitpicks out of some obscure page seven years ago—

Mr. Lewis: Nitpicks?

Mr. Deans: Oh, Embarrassed!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and what really is getting to him—is that this is a Tory government and we're successful and we're saying so.

Mr. Deans: The member has gotten to the Treasurer.

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it's a Tory government and we are suffering. That is what I'm complaining about. And, furthermore, it's a Tory government that talks out of both sides of its mouth.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not.

Mr. MacDonald: Let me finish the quotation that the grand duke of Chatham has interrupted once again. I'll finish it. He's right, that the main thrust of this was to get a more equitable sharing in the revenues. The federal government has no deficit, it has a surplus—the province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I was going to complete the quote, because far be it for me—I'd never want to do an injustice to you, Darcy. I want to quote the Treasurer exactly, what he was saying in quoting this five-year-old staff paper:

> The dissatisfaction with existing federal-provincial tax-sharing arrangements is really due to the fact that the total government sector is under-financed, and that the resulting deficit is unequally divided between the two levels of government.

There's the Treasurer's point and I concede it. The resulting deficit is unfairly divided. Therefore, the Treasurer wants a fair division of revenues as between the federal government and the provincial government, so that his deficit won't mount here while there are surplus is in the federal government. But that doesn't invalidate the premise upon which he is making his case, and the premise upon which he is making his case, I want to reiterate, is very valid.

Since governments contribute 22 per cent of the gross national product in goods and services and since it is clear that the private sector is not going to provide jobs, because many of the jobs are going to be in sectors of the economy and in providing services that are not profit-making, then the govern-

ment has got to play an ever-greater role rather than a lesser role. That is what the Treasurer was saying in this document, and I agree with it. All I want to say is it is just as valid now as when he tabled it in February, or when it was written back in 1966.

Having acknowledged and tried to paint a picture, Mr. Speaker, of the overall framework of fiscal policy and the role that the Province of Ontario plays in this, I want now to pause and to acknowledge the limitations on the provincial role in fiscal policy. It has been necessary to reiterate the contribution that the provinces can make. I concede that the government now acknowledges that, but only two or three years ago it was contending that there was no role for the province.

There are three levers which the federal government can use in establishing fiscal policy. The first one is monetary policy. The second one is a national taxation policy, and the third one is government expenditures.

In monetary policy the province has no part to play at all. On taxation policy, since the provinces are forced to add new taxes, clearly it, therefore, has a greater and greater role to play there. As for government expenditures, I have drawn to the attention of the House the fact that 60 per cent of the governmental expenditures in this country are made by the provinces and the municipalities, so they have a growing role to play.

In short, while the federal government can create an overall framework, the province can bolster that framework by not being perverse in policies that tend to counter it here and there. But having bolstered it, there are then things that the province can go ahead and do on its own. For example, Ottawa can stimulate—if I can wrap up this portion—exports by operating on the exchange rate. Ontario must devise assistance programmes for specific industries that have needs. Ottawa can ease unemployment by stimulating demand through tax cuts and deficit financing. Ontario must concentrate on components in the picture, what the economists are now describing as the microlevel—summer and winter works programmes; retraining and apprenticeship, public works. Ottawa can affect prices by its control of the money supply. Ontario must rely on prices review boards to investigate specific prices. This, I want earnestly to suggest to this government, if it has the interest of the people of the Province of Ontario at heart, is an area where it can move.

For example, we have a long-standing problem, that presumably was going to be resolved in the auto pact agreement with the United States, of eliminating the differential in the price of cars as sold in the United States and as sold in Canada, including the Province of Ontario. If the federal government is unwilling to make certain that that obligation is lived up to, something can be done by the Province of Ontario, partly because it has the power and partly because it has such an overwhelming proportion of the automobile manufacturing in this province. Therefore in serving the needs of the people of the Province of Ontario this government would also be serving the needs of all Canadians.

There is a $250-$300 margin in price differential and if you assume that the average Canadian is buying a new car every third or fourth year, you have a figure that ranges anywhere from $75 to $100 that could be saved annually for every family by action that this government could take.

Secondly, again related to automobiles, there is the question of insurance. I am not for the moment going to refight the battle of public car insurance; the provincial Treasurer will say that the people of the Province of Ontario have spoken and, for the next four years with a Tory government, we are stuck with the status quo.

I am not going to argue the case, but even within the framework of what the provincial Treasurer has now, it is possible to establish a rate review board. If he were to do no more, for example, than the Social Credit government has done in British Columbia, he could roll back the prices about $15 or so, as they have done out there, within the framework of operating with the private insurance companies. All he's got to do is to act as though he is in control of the situation, rather than as if the private insurance companies were in control of the situation.

There is a third element, namely automobile repairs. We have constant complaints with regard to the racketeering and excess pricing that goes on with automobile repairs. Something can be done by this government to regularize the situation here, just as this government after a great deal of pressure a few years ago, moved in and cleaned up the used car field in the Province of Ontario.

If in terms of the price differential for cars, plus the savings through a rate review board if not through public car insurance, they do something to solve the problem in the car repair field then we have at least

$100 per year per car owner that this government could save in meeting the excessive cost of living in the province.

Another area where the government can move is in a rental review board. My colleague, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) put on record the other day the kind of contrast between rent levels in Ottawa and rent levels, for example, in the city of Montreal.

I concede there are other factors in the picture, but there is no doubt that the rent reviews and rent controls that have been established in the Province of Quebec, without any untoward consequences for anybody except to protect tenants from the excessive gouging of that small proportion of landlords who are willing to gouge—if that kind of thing were done in the Province of Ontario, once again something like $75 to $100 per family or tenant could be saved.

Finally, there is the whole question of land costs. We already have a housing crisis in Ontario, and unless we eliminate speculative increases in land prices we will soon have a housing catastrophe. The province can control rising land prices; it did so this month when its own interests were directly affected in the Pickering airport site.

Why isn't it a legitimate proposition for this government to move on behalf of all of the people of the province, not just on behalf of the government and its interest in the Pickering area, so that we can eliminate the great inflation in land costs?

How one could put a figure on that I don't know—it is a purely subjective conclusion—but $200, $250 or $300 per year is a very possible kind of saving that this government can make in terms of zeroing in on these three areas of the cost of living.

Now let me say to the provincial Treasurer that I agree with his general posture with regard to the relationship between seeking full employment and coping with inflation in the economy. I agree with him in contrast to the position that is being taken by the federal government. First, we want to have full employment and we've got to grapple with the related problems that flow from it in terms of inflation of prices. But we simply can't tolerate—indeed even the federal Liberals I think now have come to the conclusion they can't tolerate—the proposition of deliberately creating higher levels of unemployment as a means of coping with inflated costs in this country. The governor of the Bank of Canada—I have here from March 21, 1972, a newsclipping which states that Rasminsky warns of the possibility of need for price-income policies.

On Dec. 27, 1971, there was carried in the Globe and Mail a story from the OECD. This kind of study is done in a dispassionate, objective, detached way by economists and others of all of the countries that comprise the OECD. Their conclusion was that temporary price and income controls in Canada, despite their shortcomings, could be deemed preferable to a situation where either unemployment or inflation or both threaten to remain permanently at unacceptably high levels.

Now I'm not pleading for the kind of price and wage control that is suggested there. All I'm saying to the provincial Treasurer, as he conceded to Fraser Kelly in that panel exchange on CFTO the other night, is that while one seeks full employment as the objective, one can't ignore the fact that lurking in the wings is the inflationary threat. Surely it is only plain common sense that one should take such steps as will check and counter that spectre in the wings and perhaps ultimately avoid the necessity of the kind of wage and price controls that this government doesn't want—in fact, which nobody wants if they can be avoided.

What I have suggested are ways in which it can be done by way of a $250 or $300 saving per family. Quite frankly, that saving through some exercise of price review or rate review for the people in the rental area and the automobile area and the land cost area would be two or three times the kind of saving that the government is going to give if it cuts the income taxes in the fashion that it did last fall.

So much for that sector of the budget, Mr. Speaker. I want to move on to another component that is perhaps the most important component in the fiscal policy, namely employment policies. Economic development is not an end in itself but it is a means of achieving more jobs to meet the needs of our people. Therefore I think it is useful and necessary for us to take a look at the various components of the government's employment package.

The government has made a lot of the right noises. As I said a moment ago, to its credit from the outset it repudiated the federal policies which deliberately created, or at least tolerated, higher unemployment levels as unavoidable evils in the battle against inflation. The provincial Treasurer in the course of his budget statement looked Prime Minister Trudeau squarely in the eye across

the 250 miles to Ottawa and said "It's not the view of this government that there are sufficient jobs available if people would just go out and look for them."

We agree with the provincial Treasurer. There are not sufficient jobs. Indeed, on the very day on which the Prime Minister made that statement there were some 44,000 jobs advertised in the papers of Canada and there were something like 270,000 people looking for jobs on that particular day.

The government is constantly reaffirming that three per cent is both a desirable and a feasible maximum unemployment level. The NDP's complaint is not with the high-sounding words that the government utters so frequently but the fact that its actions don't back up its words. Its unemployment programmes have too little substance and too much political rhetoric.

Buried in the budget statement, in budget paper A, on page 72, Mr. Speaker, is a significant sentence. The budget paper had been stressing the proportions of the problems that are faced in Ontario in trying to maintain full employment. They pointed out for example, that our population is going up some two per cent but that our labour force last year in the January period had gone up five per cent from the previous year. The increase for the coming year they expect to be about 3.8 per cent and then there is this quotation:

> The magnitude of the task is demonstrated by the fact that the economy will have to grow at a rate in excess of seven per cent per annum in volume terms to reach the three per cent unemployment target by the end of 1975.

Do you get that, Mr. Speaker? "By the end of 1975." In short, this constantly reiterated objective of three per cent designed to create a mood, an image of the government and what it is seeking to do, and the provincial Treasurer bolsters this in such a slick way. For example, during the course of the budget speech, he emphasized that "unemployment is not going to be solved so easily. In fact, said he—and what a fatuous statement in the light of what I have just read to you—it is likely to persist into 1973.

Well, here is an admission that by 1975 the government thinks this long-range programme may have achieved a three per cent objective as a maximum for unemployment. Well, it is not only a long-range programme, it is rather a painfully long time for the unemployed who have to wait for it.

But, Mr. Speaker, I have some rather grim news for you. I want to go back and take a second look at that statement. What it said that the economy will have to grow at a rate in excess of seven per cent per annum —which means that the real growth in volume of goods and services produced will have to be in excess of seven per cent—if you are going to get a three per cent level of unemployment by the end of 1975. What is this benchmark—if I may borrow the provincial Treasurer's favourite phraseology—benchmark of seven per cent growth in volume?

Ontario exceeded the seven per cent growth rate only four years out of the last 17! Has that sunk in? Four years out of the last 17.

Last year, the real growth in the Province of Ontario was 5.3 per cent. The year before it was 3.5 per cent. What the provincial Treasurer is telling us is if we can achieve seven per cent—and we have only had that four years out of the last 17—then by the end of 1975 we can have achieved the three per cent unemployment in the Province of Ontario.

I have news for you, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to happen, on the provincial Treasurer's own terms. By his own definition, this government has set an objective of three per cent unemployed which can be achieved only in the last years of the decade of the Seventies—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: By 1977, 1978, 1980, who knows?

Mr. Lewis: Shame!

Mr. MacDonald: I want to suggest to you that it's not good enough. When one looks at the components that go into the employment package of the government, one realizes why it isn't good enough, Mr. Speaker.

The first of the components are the innovative make-work programmes that the provincial government is now establishing, along with the federal government, to meet winter seasonal employment as well as summer student needs. Let me pause here once again, because I am not underestimating and I am not minimizing the proportions of the problem that is faced. It's almost a little mind-boggling to grapple with the fact that the labour force growth in Canada, and particularly in the Province of Ontario, is at a rate which matches the total labour force growth in France, Italy, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden.

An hon. member: Combined.

Mr. MacDonald: Combined, right! Combined!

So we have a real problem. But let's take a look at what this problem means. This is where the government's schizophrenia rather puzzles and plagues me.

While proclaiming that the private sector holds all the answers to solving our employment problem, the minister goes around boasting of the fact that we exceeded the 31,000 jobs through government initiated programmes this winter; and he reiterates the promise that we are going to have 18,500 jobs for summer students in the coming year.

Well I am back to my basic point, Mr. Speaker. Why argue that the private sector is going to do it, and then in the next breath boast that you have done such a good job in this area, because the point is you haven't done a good enough job to solve the problem.

You have got to do more—and sure the private sector has got to do more! What you have got to do is to cease being such a doctrinaire unrepentant Tory and face the fact that a mixed economy, with the private sector doing more and the government doing more, is the only answer to our problem.

Mr. Lewis: The fact is that he has conceded it.

Mr. MacDonald: You see the schizophrenia—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am glad to hear that, because I was getting a little bit worried about myself until I heard that.

Mr. Lewis: Read your own staff papers!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member's leader's remarks about succession duties a few months ago really shook me up.

Mr. MacDonald: The interesting thing is that the schizophrenia is not only in terms of the provincial Tories themselves, but is between the provincial and the federal Tories, because—

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): They are in bed with the NDP.

Mr. MacDonald: Because Bob Stanfield is going around saying that all we need to do is give private enterprise enough incentive to invest. That is his argument, give private enterprise enough incentive to invest and it will undertake sufficient new endeavours to generate the needed jobs. What I am saying is that the make work innovative programmes for jobs in the winter and jobs for students in the summer are being provided by the government at Ottawa and we agree with it. What we are drawing attention to is that this government agrees with it too and we wonder whether it shares the analysis of the federal government. Why is the provincial government doing it except, perhaps, to be a copycat?

Does it share the analysis which is now slowly leaking out from Ottawa as to why they persist in Opportunities for Youth programmes in the summer and winter works programmes that were so arrogantly dismissed by Pierre Elliot Trudeau in 1968 after the election? He was not going to have any more of those but they are back in great profusion now with another election coming up. But why? The answer is because we have a seasonal unemployment programme in the winter and because we have this fantastic phenomenon of hundreds of thousands of youths who are looking for jobs in the summer time. The government finds that if it tries to cope with unemployment through the use of the classical fiscal levers, it overheats the whole economy to a level that is beyond control in terms of inflation. It would be far better to zero in on the short-term seasonal needs in the winter time, or the short-term student needs in the summer time, with innovative make-work programmes.

Does the provincial government agree with that thesis when it was spelled out by one of the boys on the Globe and Mail—I have forgotten exactly who it was now, a week or two or three ago—in a Saturday edition? He said that this was experimental at Ottawa; that they were examining the results to see whether the expenditure of money was justified. The fascinating thing is that this government is doing the same thing. Is the Treasurer examining the results? Because some of these make work innovative programmes have been pretty makeshift, pretty last minute, pretty unplanned and therefore not very meaningful in terms of the potential social contributions that they can make. It is just possible, that one of these days all the dead elms along Highway 401 are going to be cut and the provincial Treasurer will have to look for something else.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is just before six o'clock, would the member let me reply to that? We are given to understand that there are something like 15 million dead elms in the province—

Mr. MacDonald. Not along Highway 401.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and we are cutting them at the rate of about 500,000 a year, so we have a few years to go.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, it is obvious by a bit of quick mathematics that this programme has the same length of life as the promise, for instance the bridge to St. Joe's Island. Thirty years, precisely 30 years, to get the 15 million trees cut.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Add an appendix B to the budget papers now.

Mr. MacDonald: Do I adjourn it or do I sit down, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Just sit down.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX

INCIDENCE OF THE TAX CHANGES ANNOUNCED IN THE 1972 BUDGET

Item and Assumptions	Tax Change	EFFECT ON FAMILIES AT VARIOUS INCOME LEVELS (1) Low Income, Working Class About $5,000	(2) Skilled Worker White Collar About $10,000	(3) Professional About $20,000
Cigarettes:				
1 small pack a day	2¢/pack	7.30	7.30	7.30
Gasoline				
(1) 10,000 miles at 20 mpg (2) 10,000 miles at 15 mpg (3) 2 cars, 10,000 miles at 20 and 10 mpg)	1¢/gal.	5.00	6.67	15.00
Draught beer:				
(1) ½ doz. once a week (2) ½ doz. once a week (3) none	2¢/glass 3¢/glass	6.24	9.36	—
Bottled beer:				
24 every 2 weeks	35¢/case	9.10	9.10	9.10
Liquor:				
(1) 1 bottle per month (2) 1 bottle every 2 weeks (3) 1 bottle every week	30¢/bottle	3.60	7.80	15.60
Wine:				
(1) none (2) 1 bottle every 2 weeks (3) 1 bottle every week	20¢/bottle	—	5.20	10.40
Car Registration:				
(1) 6 cyl. vehicle (2) 8 cyl. vehicle (3) 6 & 8 cyl. vehicle	6 cyl. & up $4.50 8 cyl. & up $5.00	4.50	5.00	9.50
Discontinuation of remuneration of vendors for collection of taxes. $10 million assumed to be passed on equally to all Ontario households.		5.00	5.00	5.00
Other fee increases (GO-train fares, provincial parks, etc.), including those to be announced later. $20 million distributed evenly to all households.		10.00	10.00	10.00
Subtotal	approximately	51.00	65.00	82.00

Item and Assumptions	Tax Change	EFFECT ON FAMILIES AT VARIOUS INCOME LEVELS (1) Low Income, Working Class About $5,000	(2) Skilled Worker White Collar About $10,000	(3) Professional About $20,000
Plus loss of residential property tax credit in 1972		70.00	70.00	70.00
TOTAL COST OF 1972 BUDGET TO THE ONTARIO FAMILY IN 1972		**121.00**	**135.00**	**152.00**
Total cost of budget to families in special circumstances:				
To the family with one child in				
(1) a university or CAAT (extra $100)		221.00	235.00	252.00
(2) a nursery school (extra $250)		371.00	385.00	402.00
(3) a teachers' college (extra $585)		706.00	720.00	737.00

The highly regressive nature of the tax changes is immediately apparent. The low income family must pay $121 in increased taxes to the provincial government in 1972. The middle income family, with somewhat different spending patterns, pays only $14 more than the low income family, in spite of an income twice as great. And the high income family, which may have an income of four or five times as much as the low income family, pays only an extra $31. (In fact, this amount might be eliminated entirely, given the more generous nature of the gift tax and succession duties.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 4, 1972

Use of government planes by cabinet ministers, statement by Mr. Davis 773

Use of government aircraft, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Gaunt 774

Nursing home regulations, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Burr, Mr. Deans, Mr. Shulman 774

Beaver Valley Planning Board, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deans 777

Government assistance for Toronto fare plan, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Gaunt .. 779

WCB task force, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Gaunt 779

Distribution of increases on alcoholic beverages, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 779

Corporation tax credit, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 781

Increased cost of tobacco products, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 782

Increase in urban transit subsidies, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Young 782

Ownership of land in Metro Centre, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 783

Information on savings in health insurance costs, question of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 783

Death of Claude Gervais, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 783

Commission to evaluate government programmes, bill to establish, Mr. Shulman, first reading 784

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. MacDonald, ... 785

Recess, 6 o'clock 823

No. 22



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 4, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock p.m.

ON THE BUDGET
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps before the hon. member for York South continues, I might indicate to the House that we have some visitors with us in our galleries this evening. The 4th Scarborough West Scout group of Scarborough, the 20th Agincourt Scout group of Agincourt and the 16th Bendale Scout group of Scarborough.

The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Yes Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking as I looked across there that it is going to be difficult, but you and I can have an intelligent conversation anyway.

I was dealing at the 6 o'clock dinner break with four components of the government's employment policies. In the first were the winter employment and the summer student employment packages, now described in some quarters as innovative and make-work to cope with the rather extraordinary employment situation that we face in Canada. The traditional situation, the winter seasonal problem; and secondly the new one, namely the great influx of students into the labour market in the summer time.

I had noted that the federal government was arguing that its approach was a preferable approach to the traditional effort to cope with unemployment, because if you attempted to cope with unemployment by an expansionary policy that overheated the whole economy and the result was inflationary problems that were not only unmanageable but completely intolerable. Therefore the theory that is now being publicly revealed as the background to the federal government's approach, in Opportunities for Youth programmes for example in the summer, is that one should zero in on this temporary pocket of unemployment and deal with it in a make-work innovative way.

My query to this government was that since they are duplicating these winter and summer employment programmes, is their rationale the same? Do they agree that this is the effective approach? Since they are duplicating them, one must come to the conclusion they do agree or that they have some other rationale?

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We don't have a quorum.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is quite correct. Will the attendant please ring the division bells?

Mr. Speaker ordered that the bells be rung for four minutes.

Mr. Speaker: We have not had the bells ringing for quite four minutes, however there now being a quorum the hon. member for York South may proceed.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that if this government does share the rationale for these winter and summer works programmes the federal government is now advancing—and since it has such programmes presumably it must share that rationale or have some other—then what plans has it to make these make-work projects more meaningful than they have perhaps been in the past?

I think the most common criticism made is that they have been cooked up at the last moment and don't really represent any meaningful social contribution. I must say that I wasn't particularly impressed with the provincial Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) intervention when he assured me that since they were cutting the dead elms along 401 at the rate of a half a million year, and as there were 15 million of them to cut, I could only conclude that he figures—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): A lot of deadwood on that side.

Mr. MacDonald: —he's got 30 years of dead elm cutting.

That's a lot of deadwood, I agree; and I can quite understand why the Tories would think they have got a lot of deadwood to be cut.

However, my point, to be serious Mr. Speaker, is that such make-work employment programmes are likely to become a permanent need for the foreseeable future. If the provincial Treasurer can get over his rather doctrinaire obsession that private enterprise can and will do the job, he will recognize the need for an even great expansion of the government projects in this connection and I think he should be planning for it now.

I for one, and certainly we in the New Democratic Party, would like some public declaration of what the government's intentions are for the next year, because that might at least assure us that we are not going to get announcements like we did last year in October—by coincidence in the election—on the eve of the time at which the project should be launched.

The second component of the government package of employment policies that I want to touch on briefly is the daycare facilities that were built this past winter. This year the government married or combined winter employment needs to a long-standing social need, namely the provision of daycare centres.

It was a strange kind of marriage, rather hastily ordered and rather belated. Indeed when it was announced during the election campaign it was presented in terms of 4,000 new places and 150 new nurseries. I don't know what the final figure is, or whether it is available, but the figures, when 93 per cent of the moneys appropriated had been allocated—and this was back in the latter part of January—the figures at that time, if extrapolated to 100 per cent of the money, would work out at approximately 2,260 new places and only 67 nurseries.

In short, measured by the yardstick of the government's objectives spelled out in the election campaign, it is going to have less than half of the number of new nurseries and just a little more than one half of the number of new places.

Again Mr. Speaker, I raise this because it is estimated that the number of places needed in daycare centres in the Province of Ontario is about 300,000; and only 27,000 have been met. That means there are 273,000 more places to be built and the programme this winter built 2,260. I think members would have to agree that is little more than a mere dent in the massive need.

I raise the question: If in the winter employment programmes next year, either in relation to such a long-felt need as daycare centres or some other long-felt social needs, the government is going to tie them together, what are the plans now? Specifically, for example, what are the plans for daycare centres and continuing the programme into next winter? Even the provincial Treasurer, in his most optimistic moments, is not going to kid us that the unemployment problem will not be with us next winter.

Is the government going to carry on the daycare centre? Is there an allocation in the estimate? What other—the provincial Treasurer shakes his head and says no. Therefore my question is even more pertinent.

When is the Treasurer going to announce it and when is he going to plan it? In this planning, so that the efforts will be more socially meaningful, what other social needs does he feel that he can conceivably combine with meeting unemployment in wintertime?

I move now to a third area. During recent years society as a whole has become quite hung up on the number of people who are on the welfare rolls; with a rather well-developed suspicion that welfare is becoming a haven for the shiftless and that massive numbers of people on welfare are really employable and do not want to work. The fact of the matter is that most of them do want to work. And because of this whole concern the government, and I give them credit in this connection, set up a task force this past winter to examine the whole relationship of employment opportunities for welfare recipients.

The task force took its job rather seriously, and in the minds of some went a little further perhaps than the original terms of reference. They examined the whole operation of welfare and the whole relationship of welfare to retraining and the Manpower offices of the federal government. The chaotic situation they found on both sides and in the relationships between the federal and provincial activities was almost beyond description.

Let me just put on the record two or three paragraphs, as succinctly put on this issue as I have found them anywhere, by Harold Greer in an article which was carried in the Windsor Star on March 15. He said:

> Municipal welfare administrators generally know little of Manpower [that is the federal Manpower] and vice versa. The two offices in the one community may operate in mutual ignorance if not antagonism.

That was the task force's conclusion. Harold Greer continued:

> But Canadian Manpower represents only some 23 per cent of available job opportunities at any one time. It is also necessarily an employer-oriented service while welfare recipients tend, for one reason or another, to be those whom employers do not want.
>
> What about other government programmes and services? There is, of course, a myriad of them—industrial training, mobility grants, apprenticeship training, local initiative projects, winter sports, etc., etc. But all is confusion. There is no co-ordination and there is no integration of effort.

Later, Mr. Greer wrote:

> More soberly, the task force continued: "We can find no real evidence of comprehensive Manpower policies for the Province of Ontario."

We all agree with that, and we usually tend to get from this government rather sharp criticism directed at Ottawa. Therefore the next point is an important one, and I quote Mr. Greer:

> On the other hand, the recruitment of people to jobs is still basically a very local, parochial, individual, human, subjective and unsophisticated process.
>
> The existing placing and training programmes are, like Canadian Manpower, economic services designed to meet the needs of the employers, when what is needed for the most employable welfare recipients are social services designed to remove the impediments to employment.

In short, what emerges from this report is a plea that the provincial government should move in and instead of operating a service that is geared to meet the needs of the employer and that results in many welfare recipients continuing to languish on welfare, they should direct their activities to meeting the individual needs each of these welfare recipients so that they can be retrained or reskilled and returned to the labour market.

You don't need to pioneer here. The interesting thing that was noted with emphasis in the report of the task force, was a programme that had been initiated in the Province of Alberta. It was a 1969 experiment. This service included the work of placement officers who sought jobs to meet clients' needs rather than searching for a man to meet the needs of an employer.

In short, the approach was reversed — to take a look at the needs of the individual himself. After 13 months, 47 per cent of the clients had entered employment against 10 per cent for a control group which had received no such service.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. It meant that by that approach in the experiment in Alberta, 47 per cent of welfare recipients were returned to the labour force, because the problem that each individual was facing had been focused on, had been solved and he was able to go back to work. That compared with 10 per cent in a group that was operating within the normal framework of the federal Manpower and other provincial services. The saving, incidentally, in that one group in the Province of Alberta, was $110,000.

In short, it seems to me there are guidelines that have emerged here of which this government might take note. They have been drawn to the government's attention rather emphatically by a task force that has been set up by the government itself, and I would hope it would start to plan; and indeed might take this Legislature and the public into its confidence as to what it is planning to implement the recommendations of that task force for next year.

Finally let me move on, Mr. Speaker, to the fourth component of the government's employment or job creation package. This is of course the prize exhibit, the government's investment tax credit.

Last year during the budget the provincial Treasurer came in, this same provincial Treasurer, almost with tears running down his cheeks. There was a quaver in his voice as he tried to persuade us that he had burned the midnight oil. He had applied himself as best he could to try to find ways and means by which he might cut taxes for those people who deserved it most—those in the low income groups, pensioners, those who were on fixed incomes. And with that tear running down his cheek, Mr. Speaker, he told us that he had not been able to do anything. The only tax cut he was able to give us, said he, was a $125 million handout to the corporations, because once again he was going to tie it to employment. Said he: "If we give them this five per cent rebate on investments in machinery and equipment this will result in a massive expansion of the economy, the creation of many new jobs."

Mr. Speaker, the incredible thing about this is that it was misconceived from the outset. Anybody who knows anything about investment in the modern technological age knows that if you invest more money in machinery and equipment the odds are very

high that you are going to require fewer people tending the machines rather than more. In short it is not going to be job creation.

It will be a long time before the income tax returns are in, but the minister is now taking refuge in the fact that many other factors influenced and slowed the programme down. We are now informed—and we had it confirmed this afternoon in questions that were put to the provincial Treasurer—that in the first year instead of spending $125 million, there was a tax credit of only $30 million.

The thing that fascinates me about this, Mr. Speaker, is that after all the centrepiece role that this project was granted in the budget of last year, we came into the budget this year, and believe it or not in the budget statement itself—if you ignore the budget papers—the provincial Treasurer did not have a single word to say.

An hon. member: Right!

Mr. MacDonald: Not a single word. You would have thought that at least he would have felt compelled to have explained that off-the-top-of-his-head figure of 6,000 jobs that allegedly had been created as early as last October.

You will recall during the election debate the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) asked about the tax investment credit programme and how many jobs had been created, and suddenly the figure of 6,000 appeared. It served the purposes of the election, but interestingly enough the provincial Treasurer had so little confidence in it, that he didn't get up and boast of even the 6,000. He didn't mention the whole programme at all.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that it is an abject failure. And there is reason to believe that it is going to continue to be an abject failure. Not only because it was misconceived at the outset—the government thought it was creating jobs when in fact investment in machinery and equipment is likely to result in fewer jobs—but because of the general situation across all Canada.

Again, we had further comment from the provincial Treasurer this afternoon on this report that has come out only a week or so ago, but which the provincial Treasurer contends is actually two or three months old. These are investment intention figures for 1972 for Ontario and they show that public and private investment in construction and machinery and equipment will rise by only 4.4 per cent, compared with nearly seven per cent in 1971 and a 10-year average of seven per cent; for the manufacturing industry it is actually dropping.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, the rather disturbing thing, is that the Ontario figures are below the national average in investment. Suppose one were to accept for a moment the intervention of the provincial Treasurer this afternoon when he argued that these figures are pessimistic, that they were gathered following the Nixon programmes last fall and that in later surveys the provincial government has taken he has come up with a more optimistic figure. For the moment, let me accept the provincial Treasurer's comment. He said he thought that investment next year would be 6.1 per cent.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): In machinery and equipment.

Mr. MacDonald: That is one per cent less than the 10-year average. Now I ask this question. If they were achieving one per cent less than a 10-year average, what evidence have they that this corporate handout is playing any role at all in terms of increased investment? There is no evidence at all.

Indeed again we come to a third area in which this government's analysis was very faulty. In the 1960s we were constantly being reminded, as I am sure the provincial Treasurer will recall, that in the secondary manufacturing field, and indeed in many other fields, there was a great unused plant capacity. In the booming period of the 1950s and 1960s companies optimistically ploughed back great profits into expansion of their plants. I have a general recollection of reading figures in which it was staggering to learn that many major sectors of the manufacturing industries were operating at 65 per cent, 75 per cent, 80 per cent or 90 per cent of their potential.

When we move into the kind of situation we face now, Mr. Speaker, obviously when companies have got tighter profit situations, they aren't going to be spending more money to expand a plant when they have already got unused plant capacity. This government must have known that; but their analysis was poor and therefore their programme has been an abject failure.

In short Mr. Speaker, the government's overall programmes; all the various employment components, are piecemeal. They're misconceived; they're ineffective. If the full employment objective of three per cent, no more than three per cent, is to be achieved

ahead of the 1975 schedule there must be, admittedly, the greatest possible job creation in the private sector.

My advice to the provincial Treasurer is don't put all his eggs in that one basket. The private sector is not the epitome of efficiency, in spite of the ideological predelictions of the provincial Treasurer. In fact, I was rather interested—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nor is the member for York South!

Mr. Macdonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right!

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): I thought they discarded the member a couple of years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: Pardon?

Mr. Henderson: They discarded the member a couple of years ago.

Mr. MacDonald: That's an irrelevancy. No wonder this government keeps getting—that member can't keep that wavering mind of his on a sequence of thought without getting drawn off in some direction—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): In fact to credit him with a mind is unduly generous!

Mr. Henderson: They discarded MacDonald as leader.

Mr. MacDonald: I am saying to the provincial Treasurer don't put all his eggs in one basket because the private sector is not the most efficient area to create jobs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the member's opinion.

Mr. MacDonald: In my opinion; and indeed I was just going to draw attention—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Increasingly so.

Mr. MacDonald: —to the fact that away back in 1962—

Mr. Lawlor: You'll learn the facts of life.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We did.

Mr. Lawlor: We'll see in another four or or five years.

Mr. MacDonald: —Professor Burton Kierstead, then on the political science department of the University of Toronto—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since he became an academic, he has become unbearable.

Mr. MacDonald: —wrote a letter to the Globe and Mail in which he was spelling out the guidelines for a policy of economic growth; and the last of his guidelines is still very pertinent. Let me quote it to the House: "Basically our problem doesn't stem from high labour costs." If I may just interject: This of course is the constant argument of many people. We don't have the kind of economic growth that we could have because labour costs are so inflated and so out of line. Professor Kierstead said.

> Basically our problem does not stem from high labour costs—85 per cent of our imports come from a country with higher wages than ourselves—but from entrepreneurial inefficiency generated by protectionism and subsidies. We already have a planned economy, planned to maintain the inefficient. My plea is for an economy planned to invigorate the efficient and the developing sectors.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Okay! If I need to remind the provincial Treasurer, he might go back and read—what does he call that document that was put out in the first week of October? An economic plan for the—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We called it the October 14 revolution.

Mr. MacDonald: The October 14—yes, it certainly was revolutionary all right. Well as a matter of fact—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Thank you!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I thought the member would like that.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the provincial Treasurer's interjection is rather a good one, because for a Tory document it was pretty revolutionary.

What he did was to confirm Burton Kierstead's point that there are some gross inefficiencies in the private sector and what we should do is try to cope with those inefficiencies and get rid of them. Okay! In the government's own document, implicitly if not explicitly, it agrees with Burton Kierstead—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It shook a few people.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Including the Premier!

Mr. Lewis: Several million!

Mr. MacDonald: Surely the lesson that emerges from this is that you can't afford to rely on it to the extent that at least you go around making pronouncements about it in terms of the private sector being able to solve either our employment needs or our social needs.

If I may try to achieve a common ground with the provincial Treasurer; I don't want to be doctrinaire, and I'm trying to persuade him not to be doctrinaire.

We've been the butt of accusations in the NDP that we are doctrinaire public enterprisers. In fact we are not. We agree that the private sector should be encouraged to do as much as possible. Not, may I just add, by dipping into the public treasury with gross handouts from the public treasury to put public good as the top priority. We agree they should play a role but we emphasize—and I say to the provincial Treasurer if he wants to achieve his objectives he has got to emphasize—the continued expanded role of the government, and quit going around preaching and denigrating and undermining public confidence in the capacity and role of the government.

He holds the trust for government. I sometimes wonder if anybody has ever put his mind to a study of what the consequences are of the Tory operation of government. One of their main thrusts, all the time, is to say government isn't efficient and that the private sector is efficient. Yet government is becoming an increasingly large section of the economy. What the Treasurer is doing is undermining public confidence in the public's own instrument to have some control and direction and provide some supplement to the economy as a whole. I suggest to the Treasurer that in the kind of approach he normally takes he is not serving the public good.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The Tories can't run things efficiently; that's all!

Mr. Lawlor: They're committing hari-kiri.

Mr. MacDonald: Now let me face up to—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Ask the Treasurer. That is the guy.

Mr. Lawlor: It is just a case of his being aware of his own limitations.

Mr. Sargent: I paid for this myself. The bank and I paid for it.

Mr. MacDonald: I seem to be having a lot of competition here tonight, Mr. Speaker. These people who come back from the sunny beaches and haven't been able to talk for the past two or three weeks seem to be bursting upon us.

What I wanted to proceed to was the next obstacle the government raises for itself. The provincial Treasurer is credited in the public press as saying we have reached the limit of our indebtedness. I don't know exactly what he means by that. If you take the Smith committee's nine per cent of the gross provincial product as a legitimate level to which indebtedness can go, obviously we are miles away from it. The last figure I saw was something below six per cent.

If the government is talking in terms of any one given year that it has reached the limit, I think it is interesting for us in this Legislature to remind ourselves that while the government has something over $1 billion cash it has to seek, it is actually picking up about $600 million of that billion from the Canada Pension Plan and about $200 million from the teachers' superannuation fund; so it has got to go to the market for only $200 million. I suggest that for the province of Ontario to go to the market for only $200 million is not really a serious threat to the credit ratings of the province.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon me! Don't forget our friends down the street.

Mr. MacDonald: I know the Treasurer's friends down the street; but he always uses them as an excuse, and unnecessarily so. That is a business; they have a capacity to meet their debts that is really nothing to do with his at all. The sooner we disassociate them, cut them off, cut the umbilical cord and let them handle their own bonds—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Hydro can hide behind its rate stabilization funds until the end of this century.

Mr. MacDonald: Right! It is big enough that it can hide.

However let me for the moment, for purposes of the point I want to make, say to the provincial Treasurer that if he is apprehensive about the amount of money that can be borrowed, the indebtedness, then the obligation is on him to raise revenues where there are revenues to be raised. In raising them, not only would he have the money in the public treasury, but he would have greater equity in his tax structure. That

brings me to the next point that I want to turn to, namely the –

Mr. Haggerty: The member is not suggesting further tax increases, is he?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I am suggesting a tax increase! The right kind of a tax increase; a tax increase in areas which are not bearing their fair share at the present time.

Mr. Lawlor: Don't tell him too much, he will do it next year. He has to!

Mr. MacDonald: In fact it is a fair query after all the advice that I have been giving the provincial Treasurer for the last hour and a half or two hours, that he should say what would we have done. Okay; I will respond to the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I know what the member would have done.

Mr. MacDonald: Just let me put it on the record so that others who are not as perceptive as the Treasurer will be able to get it.

What would we have done? First we would have wiped out the investment tax credit, because it is not achieving its objective. It is an abject failure; it is misconceived. And the government would have saved $130 million.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Could I just say this?

Mr. MacDonald: Right!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the member is right–and I don't for one minute concede that he is–then the revenue loss is not there. He really can't have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis: Why did the Treasurer put on all the other taxes?

Mr. MacDonald: Look, the Treasurer has $130 million allocated –

Mr. Renwick: He has got the point.

Mr. MacDonald: He has $130 million allocated which he is going to hand out to the corporations–what we are saying is that $130 million can be redirected elsewhere. Indeed that alone could have obviated the necessity of raising a single one of the new taxes, because $130 million comes very close to matching the $134 million in new revenue that this ogre, this grand duke of Chatham put on.

Mr. Renwick: He wishes he'd thought of that now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Or incidentally the $127 million it cost to reduce Medicare premiums.

Mr. MacDonald: That's another matter.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just incidental. That's all right.

Mr. MacDonald: We are saying that the Treasurer got $130 million that he needs and hands out to the corporations because (a) they don't need it; (b) it won't increase their investments; and (c) the programme as a whole is a failure.

Let me add to it. Secondly, we would wipe out the increased revenues to the liquor and brewing industry, and that means $18.9 million. Now let me just note, Mr. Speaker, we are not suggesting the Treasurer wipe out the tax.

Mr. Lawlor: I think it's useless; I don't think he is going to be persuaded.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not arguing. If the government needs more revenue –

Mr. Lawlor: I'd just give up on that if I were you.

Mr. MacDonald: – and for the moment I am going to concede the point that it needs more revenue–these are, and I hate to use the term of the provincial Treasurer, "avoidable appetites," but these are so-called luxuries, although many people would not deem them to be a luxury, which in our view –

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We finally found a common ground.

Mr. MacDonald: In our view it's at least one of the areas most legitimate for the imposition of tax.

Thirdly, we would wipe out the increased revenue to the tobacco industry–and what exactly that is quite frankly I don't know; I guess it is about $5 million.

Fourthly, we would substitute for the increase in park fees an increase in the hotel tax to 10 per cent from five per cent; and that would raise $15 million. Now if you want to keep it down to seven per cent or eight per cent it would raise $8 million or $10 million. Certainly that is a more equitable and a more lucrative way of raising it than the extra $1.2 million the Treasurer is raising from the increase in park fees.

Fifthly, we would raise resources taxes from the present 1.3 per cent of total production to at least five per cent; estimated extra revenue on 1971 production would be $58 million.

Sixthly, we would raise inheritance and gift taxes to take up the slack from the federal withdrawal and to obtain a more appropriate share of estates—at least $50 million.

Now those figures in themselves, Mr. Speaker—$130 million; $18.9 million; $5 million; $15 million; $58 million; $50 million—take you well beyond the $200 million mark, close to $300 million.

In short, there is revenue that can be raised, and in the process of doing it you would create a more equitable tax structure to meet the kind of programme that I suggest this government should be launching if it really wants to develop our economic potential to the full and if it wants to realize full employment in its terms of no more than three per cent unemployed by something ahead of 1975, to say nothing of the government's present programme which would extend it to about 1978 or 1980.

There are three other areas; it is difficult to affix figures to them. My seventh point would be a study of an imposition of wealth taxes. The eighth would be to shift tax reliance from regressive property and flat rate taxes and premiums to increased use of progressive taxes such as corporation income tax and personal income tax. Ninth, would be to cut out the waste trips to Cuba, overpriced public relations men in the PM's office, institutional advertising which is a waste of money and not necessary, and entertainment like Louis XIV, all conducted with the people's money.

The moneys are available for the government to do the job; that's my point. If private enterprise won't, public enterprise must. Only in this way can our economic potential be realized to the full, otherwise the three per cent objective for unemployed is empty rhetoric even for 1975.

The most outstanding characteristics of this budget are its inconsistencies, its contradictions and its unbelievable manifestations of political schizophrenia. In one breath the provincial Treasurer boasts about his achievements through government-initiated winter employment projects. In the next breath he proclaims his faith that the private sector can best solve our unemployment problems.

With one hand the government offers $21 million in summer employment for students; with the other hand it takes away $23 million in higher tuition fees and cuts off $16 million in student aid.

The provincial Treasurer laments the extraordinary five per cent increase in our labour force last year, in part contributed by students who left post-secondary institutions; yet with his higher tuition fees he is going to drive even more out into the labour market more quickly.

Supposedly, this government is laying greater emphasis on public transit. It puts people before cars—remember? Yet its public transit allocation—and now I get into figures that are disputed; we will have to sort them out in the estimates. The provincial Treasurer said this afternoon this $12 million was solely for picking up the debts of existing public transit systems, but it's all in a budget that has $589 million for communications out of a total of $5,051,000,000.

Having made such an inadequate amount available, in our view, it then increases GO rates to discourage use of public transport—here's the conflict, the contradiction in this government's approach—and it increases the motor vehicle fuel taxes to add further to the deficits which threaten public transit systems.

In fact Mr. Speaker, if I may pick up on the provincial Treasurer's intervention this afternoon when he said that $12 million was to meet the deficits of the transit companies, how much more money is he going to have to put in to pick up a larger deficit because of the fuel tax increase? It is putting money into one pocket to pay for the larger deficits which the government itself is creating.

In short there is no coherent underlying philosophy; there's no consistency in the government's approach. It's piecemeal, uncoordinated, contradictory and its tax basis is increasingly inequitable.

Above all else the 1972 budget is a PR con job of unprecedented proportions; it preaches restraint, but the Premier himself doesn't practice what his government preaches!

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Having doubled the expenditures for his own office in the first year, during the next year, according to the estimates he is going to treble them. In early February of this year, the Premier threw a first-ever provincial party for the diplomatic representatives of some 40 countries.

An hon. member: The member knows who wasn't invited.

Mr. MacDonald: "And a very VIP affair it was," reported Zena Cherry in the social columns.

Is it surprising, therefore, that one of his superministers should have hijacked a Lands and Forests plane to spend the legislative mid-term break in Cuba in an ill-prepared and thinly disguised effort at personal diplomacy, which by mere coincidence became an Easter holiday junket for himself and his family?

The provincial Treasurer burst upon this legislative scene last Tuesday night with a performance which opened with a crescendo like Brahms' Fourth Symphony—all of the stops were pulled from the very first note; it was an overwhelming cacophony of potential rhetoric.

Mr. Lewis: Mostly cacophony!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Just listen again, you didn't hear it last time.

Listen again and consider the second time exactly what the provincial Treasurer said: "The 1972 budget which I am presenting today reflects the confidence of this government in the strength of our economy and the future of our province." Well, Mr. Speaker, that was an outburst of Tory bombast and very little more.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: But he went on:

"It maintains the momentum of Ontario's action to restore full employment." Mr. Speaker, what momentum? Unemployment is now at 4.5 per cent; the provincial Treasurer himself predicts that it will average 4.8 per cent over the next year!

Now there's momentum—they're in reverse and going up the hill at great speed. He talks of a maximum of three per cent unemployed as desirable and feasible, but budget paper A reveals that it is 'way off in 1975.

Every one of his job-creating programmes was at best only a partial success. And as for the government's prize exhibit, that $125-million handout to the corporations by way of a tax credit for new investment, the major economic thrust in the past year, it was an abject failure.

"It seeks to foster maximum expansion in private sector activity and investment," said the provincial Treasurer. Indeed it does, Mr. Speaker, with further handouts from the public treasury, dressed up as incentives, and with tax favouritism for his wealthy friends, both individual and corporate, which make a mockery of tax equity.

"It purposefully slashes the growth in provincial spending and reorders our priorities to meet urgent social needs." Mr. Speaker, what priorities are being more fully met beyond the oft-promised and long-postponed hospital insurance coverage of nursing home care? What social needs? The government has done no more than belatedly—and many years late—point itself in a few of the right directions. But it hasn't moved! And as for the purposeful slashing of the growth in the provincial budget, it proclaims the tightest restraint in the last 19 years—but the figure of 4.5 per cent increase is barefaced statistical juggling, nothing more.

Quite apart—and I am going to try to sort it out—quite apart from the inclusion of OHSC revenues and expenditures in the provincial budget, the increase over last year's $4,663,000,000 budget to this year's $5,051,000,000 is some $388 million, and that, if the provincial Treasurer can calculate, is 8.3 per cent not 4.5. Moreover, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member would want to be fair, I am sure—

Mr. MacDonald: I always want to be fair.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and he needs a rest! The calculations which are detailed in budget paper, whatever it is, C-12, are based on year-to-year actual expenditures. Therefore the percentages which I put forward in this budget are based on what is our best guess 1971-1972 will end up at—that is not very good English—but it does not compare this year's budget with last year's budget; it compares this year's budget with what we expect with 1971-1972 interim figures.

Mr. MacDonald: Look Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into this numbers game. So that we can deal with figures that we can agree upon, I am taking the budget that was announced last year when the Treasurer introduced it in the House and I have transferred OHSC expenditures and revenues into the budget. The result was $4,663,000,000 rather than the $4,200,000,000 that was the case before OHSC was included. Okay?

That means from last year's budget, including the additions during the course of the year plus the added increase this year to $5,051,000,000, it has gone up 8.3 per cent; and the Treasurer can't argue against that.

However that is only half of it. That is only half of it, because the interesting thing is that over the last four budgets, the last four budgets have seen their initial totals exceeded during the fiscal year by $148 million, $470 million, $454 million, and last year, $308 million—an average of $311 million. Now one can reasonably assume that something of the same kind of increase is going to take place during this budget year.

Let's take an average of it, and the average is some $311 million. If you add $311 million to the figure that is already in the budget the Treasurer announced, it will mean that by the end of this fiscal year, that is March 31, his budget increase over the last budget will be approximately 15 per cent. So why is he trying to kid the public with this 4.5 per cent, the tightest restraint in the last 19 years?

I repeat it is a PR con job of major proportions; and when you have to resort to this kind of playing with figures and statistical juggling, it is obvious that you are pretty well bankrupt on the issue.

However I go back to the budget. "It increases our financial aid to local government"—Well so the budget proclaimed! Sure it does, but in such limited amounts as to break still another election promise of 60 per cent of overall costs of education.

Furthermore, by switching this year's residential tax rebate to next year's credit, the provincial government is going to load $160 million back onto the local taxes for this calendar year—and that's solving the local taxation problem?

It preserves responsible financing—this is the prize—it preserves responsible financing by raising taxes in selective areas. Well there is a euphemism if I ever heard one, "responsible financing." Having bribed all of the people with tax cuts before voting day, the government now cynically slaps on new taxes once it has been returned to office.

And the areas for the new taxes certainly were selective: No new oil taxes, no new resource taxes, no new corporate taxes; and to boot, further multimillion-dollar corporate handouts to bolster the already adequate revenue of the breweries, the distilleries and the tobacco companies—all hidden away in consumer price increases declared necessary to keep the budgetary deficit within manageable proportions.

And this is called "preserving responsible financing." That's the budget, Mr. Speaker; stripped of all its rhetoric, its statistical juggling and its cynical travesty of striving for greater tax equity.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: If I can borrow the punch line from one of the Globe and Mail editorial commentaries: "Shame, shame, shame."

Now that we know how the Davis team really operates we should rewrite the Tory slogan for the last election campaign. It should read: "Trust us and your cost of living will zoom." And how it has!

Mr. Gisborn: "It's not what we'll do for you but what we'll do to you."

Mr. MacDonald: As for the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, we are going to get out all of our old bumper stickers and distribute them to the nearly 900,000 people who supported us. Those bumper stickers read: "Don't blame me, I voted NDP."

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Really original.

Mr. Lewis: Sweets to the sweet.

Mr. MacDonald: I guess we can put it all down to experience, Mr. Speaker. Too many of the electorate insisted on the God-given right to suffer a little longer—and how they are suffering. Well in the fullness of time the people are going to catch up to you.

Mr. Lawlor: Democracy will have its day!

Mr. MacDonald: But meanwhile, as an expression of non-confidence, I would like to move, seconded by the member for Scarborough West, the following subamendment:

We regret the failure of the government to recognize the fundamental economic problem of continuing high levels of unemployment and continuing inflation, and the resulting failure to initiate any procedures or mechanisms to stabilize the economy and reduce the cost of living by such measures as a public automobile insurance plan, rent review boards, public scrutiny of utility costs, etc.

We regret the inability of the government accurately to assess the capital equipment investment programme of industry.

We regret the failure of the machinery tax credit programme to stimulate the econ-

omy and provide job opportunities so badly needed.

We regret the decision of the government to impose a miscellaneous hodge-podge of regressive tax increases which are unnecessary because of the $100-million unused machinery tax credit.

We call on the government to withdraw the following tax increases;

1. The gasoline tax increase;
2. The motor vehicle tax increase;
3. The tobacco tax increase;
4. The increased fees for use of provincial parks;
5. The toll increase on provincial bridges;
6. The GO-Transit fare increase;
7. The educational tuition fee increases; and
8. The fee increase for motor vehicle licences.

We reject the principle of increased prices for beer, wine, liquor and tobacco which provide manufacturers with windfall profits at the expense of the consumer without any justification.

We regret the intent of the government to restrict access to post-secondary education through increased fees and reduced student aid, and urge as an alternative a student aid system which will assure equal access for all income groups based on ability to meet whatever standards are established.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is some bad grammar in there.

Mr. Sargent: You should resign.

Mr. Lewis: Let's vote on it.

Mr. MacDonald: It is good economics even though it is bad grammar.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is an incredible motion.

Mr. E. M. Havrot (Timiskaming): Santa Clause is coming to town.

Mr. Lewis: Darcy, resign!

Mr. Sargent: And sell the airports.

Mr. Handleman moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Mr. McKeough, in the absence of Mr. Davis, moves second reading of Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Oh, surely not!

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, a number of the members spoke on the previous bill—the omnibus bill concerning the reorganization of government in general, and in particular, perhaps the reorganization affecting that which is outlined in Bill 29 — and I thought it might be helpful if I made some opening remarks concerning this particular ministry and the particular legislation which is embodied in the bill.

I am not going to attempt to answer all the questions but will answer some of the questions which were raised during the course of second reading on the omnibus bill, and raised in committee discussion of the omnibus bill. First of all, let me say, Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to reply later on to whatever comments might be made about this particular bill. Let me say, particularly to the leader of the Opposition and to the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) that whatever —

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We take it all back.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — slight differences of opinion may have appeared this afternoon and this evening between our outlook on matters budgetary, that the member for Chatham-Kent, the present incumbent of the ministry being described in Bill 29, appreciated very much the comments which were made as to the capacity or otherwise, or the capabilities or otherwise, of the person whom the first minister has proposed would fill this particular ministry when it is established.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What is all this?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What I am trying to say is that I appreciated the remarks of both my friend from York South and the Leader of the Opposition and certain other members. Let me perhaps —

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is not the way to restructure the government, though.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — trace some of the background to this particular recommenda-

tion of COGP which now manifests itself in legislation which is before the House.

The members will recall that prior to the proclamation of the bill establishing the Management Board as a separate ministry of government under a separate chairman, the Cronyn committee – the Committee on Government Productivity – reported to me and did so for indeed, I guess, eight or 10 or 12 months. I would say that during that time I had some inkling of the direction in which they were heading and some idea of the reasons for which they ultimately made their recommendations. I may say that during that period and afterwards when they had made their recommendations, certainly I spent more than a little time thinking about and talking about those particular recommendations.

I say this particularly to my friend from York South who mentioned it in the debate in December, this is one of the things that I think should go on the record about the Cronyn committee and its recommendations. They were excluded by their terms of reference, of course, from any discussion or any recommendation of improvements as to the conduct of the House or as to the rules of the House, specifically by the order-in-council appointing them; it was never mentioned during the course of that time. The matters concerning the House were excluded from their terms of reference.

I think it should go on the record that I know of no group who paid more attention, and insofar as I know, still are paying attention, to the deliberations of the House. Mr. Cronyn met with me on a number of occasions during the year that they reported through me to cabinet. I must say that Mr. Cronyn and Dr. Fleck were far more aware of the deliberations of this House than probably I was myself. They followed and felt –

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer mustn't let anybody say anything like that about him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I am trying to be in earnest, I say to my friend, the Leader of the Opposition.

I think that they interviewed, for example, every minister of the Crown. They interviewed the Leader of the Opposition. They interviewed the former leader or the present leader of the New Democratic Party. They undertook a series of interviews with great numbers of public servants and outside people, and religiously they read Hansard.

As I started to say, they often knew more about what was going on in the House and what the deliberations of the House were at a certain moment and the views of members of the House at a certain moment than I knew as a member of the House—I regret this—because often I wasn't here. They were reading Hansard. They were conducting interviews and I think manifest in their recommendations concerning parliamentary assistants, which could have been said to have been outside of their terms of reference, was a respect for the prerogatives, the privileges, the traditions, the duties and responsibilities which the people of Ontario have bestowed on the 117 members of the House. I wanted to put that on the record.

It became apparent to me sometime last summer, I suppose, of the particular direction in which the Cronyn committee was heading through the consultants that they were using and through their own thinking; that they were recommending what ultimately became, and is in the bill before us, a merger of the former Department of Treasury and Economics and the former Department of Municipal Affairs. As I have said, I thought about that for more than a little time and I thought about it after the report was released.

The first thing that came to my mind when I heard about that idea and as I thought about it – it has still not left my mind and I am sure that there are members of this House who have thought exactly the same thing—comes to the root of the arguments which were presented on the second reading of the omnibus bill, and no doubt will be presented further tonight. I look forward to those discussions. There is no question that if there has been one item which has been complained about by the Leader of the Opposition—and I think by the former leader of the New Democratic Party—if there has been one single criticism of the organization of government which has been paramount since my time in the House it has been the lack of co-ordination in two specific areas.

The former leader of the New Democratic Party touched on it tonight perhaps. I wouldn't agree with him tonight but the co-ordination must follow, must be there, whether we agree with the results or not, at the staff level and at the political level in the integration of the two tax systems presently extant in this province, one which we administer directly and which we collect through the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman), the other which is the biggest single tax still in the province and for the shape of which we are really responsible—not for the

amount of it—in this Legislature; namely, the property tax.

There must be an integration in our thinking, in our planning, in our budgetary process between those two tax fields—among many tax fields, really—but the large tax field which is the real property tax and which, let's be realistic about this, is going to remain one of the largest tax fields, if not the largest tax field, in this province for many, many years to come. It is a big amount of money. No government and no minister and no Treasurer are going to say we are going to cut it in half on some happy day and bump up other taxes. It is a big tax field. It must become a more equitable tax field. We are in the process of doing that—Lord knows, taking a long time, Mr. Speaker, but it is being done.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Ten years too late; about ten years too late.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But it must be integrated with the provincial tax system. That is the one great problem which members in this House have talked about time and time again. The second problem is one called "planning." I know of no group which has criticized more than my friends opposite —right opposite—the lack of co-ordination, for example, between the regional development branch and the community planning branch and, I may say, with some justification. There is no question that if there are two areas which need to be put together in terms of integration of planning at the provincial level —

Mr. Sargent: It is one hell of a mess; that's all.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member must have been down there with the provincial secretary. He has a good tan.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — then it must be the relationship between provincial planning at a regional level and local official planning. Those were the conclusions, I think it is fair to say, the Cronyn committee came to. I don't think in fairness and honesty anyone would quarrel with the thrust—I was going to use that word—the thrust of their recommendations. Certainly I couldn't, having served and having had the privilege of serving in both ministries.

There must be an integration at the ministerial level between the two financial areas, the two planning areas—and one could go on —between, if you will, the intergovernmental areas, but particularly, I think, in terms of finance and planning.

There is a third reason, which I think the Cronyn committee has suggested in its reports, and certainly has suggested in their discussions with me and in some of the reasoning they have put forward formally and informally as to why they thought it was necessary to create this new ministry and, that is, that we must keep on the pressure. I say this to myself most of all. I say it to my colleagues, of course, but I say it to myself most of all, we must keep the pressure on the now-to-be Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, to create stronger units of local governments—call them restructured units, call them regional governments, call them whatever you will—to make sure that we have the units of governments there which are capable of carrying out whatever the broad guidelines are which may be laid down at the provincial level.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): As long as the government has the development that goes with it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As long as we have the developments that go with it. But we have a choice.

Mr. Sargent: And regardless of whether the people want it or not, the government is going to do it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My friend from Thunder Bay and I have discussed this before. Do we do it with 900, in many cases fragmented, municipalities or can we do it, better and can more of it be done at the local level if we have stronger units of local government? This is surely one of the reasons. If I was convinced about this a year ago, now I am more convinced, because I have seen from my vantage point as Treasurer the number of things which are being done by the province, and I regret this, because we do not have a properly organized system of local government, a strong system of local government, that is not uniformly strong. We need a strong system of local government to carry out some of the things which we are presently doing at the provincial level, which I don't think it's necessary for us to do. So that's perhaps the third reason which is hinted at in the Cronyn report, but I think it's there.

One of the suggestions which was made, I think, by the member for Ottawa South, in particular—he is not with us this evening—

was that this area was large enough to be a policy field in itself. I must say that that's something that, again, I thought about, and I am told that it is something that the Cronyn committee thought about. I think if one examines the role of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, one would realize that it is not in itself part of a policy field. It cuts across all the policy fields.

As much as anything I think Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs must regard itself and be regarded as a central agency; a central agency in the same way as Government Services perhaps, a central agency in the same way as Management Board, but something which has a job to do, of course, but also has a service role to all the other departments of government, not just to the Natural Resources field, nor just to the Social Development field or the Justice field, but really to each of the policy areas of government. And surely matters such as regional development, regional government, and restructuring of local government, or something which affects really every one of the ministries, do not just affect a policy field. What I'm saying is that I think the Cronyn committee felt—and certainly I would come to the same conclusion—that to put together a policy field in which you would include Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, would in effect include practically every ministry of the Crown. That is, I think, the way the system is designed. We are a service agency to—

Mr. Sargent: But you're not sure.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —each of the policy fields, and we make our input particularly at the policy and priority level, and to the whole cabinet and, where we can, at the policy field level.

Mr. Sargent: Nobody knows what's going on.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is a second reason why it was felt, and I would concur with this, that a policy field could not be created. The concept of the policy fields and of the policy field ministers, now called provincial secretaries, was that they would be lean in their operation. They would be composed of the provincial secretary, the deputy provincial secretary, perhaps two or three staff, and they would use the staff of the ministries within their policy field. They would draw on the staff of the Management Board secretariat. They would draw on the staff of Treasury, Economics, and Intergovernmental. But they would not, in effect, build up staff on their own. And I think you will see when you get into the estimates that the present structure of the provincial secretariats, the three secretariats, reflects that.

That would not be possible, in my view, in terms of a provincial secretariat, if you will, of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs for one reason, and that's the budget. The budget obviously has to be in many respects a personal thing, and as a personal thing I directly call on the advice, as does my deputy, of some 30 or 40 people in the taxation and fiscal policy branch and to some extent on those people who were in what is now economic planning branch, some 20 or 30 people, who, I think, must be personal to the minister, or to the deputy in the budgetary process. Thirdly, and most importantly, we call on the background and the knowledge of those residual people who are now in the—and I can't remember the new title—in the former controller-of-accounts area, those I would call the bookkeepers of the government, the people who ultimately certify to me that the books are in balance.

All this is the basis on which I bring in the budget. That must be personal to both the deputy and, I think, to whoever is the incumbent of the Treasurer's office.

So, unlike the policy fields, where I think they're free to call upon the advice of a great number of people within their policy fields within the central agencies, I would suspect that the number of personal staff, if I can put it that way, people who must be personally responsible to the Deputy Treasurer and to the Treasurer himself, probably number—I'm guessing—100 or 150 people, the people who are intimately related to, or are responsible for the background and the bookkeeping which goes into a provincial budget once a year. Therefore, you would have, not a policy field as COGP has recommended, but rather a different kind of an animal. Therefore, I think they veered away from the policy field for that reason as well.

The third general criticism or suggestion was that there should be a ministry of economics. I say this to my friend from St. David (Mrs. Scrivener), who suggested a ministry of planning and economics—perhaps it was suggested during the course of the debate by one or two others—I think this would be turning the clock back.

In that connection I am going to say something about my present deputy minister, who I think members on all sides of the House would agree is probably one of the finer

economists in Canada today. It was his responsibility five years ago to bring together in this government part of a ministry—the former Department of Economics and Development—to bring it together with Treasury to form Treasury and Economics. And, since the member for York South has been reading some old speeches—I don't think he has to read this particular article, but I will mention it tonight—one of the better articles around for one to read is an article by Ian Macdonald, the Deputy Treasurer, on the marriage of the two departments. That was in the Economic Review three or four or five years ago; and we still send the article out to new people coming into the department, pointing out what we were trying to achieve in that department.

Now, on the extension which we are launching into—what I am saying is I think it would be a mistake to turn back the clock. Let me come back to that in a minute, but the extension which was proposed, and which the government has accepted and which I am endorsing, obviously, is certainly a venture into areas with which we are not completely familiar. They are unchartered waters, if you will.

In the past—let me read some notes—in the past the province's trade and international economic intelligence network, its economic research capability, and the apparatus by which sound economic and financial planning took place at the local level were not sufficiently close. Housing policy, municipal organization, provincial and local taxation—all these responsibilities were in different organizations and yet the separation really wasn't valid.

When one talks about economic planning one is talking about, among other things, industrial location. When one is talking about industrial location one must also talk about sound local government to service the people who work in industrial establishments and the establishments themselves. And clearly one can't talk about people working without referring to the facilities necessary to house them and the overall levels of economic achievement necessary to ensure that they are fully employed.

The new Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs rests on the fact that economic policy in the latter years of the century must be much broader than it has been in the past and that more co-operation between governments, and even departments of the same government, is necessary if coherent economic policies are to be properly executed. Every activity in this new ministry is government wide in impact and must be closely associated with the other central planning groups of the Ontario government.

Many governments—and one thinks particularly of the United Kingdom—have experimented with departments of planning, or departments of economic affairs, or some such similar title, with responsibilities to co-ordinate government-wide action. Those experiments, and I think this is a fair statement, have universally failed because of the lack of leverage supplied by the central position of responsibility for the budget and overall government finance.

In other words—and I hope that we have recognized this in Ontario in that marriage of two departments—economics and finance are inextricably bound together. We like to think that the experiment, now a fact, with Treasury and Economics has been successful. We hope that we will be at least as successful in applying the same principles to urban and municipal affairs and to pull them into the same orbit.

It was interesting today; I went down to the Canadian Club to hear Mr. Turner, federal Minister of Finance, speak on his new responsibilities. I have not got the text here but one of the things that he indicated, and my friend from York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) might confirm this, was that along the way—he did not say this directly but I think this is a fact and I think that most informed observers looking at Ottawa would recognize it, that one of the problems with Ottawa financially, economically, has been that the Ministry of Finance has been simply, if you will, a treasury operation. It has raised taxes; it has had some input, but I think slow, into how the money was spent. It has not worried about economic policies.

My friend from York-Forest Hill knows this all too well, but we have a very powerful Ministry of Transport, for example, at Ottawa. We have, for example, an immensely powerful economic force in the Ministry of Regional Economic Expansion. These are forces which we would like to think are co-ordinated in Ontario because we are a Ministry of Treasury, if you will, and Economics. It was interesting that Mr. Turner said today that he did not think that Ottawa had been as strong in the Ministry of Finance on the economic side as they should be and that they proposed to do something about it.

I refer those brief remarks on this very interesting speech to the members because I think, really, that is what we recognized.

Again, I pay tribute to the former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton); I pay tribute to the former Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) who I think also recognized it as much as anyone and in particular went out and hired one Ian Macdonald who has brought about this marriage. This marriage has not been without its pitfalls and its fights along the way. I'm quite sure that all will not be completely smooth sailing in the years ahead or months ahead in terms of this newer, broader role.

The members opposite have been, as I said, very kind in their remarks. They wondered about the size of the job, the magnitude of the job. I think two things should be pointed out. This is one of the things which frankly I looked at very carefully from the time it became apparent to me that the Cronyn committee were going to recommend, from the time they actually did table their recommendations to the time in December or January when the Prime Minister (Mr. Davis) and the government accepted them. Having no idea particularly what role I might fulfil in that reorganization but I suppose, in fairness, having some idea of what I might be asked to do, I looked at it with more than just a little bit of interest.

Mr. Stokes: Does the Treasurer think anybody else but he could do it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, let me describe —I don't want to use the word "ignorance" but I find a certain—

An hon. member: Lack of knowledge.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —lack of knowledge from a great number of people, until I analyse it myself, about what the Treasurer's job has been. Remember what the Treasurer's job in Ontario has been until the last month and a half. He has been, if you will, Minister of Finance, I think perhaps that's an all-embracing title which I'll come back to. He has been chairman of the Treasury Board, now Management Board. He has been the minister responsible for the civil service. Those latter two jobs, and I think I am being fair about this—Chairman of the Treasury Board and minister responsible for the civil service—I would guess occupied 40 per cent of my time for the last year of my last time in terms of administering a department and being a policy maker, aside from whatever political duties and or personal time I may have had in the last year. But in terms of my governmental time, both within and without the House, I would think it is fair to say that somewhere around 40 per cent of my responsibilities were related to my being minister responsible for the civil service and as Chairman of the Treasury Board, now Management Board.

Those responsibilities now are both gone. I remain a member of the Management Board, but it is not incumbent on me to be there and quite often, frankly, I'm not. I have no further responsibilities for the civil service.

Aside from the Management Board and the civil service, I think we have to appreciate what has been taken out of the two departments, Treasury and Economics and Municipal Affairs. The Prime Minister mentioned the transfer of the reporting relationship of the Ontario Municipal Board from the new ministry to the Ministry of the Attorney General, and the transfer from this ministry to the Ministry of the Attorney General of the assessment review court. This is something which I think is growing in importance; the whole assessment function is being transferred. I think these are good moves by the way, aside from their lessening of responsibility, particularly the transfer of the whole assessment function as we approach market value reassessment across the province.

Government pensions—including, I might say, legislative retirement allowances—are transferred from Treasurer and Economics to the Ministry of Government Services. As for the whole cheque-writing functions—and this took some of my time—as of Saturday last, if someone does not get a cheque, he now phones the Ministry of Government Services rather than the Treasurer's office.

The Racing Commission, which was moved some months ago and occupied some little time of the Treasurer—as it reported through the Treasurer—has been moved. The Pension Commission has been moved, frankly because —Is he here? Yes, the chairman of the Pension Commission is here—because it's a very smoothly working operation that occupies very little time.

Mr. Sargent: Please stand up so we will know him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those are all the things which have been moved. I'm sorry to take all this time, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's important to put some of this on the record.

Aside from those things which have been taken out of the two departments, in particular no longer being the Chairman of the Management Board, the minister responsible for the civil service, I am being assisted by

the appointment of two parliamentary assistants.

The Leader of the Opposition—

An hon. member: They are never around here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Pardon?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): One is acting mayor of Ottawa. They are never around here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, they are doing a great deal, I say to my friend.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you get three or four of them?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The member for Grey-Bruce wants the job.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If I could get them of the calibre of my present two, I would take on three or four more in a minute.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How do you like that?

An hon. member: Real nice fellows.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Leader of the Opposition —

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member for Grey-Bruce was helping you without being coached.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I fell into that, didn't I? Strike that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: A little earlier in the debate the other day, the Leader of the Opposition asked for the responsibilities of my two assistants. There is a memorandum going out to members of the Legislature and to the municipalities in the next few days indicating the structural organization of the new department and indicating the present duties of the parliamentary assistants. This is a changing thing; it will change from time to time. But since the Leader of the Opposition asked, I am pleased to provide this information.

The member for Ottawa South (Mr. Bennett) is presently assisting me in terms of the proposed regional government for the Sudbury area; he has various responsibilities under the Planning Act for what are now called municipal services and formerly were called matters relating to municipal administration, municipal accounting, and the North Pickering new community.

Mr. Roy: He is running the city of Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Roy: He is running the city of Ottawa right now.

Hon. Mr McKeough: Yes, at the present moment he is, and I am sure that he is doing a very good job. And he is managing without the benefit of advice from the hon. member for Ottawa East tonight.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, he is paid better than the minister.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): He is not in the House right now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, he is in Ottawa. He is presently acting mayor, I say to my friend from Essex-Kent. He is not in the House tonight. That is where he is.

Mr. Roy: Where was he yesterday if you say he wasn't in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He was in Ottawa yesterday too, I understand. The member for York East (Mr. Meen)—this is information which your leader asked for—is assisting me with reference to the legislation for the Waterloo regional government, with private bills, with legislation, particularly the Municipal Election Act which will be brought forward very soon to the House, the Municipal Act, the amendments to the existing regional government Acts and the Haldimand-Norfolk study. Both are involving themselves with the municipal liaison committee and those deliberations, with regional development generally and with tri-level consultations. I would simply say that those duties will change from time to time, but presently that is the breakdown of their responsibilities and their assistance to me, which is very great indeed.

I thought I might take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to indicate—and this again will be going out in a letter to the members—the division of responsibilities or the organization of the new department, which the Management Board approved about a week ago. Organization charts aren't perhaps the most interesting things to look at, but perhaps this is a good time to indicate what has happened, though not in terms of the reorganization of the two departments, because it has been approached from the basis of building a new department.

Obviously the minister is at the top of this organization chart and proposes to remain there. Reporting to him are OMERS and

the advisory committee on regional development, chaired by the Deputy Treasurer. Then come the Deputy Treasurer, deputy minister of the department, assisted by a small group, and then four streams, four sections, through the department. I will run through them very briefly and give you some of the names.

There will be three assistant deputy ministers and what is called a general manager administration, the housekeeper—he might not like that title; he isn't appointed yet—but he is the housekeeper of the departmental administration. In the first stream, the first section, is the assistant deputy minister for economic policy and intergovernmental relations. That appointment has been made. It is Mr. Donald Stevenson, whom some of you will be aware of. He is now, as of April 1, an ADM. Reporting to him are two executive directors really, but by other titles. The general secretary for intergovernmental relations and that secretariat which is Mr. Greathed, whom many of you will know. Coming in underneath that will be both the federal-provincial relations secretariat and the—for lack of a better term—provincial-municipal relations secretariat.

I want to stress in terms of the intergovernmental aspects, both up and down if I can put it that way, both federal and local, that we are very much in that instance a service agency. I think the Leader of the Opposition has talked from time to time about that particular secretariat being in the Prime Minister's office as opposed to being in the Treasurer's office. Think how big the Prime Minister's office would be if that had happened, and how much better speeches opposition critics would have had this afternoon. Where they are is not particularly important. We think we know that much of our relationships with other levels of government happens to be financial, and if there is a locus for that secretariat which attempts to serve other departments, other ministries, attempts to co-ordinate our relationships with both levels of government, then perhaps it is as much financial as it is anything else and this new department is the appropriate place for it, but it takes its direction very much from the Prime Minister and from the government as a whole.

Mr. Stokes: Have you appointed somebody for that yet?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, Mr. Greathed.

Mr. Stokes: Who are the two others?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Stevenson, and Mr. Greathed who is the general secretary, intergovernmental affairs secretariat. The two people underneath him for federal-provincial and provincial-municipal are not yet sorted out, or at least not yet appointed.

Mr. Sargent: What are you paying these deputies?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The other stream—

An hon. member: None of your business—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the other stream under Mr. Stevenson is the senior economist, the office for economic policy, which is Mr. Honey, and reporting to him, the economic planning branch and the economic analysis branch, one headed by Mr. Redgrave, who was in taxation and fiscal policy, and the other, the economic analysis branch, headed by Mr. Frank. But Peter Honey is the head of that stream.

The second major division has the assistant deputy minister of Finance. That position has not been filled, and will, in fact, be advertised within the service and outside the service.

Mr. Sargent: Give it to the member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root). He's lost a job.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Immediately under him, and I think this is somewhat interesting, will be a debentures corporation. We have corporations now lending money to universities, to school boards, to municipalities, to the Ontario Water Resources Commission, and over the course—not immediately—of the next few months and perhaps a year, we intend to try to bring these various lending corporations together in a debentures corporation or under one management.

The former assistant deputy minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr. Hickey, will be taking on that responsibility, but probably not for two or three months. He is, and this may be of interest to members of the House, in the process of completing a very lengthy and what I think and I hope will be a very worthwhile contribution to public administration at the municipal level in this province. He has been examining for the last year or year-and-a-half, various forms of local government, boards of control, council manager, city manager and ward systems. I don't think this will be a definitive work, but I think it will be a contribution, and I hope that there will be many more contributions to that particular area of public administration where, quite frankly, I think a lot of research and a lot of

input needs to be made. Mr. Hickey will be completing that assignment and then taking on the debentures corporation.

Underneath the assistant deputy minister of Finance, there are again two divisions, the first, the taxation and fiscal policy division headed by an executive director, which will be Dr. Terry Russell, whom many of you know, whom Mr. Robarts used to refer to as Terry of "Terry and the Pirates" fame. He has been responsible for many of our papers, and he will be assuming a larger role in terms of our taxation and fiscal policy. Under him will be an actual tax and fiscal policy branch, which will be headed by Mr. Duncan Allan; a municipal fiscal development branch integrating that area in with provincial taxation, to be headed by Mr. Al Reeve who was head of municipal accounting, and finally, an emerging area, a grants policy area, to try to bring together some rationale, the grant policy of a whole host of government departments, and to take a look at that whole area, and that will be headed by Mr. Henk Ploeger.

The second stream has executive director of finance policy, Mr. George McIntyre as the executive director, presently the comptroller of accounts. In that area is the securities branch. Members would some day perhaps like to come over and look at our vault, which is on the bottom floor of the Frost building north. You have to sign in and out and clank in and out. I would be glad to take the Leader of the Opposition over there.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I will bring my briefcase.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Come over; there's no money, just securities There is also the finance management branch which is most important. That is the area in which we receive our borrowing advice. It is a very large area. I listened to the remarks of the member for York South earlier this evening about our borrowing. He dismissed—not dismissed, but made light of—the combined problem of Ontario Hydro and the government of Ontario. I am afraid that our borrowing advisors do not dismiss it quite that easily. Ourselves—

Mr. MacDonald: I have talked to share people down on Bay St. They say it is not necessary and I believe them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, it's not the advice they give us. What they look at is the possibility of this government and Ontario Hydro going to the market this year, I suppose, for something approaching $1 billion.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Is the Treasurer going to go here or in the United States?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, that is to be determined, and how much we will go for is to be determined. But let us say together about $1 billion and that amount does not get any less—enormous sums of money.

We are concerned, of course, because—and we have discussed this with both the Bank of Canada and the Minister of Finance—that that kind of money is not readily available in Ontario or in Canada. We have been adhering to the suggestions—a stronger word than that—of the Minister of Finance of Canada. I do not think this is any great secret.

Ontario Hydro has been in the queue twice in New York—the money has been there—and they have been taken out of that queue by the Treasurer of Ontario because we did not think it would be in the interests of the people of Canada in terms of our present problems with the Canadian dollar. I do not know how long we can do that.

Our advice is that there is less pressure on our dollar in borrowing abroad and we will be continuing to explore the European markets. I said before that I think one of the great services which the former Treasurer rendered to this province was opening up new markets, in particular the deutsche mark market and the Eurodollar market.

There are other markets in the Common Market area which should be explored—French francs, Belgian francs, Swiss francs. They are in touch with us from time to time. So far it has not yet been attractive enough, but I think we will be looking to them in the future as a source of funds.

The Deputy Treasurer and I and several others will be going to Japan later on this month. There are strong possibilities that the Japanese market may open to the Province of Ontario, and we intend to take a look at that possibility in the next few weeks. It is an enormous area.

I have digressed. I have only digressed because the member for York South said the problems weren't large. I would like to debate that sometime with him. My advice is that they are large.

Also under that area of what we call financial information is accounting policy, which is the branch which turns out periodic statements to government as to where we stand during the course of the whole year, and relating budget to actual performance and forecasting. For example, the budget is

built on what is now an 11-plus-one statement—11 months actual, one month forecast—and that comes out of that particular branch.

The audit standards branch is responsible for setting audit standards and ultimately recommends to me, and through me to the executive council, which departments, and when, do their own pre-audit and have the provincial auditor do a post-audit only.

The third major stream—and I am taking much too long, Mr. Speaker—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Right!

Mr. Stokes: Let us have some development.

Mr. Sargent: Why doesn't he do something different and not say a lot?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The third major stream is the assistant deputy minister, urban and regional affairs. That position is remaining vacant for the time being. Under him are two executive directors. Urban and regional development is headed by Mr. Eric Fleming, formerly the director of municipal finance. Reporting to him are the regional development branch, headed by Mr. Clasky; the municipal organization branch, a new branch to be headed by Mr. Ron Farrow; the provincial-municipal research and evaluation branch, the post of head of that branch to remain vacant; and the municipal planning and development branch, involved with long-range aspects of community planning, to be headed by Mr. Keith Bain. Then the executive—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the minister got Mr. Palmer in that branch?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I beg your pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the minister got Bill Palmer in that lineup?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Bill Palmer? I will come back to him.

Then there is the executive director of provincial-municipal services, Mr. Don Taylor. Reporting to him are the advisory services branch, to be headed by Mr. Al Butler; the plans administration branch, having most of the functions of the old community planning branch, to be headed by Mr. Milt Farrow; and then regional offices—this is something which is emerging which we would like to get into more—to be headed by Mr. Vince Bozzer, who is in Mr. Palmer's office at present; and the municipal subsidies branch, Mr. Trewin, of whom I think most of you are aware.

Finally, what I described as the housekeeper, to be headed by a name which has never been used before in government but we thought that it was appropriate—the general manager, administration, of the ministry; accounts branch; the personnel branch; the information branch; the law branch; and the systems branch. That is an outline and it is not yet a complete organization chart, obviously. It will be filled in.

Mr. Sargent: The Treasurer must be the smartest man in America.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And we will be getting into—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One of the smartest, just one of the smartest.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Where is Bill Palmer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Bill Palmer?

Mr. Good: He's an advisor to somebody, is he not?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. Bill Palmer has been appointed by the Prime Minister, for I think the next six months, as a senior advisor to the ministry with the rank and status of deputy minister.

Mr. Good: The Premier didn't know what to do with him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Didn't know what to do with him? I knew what I wanted to do with him, which was to advise me for the next three or four months; and that is what Mr. Macdonald wanted to do with him. There is no worry about what to do with one of the most—

Mr. Sargent: He is the best man the Treasurer has.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —capable public servants in this province, one William H. Palmer. He has more than a small job to do and I am particularly delighted, as is my deputy, that he will be advising us for the next three or four months, particularly as the new department is created.

Physically, we would hope that the whole department will be located in the Frost Building, north and south. The Frost Building north is presently vacant because it is being air conditioned.

The first call on the Frost Building, north and south, will be the Management Board secretariat, and the civil service who will occupy part of that space. We would hope

that most of the branches which are coming over from the former Department of Municipal Affairs, plus the branches of Treasury and Economics which are spread out around the city, will, by the fall I would think, nearly all be located in the Frost Building, north and south, along with the Management Board and the civil services.

I don't think that the number of personnel is necessarily a test of how large or small a job is, but it is interesting to note that the Minister of Treasury and Economics, when he was Chairman of Treasury Board and minister responsible for the civil service department, had something like 1,100 employees. I now find that I have something less than 800, which is perhaps some indication of the responsibilities of the new department.

Finally—and I am trying to conclude this—let me say something about the power—that was the word which was used by certain people opposite—the power. Let me make it very clear that—

Mr. Sargent: That's the thing, the minister is drunk with it!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let me make it very clear that the power of the Treasurer and perhaps the Minister of Finance is a more embracing term; perhaps that is the title which the office should hold. But we thought the Treasurer was a fine name. I thought so personally; the Treasurer of Ontario. One would hardly expect a Tory government to change good old names unnecessarily and we stuck with that name. Perhaps finance is a more embracing term. Perhaps if we called it the Ministry of Finance we would not have had to have those three ministries underneath the name; those three sections.

Let us understand what has happened, and I think this is true at Ottawa. I think it is true in the United Kingdom. It is certainly true here. It did not start with me. It certainly started with my predecessor. The responsibilities of a Treasurer, of the Ministry of Finance, used to be much more enormous than they are at present.

I think the day was when the Treasurer, the Chancellor, the Minister of Finance, simply sat down perhaps with his leader and decided what was going into a budget and how it was going to be raised.

They accepted suggestions from time to time, but essentially the budget process which became the programme of work, if you will, for the year, which was laid on the floor through the budget, was essentially something done by the Treasurer.

My predecessor will confirm this. It was done by the Treasurer in this province, I assume, with some consultation perhaps in some areas with his colleagues, and probably most certainly with his leader.

The priority setting, which I suppose is what power is, rested really with the Treasurer; and whether highways spent $10 million more in those days and education $10 less or the other way around was largely a function of the Treasurer and more particularly of the chairman of Treasury Board. That power has gone; gone personally from me and also from the position of Treasurer, whether he was chairman of the Treasury Board or not, because—and I think properly—we have evolved what we now call a Policy and Priorities Board. I have heard my predecessor say the responsibilities for setting priorities are too great for one person. He felt he needed advice and I feel that I need advice.

Mr. Sargent: What did the Treasurer say on page 51 of his statement? Page 51 of the document?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And once I make my input—let me describe very briefly what happened this year. We made our input in the fall as to what we thought an appropriate budgetary deficit or surplus would be, what we thought a cash budget or surplus might be, what we thought would be appropriate for the economy; and we updated that month by month as we went through the budget process. Having established those figures, the Policy and Priorities Board and the whole cabinet had a very large hand in determining what the priorities of government were; whether Highways should get more or less, whether transit should get more or less.

I made my input and I will continue to make my input from the broad economic strategy point of view and from what I—I don't say this in a personal sense—from what my economists and I, in my political judgement, I will say that, think may be good for the Province of Ontario in a given year. But the responsibility which was formerly the Treasurer's, formerly the Minister of Finance's or the Chancellor's in the United Kingdom, is now, and must be in my view, very much a shared responsibility.

So the power of the Treasurer is not—much as I hate to admit it—what the gentleman opposite, Mr. Speaker, might think it was.

The power of the Treasurer in many respects rested with being the Chairman of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Sargent: The whole package is a custom-made job for the minister and he knows it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But the priority setting, and properly so, which was in days gone by perhaps somewhat of a prerogative of the Treasurer, has now become a responsibility into which the Treasurer makes an input to the whole cabinet.

Let me just end by saying this, that the government doesn't look on the third interim report of the Cronyn committee as being the be all and end all. I am sure that in three, four, five, 10 years we will be back making changes in the organization of government, or someone will be. The Leader of the Opposition and I might have gone on to another place.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Maybe thee and not me!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You get there in a hurry; and then with a change in government perhaps I might be summoned to that other place at some point too. We would make a great pair there, I would say in all seriousness.

Mr. MacDonald: They both have delusions of grandeur.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But this House will be debating government reorganization and properly so. Government organization should not stand still. I don't think anyone suggests that in the five bills which the Prime Minister has introduced into the House, the omnibus bill and the other four bills, or particularly in this bill, that we feel we have all the answers.

I am satisfied, and I think the government is satisfied, that we have accepted the concept of the right kind of an organization. I am satisfied that we are trying to put together the right kind of an organization in terms of Bill 29, the new Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. I am satisfied, and I know my colleagues are satisfied, that if it isn't working, if the strain which was referred to on the present incumbent becomes too great the Prime Minister will make changes and recommend to his colleagues, and then to the House, that changes should be made. Then they would—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Send the minister to the other place?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, send me to the other place!

I am sorry that I am not going to be Agent General of Ontario, I was sort of looking forward to keeping that in the back of my mind. So was the Minister of Revenue; we both had our eyes on it—that has now gone.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Maybe the minister could get a job as a colour man on television at the hockey games.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: But something else will turn up.

If the system doesn't work it will be changed. I am satisfied, and I hope I have indicated to the House tonight some of the reasons why, and I hope I have indicated how we are going about achieving what—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —COGP considered and recommended, what the government considered and what the Prime Minister has recommended, which I agree will provide a better service to the government of Ontario; and more particularly will provide better service to the people of Ontario, which, of course, is our common interest in this Legislature.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I certainly don't think the Treasurer should apologize for taking too much of the time of the House in that explanation. I found it quite useful and most interesting to see him in action without simply reading from a more elaborately prepared screed.

He did mention in one of his remarks that it had been my feeling the dealings with the government of Canada in particular should be a secretariat under the Premier, and in his view it didn't really matter where it occurred or where that particular branch existed among the ministries, but since it dealt with money it might as well be under the Treasurer. He also went on to say that the COGP members observed the House and read Hansard.

Just briefly on the second point: One of the things that used to concern us in this House, certainly those of us in the opposition, was what I called in this House the failure of the former Premier to co-ordinate the rather strong predisposition of some of his ministers to go their own way in some areas of substantial importance. The present Treasurer was perhaps the most difficult one for the former Premier to handle along those lines.

I recall the objections to a lack of control over an approach to planning which really,

from this side of the House, appeared to bring two or three of the ministers, if not into an open rivalry at least into an area where they were competing to have their plans accepted by the boss, the Premier. Well, in fact, in my view, that is the way it should be. The Premier is the boss, and must be, if our system of responsible government is going to continue. But if the COGP members were observing the Legislature during those years they no doubt would agree with me and other fair-minded observers that the Premier of the day could not keep his horses in harness. That may be why they felt it should not be associated as a responsibility of the Premiership and should be loaded onto one minister.

It appeared the former Premier somehow could not handle the problem as it was presented to him. I remember that he was well provided with assistance and initiatives. His speeches on Design for Development were good in that direction. The former Treasurer —I want to talk about this briefly in a minute —would stand in his place and say: "I am the planner for Ontario." He seemed to be trying to convince himself of that. But this power he had seemed to be in opposition to some of the planning responsibilities, and I suppose the ambitions, of some of the other ministers.

When it became apparent there were substantial problems in this regard, the Premier went on to establish an interdepartmental committee on the correlation of planning, and he said in his speech on Design for Development, phase one—was it that far back?—that he himself would be Premier of this co-ordinating committee.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Chairman!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Chairman, yes; sorry! And I suppose he expected us all to sit back and sigh and say: "Well, finally we've got some control of these different initiatives in the government." We realized that he was a busy man and it would be impossible for him to take the kind of leadership in that particular committee which in fact would bring Darcy McKeough and Stan Randall into harness.

So it may be that the COGP members were examining the reality of government, and how it appeared in the Legislature, more carefully even than he knew. And they came to the conclusion that since Mr. Robarts could not be criticized, I suppose, even in the innermost recesses of their thought processes, there must be something inherent in the whole matter of planning which meant that it could not be handled under the direction of the chief of the government. Therefore it was all put in one basket, and that is what we are discussing here tonight.

In that connection, in section 4 of the bill —I don't want to refer to a section at any length—where the duties of the Treasurer are set out there is no specific reference to planning at all. In subsection 2 it says:

> "The Treasurer shall exercise general oversight over municipal institutions and their administration and such special oversight and powers in relation thereto as are provided in or under the authority . . ."

I suppose there is a reference there to the statutes, such as The Planning Act, which give the Treasurer the legal right to say now: "I am the chief planner in the province." There is nobody to argue with him any more; Stan Randall has gone to a place he would rather be; there is no longer a Minister of Municipal Affairs and I gather from the rather—I wouldn't say obsequious—let us say co-operative attitude of the Treasurer's colleagues there is nobody over there going to give him much of an argument either.

We have finally a person who has become the planner for the province. Frankly I regret that the bill does not set out this function which in my view is his most important function in the decade that lies ahead.

It may be that after 1975 there will have to be some changes. The Treasurer says he is going to wait until he can view the changes from the security of the Senate or some other safe haven where his advice will filter down through the proper political channels to his successor.

I would predict to you—and I am very good at predicting these things, Mr. Speaker —that he will never get into the Senate. Also I would predict that, really, after the election of 1975 there will have to be a reform in government which in fact splits apart this monolithic ministry.

He has heard me on this before and I don't intend to repeat it. I would agree with the member for Grey South—Grey North? Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent)—the hon. gentleman in the dark glasses—that in many respects the ministry was tailored for the present incumbent.

I believe that COGP looked at the experience that Premier Robarts had in trying to apply some of these responsibilities, intergovernmental affairs at least,, between the government of Canada and his own government, and the whole aspect of planning. It was found there were certain difficulties

experienced by that Premier, which in respect of planning at least were his most serious failure.

I believe that the decision was made, or the recommendation was made by COGP, to put these various responsibilities together because they had seen the experience of the past. I have, as I say, regretted the fact that planning is not more specifically outlined and some limitation put on the planning authority that is now in the hands of the Treasurer of Ontario.

There is one other thing I want to refer to specifically here. That is that in the reorganizational bills which we will be discussing in the next few minutes there does not seem to be any co-ordinated pattern of authority being given to ministers. For example, in this bill the Treasurer is given all of the powers under the Public Inquiries Act for matters relating to his department, in finance and so on. It may be that there is some special need for such powers, but surely those powers are there now on the municipal side and those powers rest with the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

So this simply permits the Treasurer, as formerly it was the responsibility of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to establish an inquiry under The Public Inquiries Act for certain municipalities.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Eastview!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Eastview; Brantford had one?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not under the Public Inquiries Act.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not quite of the level. It occurs to me there is a strange lack of parallel construction. When new departments are organized it would appear there should be similar sections from statute to statute.

Well, Mr. Speaker, our views have been expressed previously on the concept of this department. A promise was made by former Premier Robarts and the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. McKeough) at the provincial-municipal conference that municipalities were going to be upgraded into a new partnership with the government of Ontario. We feel that promise has remained unfulfilled —that in fact the municipalities are now submerged in a department which may have powers which are not seen from the outside. The powers may in fact be circumscribed by the recommendations of the committee and, as seen, by the incumbent.

But certainly without a Ministry of Municipal Affairs it appears that the municipalities have been given a secondary position, which I suppose is consonant with the future of the municipalities. It is going to be difficult, as the Treasurer knows, to get the kind of co-operation that somehow he expects from the municipalities when they are led like lambs to the slaughter.

He would expect, I suppose, that they would line up bleating for an opportunity to be regionalized so that their local taxes could be raised and so that the authority of government could be removed even further from the municipalities themselves. He always looks surprised and shocked that everybody in the province doesn't agree entirely with his vision of a sort of "McKeough-ized" Ontario.

But whether the Treasurer feels he has the power or not, there is no doubt he is going to be the executioner of the municipalities; the list is already prepared. Sudbury has its name on the docket and so has Waterloo. Haldimand and Norfolk were mentioned tonight, and you know and the minister knows, that even though his predecessor backed down on his promise to give a review of local government to the county of Brant, that the new Treasurer has returned to the old approach and we can expect some examination of local government there.

I suppose the only area that is secure is good old Chatham and Kent and there is going to be the feeling that the council upon which the Treasurer sat as a junior councillor is going to be maintained without change. This is sort of typical, I suppose, of the Conservative approach that he has brought forth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: However, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to be in any way personally critical of the Treasurer. I am here simply to say that this particular compendium of responsibilities is too great perhaps not in the consumption of energy and time, but simply in the authority which it wields over so many of the priority decisions of government. There may be a network of committees which will circumscribe this responsibility, but I feel that it is associated with the attitudes expressed by the incumbent in the past, and I for one regret that the reorganization of government is moving forward in this particular style.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the first impulse, on looking at the bill and thinking about the magnitude of the department, is that it would be in the best interests of any of the politicians in the House to vote against it. It seems from looking at it that the function the political head of this department is going to have to perform would be far greater than the majority of people in this House would be capable of undertaking.

I sat during the time that the Treasurer spoke and during the time that the Leader of the Opposition spoke and looked around the cabinet and thought of those who are not here and tried to imagine another minister who might be fitted into the portfolio, who might have sufficient knowledge of the various areas to try to undertake a task as great as the task that is going to confront the Treasurer. And quite frankly, with all due respect to the varying capabilities and abilities of the ministers, I had difficulty of thinking of any other single person with the background and knowledge that would enable him to undertake that kind of job.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: No, I'm not even intending to insult them.

Mr. Sargent: A loser all the time!

Mr. Deans: Being honest, it seemed to me as I looked at it that rather than tailoring a department to meet the obvious needs, we were tailoring a department to meet the abilities of one particular minister of the Crown.

It may be that as the job unfolds and the responsibilities become much more clear, it may not be as great as many of us in this House anticipate that it will be. Maybe the removal of the Treasury Board chairmanship and the OMB functions from the job, and the assessment functions and the civil service, will reduce the two portfolios that previously existed to a point where it can be handled by one minister. But I seriously doubt it.

The Treasurer points out that the functions which he previously handled and which were handled by his predecessor were considerably greater and more onerous. The function of looking after the civil service and taking care of the chairmanship of the Treasury Board were functions that took a considerable amount of his time in the past year and a greater degree of time from his predecessor. Yet when I think of the Department of Municipal Affairs and I think of the job that has yet to be done in that department, when I think of the relationships between municipalities and the province and the fact that municipalities are continuously complaining about the inaccessible nature of the bureaucracy at Queen's Park and how they dislike speaking to civil servants when they want to get to the political head of the department, I'm convinced the majority of municipalities in the province of Ontario will be extremely upset in the course of the next year or two as they strive to get through all of the red tape and past the parliametary assistants in order that they might speak to the minister who is the person who is going to make the ultimate and final decision.

Mr. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): It is almost impossible now!

Mr. Deans: It has been difficult. The member for Huron-Bruce says it's almost impossible now. It has been difficult over the past years for municipal authorities and responsible officials to get to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It hasn't been impossible, but it's been difficult.

They've had to wait considerable lengths of time in order to sit down and discuss the matters which are of most concern to them with the minister who will make the decisions. I can't help feel that with the added responsibility of the Treasury, with the responsibility for the relationship between this government and the federal government added on, and with the emphasis that will have to be placed in that area in the next year or two as we try to iron out the fiscal problems of the province in relationship to the federal government and in relationship to the municipal governments, the Treasurer is going to find himself overburdened.

I listened to him carefully. It is obvious he has given a great deal of thought to this, to whether or not the amount of work that is going to be thrust upon him by this department is more than he is capable of handling. I strongly suspect the Treasurer, no matter how much work he was asked to do, would never agree that it was more than he could handle. I suspect that he thinks he has a capacity for carrying out functions of government far greater than those which would over-burden another.

Nevertheless, I'm convinced that it's going to be a task far, far greater than most people in this House recognize. I'm convinced that looking after such things as the setting of the budget, looking after the priorities in fiscal areas, trying to negotiate the kinds of equitable arrangements sought in financial matters and then looking after the day-to-day

operations of his department, together with the relationship with the municipalities, will be more than one person could reasonably expect to undertake.

Nevertheless, having said that, that's my view, I think he's wrong. I think the Treasurer is wrong in saying he agrees with this. It's going to come about whether I support it or not. It is going to happen. My opposition to it would be simply on the basis of what I happen to believe is the reasonable capacity of any individual person.

So I am prepared to say we'll have to give it a chance because it is going to occur; and when it occurs we will then be able to assess it with some degree of knowledge as to how he has been able to handle the job.

But I do suggest that were the present Treasurer to move on to the Senate, as he says he may do some day, it would require the Premier of the province to change the department in order to fit it to the abilities of the people who are presently in the House and willing to undertake the job.

I don't think this is a job for one man. I happen to think we will do this province a disservice. But since I know it is going to occur, I am prepared now to wait and watch, leaving with them the warning that I think they are making a mistake.

I think the functions that are now going to be within the jurisdiction of the Treasurer are far too large, far too diversified. I think, in fact, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs should have remained, that his function may well have been considerably different from what he did previously.

Mr. MacDonald: Heavens, they leave the Solicitor General with a job to do by himself. That is make-work of the most major proportions.

Mr. Deans: But I honestly believe that in terms of the Revenue Department, if I can use it as an example, I failed to see in years gone by the need for the splitting off of Revenue. Up until now with the reorganization—and the previous Revenue Minister is here—I often wondered what the purpose was of splitting off Revenue from the Treasury Department in the first instance. I often wondered what there was in the way of a department that the Minister of Revenue had that was of particular value and required an individual department to administer.

I think that if one takes a look at all of the other departments of government, the functions they perform and the responsibilities they have in the main are considerably less in total scope than the responsibilities that are being thrust upon the Treasurer, in looking after perhaps the two largest areas of responsibility of government.

Whether or not the Treasurer is capable of handling it is simply a matter of personality and personal ability. But I don't believe the department itself is sufficiently manageable to allow for the kind of citizen participation, the kind of access from the municipalities and from other leaders in the province of Ontario and across the country to the political head that there has to be. I don't think it is possible, with a department that size, with all of the many diverse responsibilities within the department, ranging all the way from planning on the one hand to decision-making with regard to the administration of taxes on the other.

I don't believe it is possible, to provide, in addition to those administrative functions, an access for the public to this department and to the department head. I think the minister will be so tied up and so far removed that his parliamentary assistants will become his access to the public, and the public itself will rarely if ever get to the Treasurer other than by television or a prepared speech.

Frankly, I feel it is an error that this government has even contemplated doing this, but I don't believe that simply to go through the motions of voting against it at this time would be of any particular value.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: But they voted for it last week.

Mr. Deans: No we didn't!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, having worn a municipal hat for many years I think I speak with some knowledge of the fear of local government people about what is happening at the provincial level. My concern is that the architects of this bill, the commission that drafted these wide powers, have never been elected people. They have never had to work in the area of the science of government as it were—

An hon. member: And they never would be elected!

Mr. Sargent: No, never would! It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that if they wanted to do something meaningful for people of Ontario who cannot reach government at all,

they could review the commission setup to make commissions responsible to the people and not to this Legislature—then they would have done something positive.

It is most important. Of the many scores of boards and commissions we have, none is responsible to the people any more. We are getting sick and tired of having to deal with arrogant civil servants.

Some time ago I met a top level member of the Conservative Party and he told me that the top civil servants laugh at members of Parliament. They just deride us. And as far as cabinet ministers are concerned, they mean nothing to them either.

Over the years I have been in this House I have gone into meetings with ministers and top civil servants. On occasion I have had the minister going along with me on a suggestion, but the civil servants have said: "No, we don't do it that way." It's a shocking thing to me, when I represent people. When I ran my council no one in my department in the city hall would tell me what to do. In this area of government we have top civil servants who run this show and the members over there, are only puppets, other than the Treasurer.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now he has the audacity to tell me he doesn't have any powers under this bill. Why Mr. Speaker, this bill is the most dangerous thing to democracy we have ever been presented with here in Ontario.

The power to tax is the complete power, the power to destroy. He has the complete power here now; everything, the whole ball of wax. He has it here in Queen's Park. The government sets the assessment, collects the taxes. What else does the Treasurer do here? He has the complete economic set up here; he has intergovernmental affairs; he controls everything—that one man! And he says that he does not have too much power.

He goes on in this document here—I will come back to it. I have had a chance to look at the meaty parts of it and there are about 100 pages. I see on page 51 he outlines he is going to need $600 million more this year than last year—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): No wonder he wants the taxing powers.

Mr. Sargent: —to balance the budget, so we get a $600 million deficit. He says, in the last but one paragraph:

> Given these financial realities, I concluded that a cash deficiency of $1,151 million was beyond the limit of the province's financial manoeuverability for the coming fiscal year.
>
> Accordingly, the government set itself a target budgetary deficit of about $600 million, and overall cash requirements as close as possible to $1 billion. After the government maximized restraint in its spending programme, I was obliged to look to our revenue sources to reach this objective. Given the target budgetary deficit, I decided to raise at least $130 million in additional revenue.

Now we have over a $5 billion deficit. This man, who was an alderman on the council in Chatham, has all this knowledge and know-how to run this big operation, to bring in a bill he tailored himself. He tells us his buddies on the Cronyn Committee devised it. That is a lot of hocus-pocus. He wrote the requirements or the outline of the bill or the specifications of what he would be and what he wanted to run this operation. Don't try and kid me about that! I have been in this business a long time.

The dangerous thing about this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, is that there is no parallel in the North American continent of people—friends of the government at top level, business tycoons—drafting what our framework of government should be in Queen's Park to give special powers to fewer people, to four or five people. We are a democratic society here; 117 people to represent eight million people to run this show, and four or five people run the show themselves. I think it is dangerous.

Has the government taken a parallel of 50 states in the United States to find how they run their administration? Have they found out how much this is going to cost us? Have they any idea what the organization is going to cost? Is it going to cost us $20 million to reorganize this?

No one knows. The confusion is beyond belief.

The other day I asked the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Bernier): "Leo, what the hell is going on in my area? Are you going to walk in and take 90,000 acres of land from our people and not let them know about it?" He said: "We are not going to take 90,000; we are going to take about 200,000 acres." And I said; "You have to be kidding." He says, "No, I am not. That is our programme." I said; "Who made the decision?" He said: "My boss is Mr. Bert Lawrence." So I asked the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) about it and he says; "Well, I really do not know what is going on."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: And I said; "When will you know what is going on?" I like the provincial secretary and I said: "Bert, I trust you. I ought to have an answer. When I get back from my holidays I want to have an answer for my people."

He says—and I think I am not speaking out of school—he says; "I do not know; I am concerned about it. I will try to have the answer for you when I get back."

So here we have a multi-million-dollar area of land, the greatest tourist area in all of Ontario—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): The second greatest!

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Third greatest!

Mr. Sargent: —the Bruce peninsula, being taken over. The greatest playground for all those American people down there coming up to use our area; and it is going to be taken over holus-bolus by the man just sitting down. He just does not know what is going on.

I am concerned about that fact. We know that the government is going to have enough votes to get this through. We know it is going to be law. But I think the shakedown period may last two or three years.

The mess that the assessments are in across Ontario, the subdivision mess at every level, was caused to a large degree by this man who sits here. He is the biggest hot-shot I have ever heard of. He knows all the answers to everything. And I think it time that he knew that we know what he is trying to do. The feature story in the Globe and Mail tonight is that the Premier says he will continue to use official planes regardless of what the opposition says. The arrogance of this group over here!

Mr. Deans: What discussion is this?

Mr. Sargent: Last year I would go down to the Island Airport to pick up my plane which I own and the bank helps me pay for, and I would see the government—Darcy and the boys—come down there. They would sit back, and they would not pay the dime to cross as I did; and they had to have the big limousines go across onto the ferry to ride 100 yards; sit there smoking their big cigars in the back of the limousine. They drive the limousine up to the plane and load the booze from the car into the plane, and I got concerned about who all these people were having these joy-rides during the weekend.

I asked in the House, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier said, well, he would put it on the order papers and he would answer it. So I asked a number of times about the log book and who were the people using these government planes for weekend jaunts.

Now, this was a bit embarrassing before an election. I could not get any answer, and I still can't get any answers. I am going to tell the minister that every time he uses a government plane for private use, or for people who are not on government business, he is going to hear about it in this House, because that is not the way to use taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would find this a convenient time to move the adjournment.

Mr. Sargent: I will conclude by saying that there is no parallel that I know of—I read a lot of American papers—in American government where they have asked outside people, those in business, to set the framework for the democratic process.

Mr. Renwick moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, does the House leader intend to continue with legislation on Thursday, and has he any information on when we will begin the discussion of the estimates?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs): On Thursday we will continue with the bills there are with regard to reorganization, that is Bills 28, 30, 31 and 34.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 4, 1972

Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. MacDonald 829

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Handleman, agreed to 839

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, bill to establish, Mr. McKeough, on second reading 839

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Renwick, agreed to 856

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 856

No. 23

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 6, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Our guests today in the east gallery are students from Ridgetown District High School of Ridgetown, and in the west gallery students from the J. S. Woodsworth Senior Public School of Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to inform the House that distribution is taking place this week of a new publication by the Ministry of Education which gives details of over 3,000 teaching and learning aids which have been written, edited or produced in Canada by Canadians.

The publication is called Canadian Curriculum Materials and its objective is to help teachers select classroom aids which reflect a Canadian viewpoint.

Over 3,000 books, films, filmstrips, recordings and other materials are described, all of which have been evaluated by the Ministry of Education and judged suitable for use in Ontario schools.

This publication represents the first major effort in this country to catalogue in one convenient source a wide selection of purely Canadian teaching and learning aids. The range of such materials has been expanded in recent years and we look for further expansion in the immediate future.

It is our hope that as this trend continues we shall see the further development of Canadian produced materials, not only about Canada itself but about other countries and curriculum areas as well. As Canadians, Mr. Speaker, we view things somewhat differently than, for example, Americans or citizens of other countries.

I think that teaching materials developed in Canada should reflect these different perspectives.

We would like to encourage the increased use of high quality Canadian materials in our schools and to this end we are sending a copy of the new publication to each teacher in the province. The plan is to issue a revised and updated edition each year. This will be facilitated by the computerized methods which have been used to compile and produce the first edition.

Incidentally, the new publication, Mr. Speaker, is bilingual in that it includes materials in both English and French for use with Anglophone and Francophone students. While it hasn't been distributed today to all the members of the House, if anyone would like to have a copy we would be happy to supply them with one.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement concerning the town of Mattawa. As reported in last Saturday's Globe and Mail, the Weyerhaeuser company has announced the closing of its plant in Mattawa.

The company has given notice to its 127 employees that the final day of operation will be June 30 next. Each employee received a letter from the president of the company in which the contributing circumstances were outlined.

Some three weeks ago the details of the Mattawa situation were thoroughly discussed in a meeting I had with the president of the company. Prior to that particular meeting, there had been many discussions aimed at finding a solution to the company's problems.

Basically, the situation is one in which the mill in question is quite old. Perhaps of greater significance is the fact that the company has always utilized yellow birch as its major species. The supply of veneer quality logs is extremely tight due to both a dwindling supply and the high level of demand.

The company during the past year or two has attempted to streamline its operations, and as well has carried out experiments utilizing other species. None of these efforts have proved sufficiently successful to permit the company to continue to operate.

At the same time as we have been working with the Weyerhaeuser company, we are also working with the Sklar Furniture company. Sklar is a company with plants in Cobourg,

Hanover and Southampton, which is interested in manufacturing wood components for its furniture operation.

Adequate supplies of the quality of hardwood—lower than those required for Weyerhaeuser, but suitable for this process—have been identified and are in the process of being made available to the Sklar company. At the same time, the federal Department of Regional Economic Expansion has made a grant of some $275,000 to assist the Sklar company to build the first stage of its complex. This will be a hardwood sawmill employing some 40 people and expected to be in operation late this fall. There will be another 40 employees in the woods operations.

The second stage of the complex is a hardwood dimension plant tentatively scheduled for construction in 1973. The wood supplies for the Sklar facility will come from the areas licensed previously to Weyerhaeuser, Consolidated-Bathurst and the Howard Smith company. Part of the Howard Smith licence lies within Algonquin Park.

However, it should be pointed out that portions of the former Howard Smith licence have been withdrawn in the interest of Algonquin Park. It should also be pointed out that the use of the timber from this area is fundamental to the establishment of the Sklar enterprise. The Sklar facilities will not pick up all the unemployment resulting from the Weyerhaeuser closure. However, it is fortunate to have this facility being established and providing employment opportunities in this area.

Monday's Toronto Sun carried an article condemning the government for the continuing rape of Algonquin Park. It was stated that this situation would result from the establishment of a new complex in Mattawa. What in fact the Algonquin Wildlands League is advocating is that the area in question not be licensed, which in turn would mean that there would be no future employment opportunities in the town of Mattawa.

It seems to me that we must strike a reasonable balance between the use of publicly owned forest for recreation and for the generation of employment. While it may be appropriate for the Wildlands League to support nothing but recreation in Algonquin Park, one cannot ignore the significance of forest-based employment, not only in this part of the province but in the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he received a report of the proceedings of the standing committee on resource development, either from the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) or the chairman, or from any other source.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I have had this morning just a very brief discussion with the Minister of Labour and, of course, I have read the press reports of the activities of the committee yesterday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Would the minister agree with me and with what has been expressed by other members of the committee that, in fact, these hearings are a travesty of justice and that in fact, the type of evidence—if it must be called that—that is being offered, should be heard only by a judicial committee or with a judicial base. Is he further aware that because of the nature of the committee dealing with natural resources, there are no people learned in the law on the committee at all, and no legal advice is provided either to the committee or to those whose reputations are certainly being put before the public in its hearings? Would he not, therefore, consider that a royal commission investigation should be instituted at an early time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Labour indicated yesterday that some consideration was being given. I, personally, after reading the reports, particularly of yesterday's committee meeting and in the brief discussions I had this morning, am not happy with—not with what is being said by any of the people involved necessarily at the committee hearings; I wouldn't comment on that—but the structure or the way it is developing, and this is no criticism of the committee. The government is giving some thought to this and I shall have something further to observe, I believe, by Monday.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): A supplementary question: Would the Premier agree that the criticism, rather than at the committee, is at the whole committee structure; that, in fact, the structure of committees in the Legislature has been proved by this fiasco to be totally inadequate—for this kind of hearing?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into that discussion this after-

noon at all. There will be opportunities for that. One might also argue with the same editorial comment, Mr. Speaker, as the member has expressed, that this could be an exception to what has been the traditional pattern of the functioning of the standing committees of this House.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The Premier is perfectly right. The government is going to have to rethink this thing. It is going to have to do something of some kind.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It was an effort to be serious; it was impossible. That is what happened.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I say, I am not going to get into that type of discussion here today. I do not think it is the occasion for it. I have stated that I myself am not content with the way it is being done—and this is not a criticism of the committee; I say that sincerely, Mr. Speaker—and I shall have something further to observe on Monday.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary question. I wonder—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has a supplementary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Premier if he will lay down some guidelines as to the use of transcriptions either by written or electronic tape recorders, and the rights of the news media to report this kind of meeting; and secondly, if the Premier will provide some guidelines as to a written record taken down by the legislative Hansard staff so that we may have a complete and accurate record of proceedings such as these.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be presumptuous for me to lay down guidelines in any personal way. Whatever directions are given to the standing committees of this House are given by the members of this House, and I am sure the hon. member must appreciate that. Anything that is done in this regard, will have to be done by the total membership of this House. So, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The Premier should have been there yesterday.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier would have been appalled at what happened.

Mr. Reid: Provide a little leadership.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —it's something else that came to my attention—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): And who were the guiding lights in that appalling conduct?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: You tried to cut it off.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: You may not have been a member of the committee but you were interjecting every five minutes. Disgraceful conduct on your part.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You should have been there.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I was there.

Mr. Lewis: What are you talking about?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You were there for only about 20 minutes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that any observations that I made—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You weren't there at the beginning.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I was there at the end and I heard him.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): At the beginning?

Mr. MacDonald: He tried to save you from your own disaster.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —related to the functioning of the committee would contain some references to the question of transcripts or reporting and the involvement of the media at those committee meetings.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I have a question of the Premier, by way of supplementary. Can he assure us that his Provincial Secretary for Justice, who likes to talk a lot in this House, or his Attorney General (Mr. Bales), is doing something today, this very minute, about the allegation of perjury in an affidavit used in this whole matter? Will he give us that assurance now, that something is being done by that department?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things being considered and I

can assure the hon. member for Sarnia that these matters have not escaped the attention of the government.

Mr. Bullbrook: His answer is he cannot assure us at all that anything is being done. He cannot assure us, isn't that it? He can sit there and bark back at the opposition but his department is doing nothing.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: The opposition hasn't heard enough barking. Just stick around.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Can the Premier assure the House that the terms of reference of any judicial inquiry that he may appoint will come to the House before the inquiry is, in fact, constituted?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite obviously, Mr. Speaker, I can give no such assurance because we are dealing with a hypothetical situation—

Mr. Lewis: It's not hypothetical.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The question asked by the hon. member is related to a decision to have a royal commission, which decision has not been made.

An hon. member: Yet.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It has not been made.

An hon. member: Yet.

Mr. Deans: It should have been made.

Mr. Lewis: By Monday it should be made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Not necessarily.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary of the Premier: In view of his statement this morning, or this afternoon, that he is considering a judicial inquiry—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't say that.

Mr. Roy: Well, the Premier is considering a royal commission or something.

Mr. Deans: The Minister of Labour definitely said he was considering—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Roy: In view of this statement, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the fact that serious allegations have been made against the then Minister of Labour and now the chief law officer of the Crown, the Attorney General of this province, does he not think that possibly there is a conflict of interest in having the Attorney General hold a judicial inquiry when he might well be a witness at this inquiry?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, not being present at the committee and recognizing the member for Ottawa East is very knowledgeable in matters of the law, I would only observe that from what I have read there have been no serious allegations made against the present Attorney General of this province and the former Minister of Labour.

Mr. Lewis: In fact, the chief witness spent all his time praising him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ACTION ON ALLEGATIONS AT WCB HEARING

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice. Since he was present at the hearings yesterday, is he going to use his important and high office to implement some special action on the allegations that affidavits were falsely taken in the Workmen's Compensation Board or is he prepared to sit back and allow that to drift past?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: It's already been indicated to the House and especially to the Leader of the Opposition that government action in this field will be known in due course.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's pretty weak for a person who is as critical as the minister is.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: That is terrible.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary: Has the Provincial—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: What is the Liberal leader trying to do?

Mr. Speaker: Has the member for Scarborough West a supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister gave no answer.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I did indeed.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister doesn't know what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Come, come!

Mr. Lewis: Has the Provincial Secretary for Justice, or the Attorney General—either of them—been in touch with Mr. Cauley since yesterday's hearing to produce the documents he alleged were perjured and to pursue it from there?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: Have any of the law officers of the Crown been dispatched to that end?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: If the question is being directed to me, I couldn't tell the member.

Mr. Lewis: I redirect it to the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: I redirect it to the Attorney General.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary of the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Scarborough West still has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: I am redirecting that question to the Attorney General then, by all means.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let's find out.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, those certain allegations were made yesterday by Mr. Cauley before the standing committee of this House. As those meetings are going to resume next Wednesday the chairman and the members of the House can call for papers and other matters. When the hearings are complete in reference to that matter—certainly note has been taken of all statements being made there—the matters will be dealt with. It is not proper to remove those matters from that committee at this point in time.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was the first objective that we had.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do we understand from the Attorney General that as chief law enforcement officer of the Crown he was able to sit yesterday before a committee of this Legislature, hear an allegation of perjury and not instruct anybody today to investigate it at all? Is that what he is saying? Secondly, is he saying in effect that the matter is sub judice and as a result of that he has no right to take any further action, that it is vested within this House?

Hon. Mr. Bales: I don't say that at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then what has he done about it?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Now, just a minute.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister has done nothing.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Don't blow your stack—

Hon. Mr. Bales: There is a hearing proceeding before the standing committee of this House. That hearing should continue and when that phase of it is completed, the law officers of the Crown can take action in reference to the matters, but there should—

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of further supplementary—

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Let the minister finish.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the minister saying he can't take action—

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The member is like a yo-yo.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The submission made by the hon. Attorney General is exactly in accord with the ruling I had made a few days ago, that as long as this investigation, or inquiry, or whatever you might wish to call it, is taking place before the standing committee as I indicated at that time it is my opinion that the sub judice rule would apply.

I have permitted questions today up to this point and its seems to me that the matter can continue as a debate if we permit it to continue as a debate. I reiterate my ruling of the other day that no further questions should

be taking place in this chamber until the committee hearing the Workmen's Compensation Board matters has completed its investigation and hearings in that particular respect. As I indicated again when I made my ruling the other day, if after the inquiry, or investigations, or hearings had been completed, and after action is or is not taken, further questions might then possibly be in order in this Legislature. But until such time, at this point I simply reiterate my previous ruling.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I am in no way challenging your ruling, sir. I abide by that and respect it. The question I had put was whether anything had been done by any law enforcement officer in connection with the allegation of perjury yesterday before the committee. Most respectfully, that has nothing to do with the sub judice rule. Surely to goodness it is manifest that the investigation of an alleged crime can take place whether a matter is before a committee or not?

Mr. W. Hodgson: The member is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, without in any way wanting to enter into a debate with the hon. member, it would seem to me that his points may be quite valid, but the hearings have not been completed. At such time as they have been completed the matters may be taken up.

Mr. Lewis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. With great respect, without pursuing the matters of the inquiry in this House, the question which is being raised is, allegations of criminality having been made, surely the hon. members then have a right to ask the Attorney General whether he is pursuing it, quite independent of what may occur at the tribunal next week, or the week after, although it should never be constituted in that form again? That is simply what is being asked of the Attorney General.

Is the Speaker contending that an allegation of a criminal act remains purely an allegation, that the presentation of perjured documents, allegedly perjured documents, remains such, indefinitely—six months, a year, longer perhaps—while the committee meets on successive Wednesdays? That would be to reduce the law to an ass, and one is right in asking the Attorney General whether or not he will pursue it.

Mr. Speaker: And other witnesses may also appear before the committee to reply to the allegations, so until it has been completed it is sub judice.

Mr. Lewis: It doesn't alter the allegation though.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has further questions?

REPORT ON COSTS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. Is he familiar with a report that was produced by the former Treasury Board, now Management Committee of government, with the assistance of his department, setting out means whereby the costs of post-secondary education might be controlled and reduced? And is he further aware that the recommendations in that report, dated December, 1971, have been followed closely by the recommendations of the Wright report, and it is evident that there is an exchange of information between those two groups of figures and investigation in this matter?

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the report of the Treasury department. This was strictly an advisory report indicating certain guidelines that may be followed in the months or years ahead in compiling the estimates and expenditures of my department. The second part of the report, as the member says, was issued in December.

There is really no indication, or definite indication shall we say, that the recent budget statement in any way followed any of the suggestions in that report, nor is there any strict analogy between the Wright commission interim report and the latest budget statement.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Can the minister indicate what background material was used by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and surely the Minister of Colleges and Universities, in taking the decision to increase tuition by an average of $100, and in this way gaining $23 million in income for the province?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the hon. member knows, one of the duties certainly of the Treasury Board, and now the Management Board is to plan in advance. The items that were contained in the recent budget statement were items that have been

considered for at least four, five or six months as possible sources of revenue. The Treasury Board's report really concentrates more on future ways of cutting the spiralling rise of education costs and post-secondary education costs. As I say, there should be little emphasis on the fact that there is a direct connection between the suggestions in that report and what has, in fact, taken place in the budget for the present fiscal year. I think it's natural for the Treasury Board and I think is its responsibility, to look at ways to plan expenditures for all departments. If the hon. member will look at that report he will see that nearly all other departments are also considered in the summation and conclusions of that report. It is really for the assistance of the Committee on University Affairs and for the officials of my department.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the minister undertake to table the Treasury Board report, since I believe it's going to be printed in the university teachers' publication very soon? That's where I heard about it. Further to that, can he indicate whether or not there is anything in any of those reports which would lead him to say to the students from Western university that there were resources within the university itself to prevent the increase in tuition, even though the government was going to withhold its support?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if the report is to be tabled it would be tabled by the Treasurer, because it is a Treasurer's report.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may: Is it not true, in fact, that this report, which indicates careful tallying on the net financial effects of a $100-fee increase for students at university, compiled in November and December, 1971, laid the groundwork for the budget; was the report on which the Wright commission was based; that the Wright commission is now engaging in an entire sham episode on anything dealing with the financial affairs of universities or students, because the Treasury Board had made a series of policy decisions well in advance, and that, by and large, the government is throwing $1.3 million down the drain for that commission, because all the material is already prepared?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The answer would be no. One of the items of information to which the hon. member refers is the amount of revenue of a $100-increase in fees. I think if he looks at the detailed report he'll see a scale of what $50 would mean, or what $400 would mean. And, also with regard to his reference to the Wright commission report in relation to the Treasury report, the interim report of the Wright commission certainly was printed, or went to the printers, before the submission was made by Treasury to the Committee on University Affairs. The Treasury report deals with financing. I think if he'll look at the Wright report he'll see that it is quite different from the actual Treasury suggestions as far as student fees are concerned, and the student loan programme.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all!

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, sure! The Wright report indicates much higher fees, really, than the Treasury Board recommends.

Mr. Lewis: It is just suggested in stages. One last question, by way of a supplementary: Does the minister agree, as the Premier did not, with the Treasury Board's submission that "in general, a substantial fee increase would tend to act as a deterrent and cause shift to further part-time study?"

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'm glad the member added the Premier's comment.

Mr. Lewis: I wanted to bail the minister out before he stepped in.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Thank you. It all depends, Mr. Speaker, on what you mean by a substantial increase. I don't think there's any doubt that, if there is a substantial increase in tuition fees and there is not a corresponding assistance under some sort of a student aid or a student award programme, it would act as a deterrent, but certainly, in my opinion, the recent increase in tuition fees should not, in fact, act as a deterrent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, but it will. It minister is unrealistic.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? If not, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

STUDY OF LAYOFF IMPACT ON PROVINCIAL GRANTS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Has the Ontario Department of Labour been conducting a careful study of the layoff and shutdown situation in Ontario with a view to ascertaining the impact of various provincial grants, performance loans, etc., on that pattern of shutdowns and layoffs?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, as he knows, we have the manpower services branch which is very active in this field. With the staff we have available I can assure him that in every instance they do co-operate with industries which are just about to give us notification of a layoff or a termination of employment. So, there is co-operation there, and we do co-operate as well with the federal government, the manpower consultative branch. We work very closely with it.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister aware of a particular study in his department seeking the effects of the performance loan programme on the pattern of layoffs and shutdowns in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this, I imagine, is being done to a certain extent at the ministerial level, because both ministers come under the resources development policy field.

LICENCE TO FIRM SUPPLYING GUARDS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question I think it would be appropriate to put to the Provincial Secretary for Justice, since I think he was involved in this initially: Does he know what has happened to the various applications for licence submitted by Canadian Driver Pool and its various other subsidiaries, allegedly involved or involved in the provision of guards and similar security services?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: I was involved in that originally, but lately it has passed beyond my purview. I believe the Attorney General is in a position to answer that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: May I redirect then, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I advised the speaker today that I had an answer for the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) who had previously asked that of the Provincial Secretary for Justice.

Mr. Lewis: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Bales: The question was asked in December of last year. It concerned an application for a licence under the name of Canadian Specialized Services to supply private investigators and security guards for the public. That was submitted to the department by a Richard A. Grange in June, 1971, and was withdrawn on Oct. 19, 1971.

At that time, charges of conspiring to effect an unlawful purpose were laid against Mr. Grange and a Constable Barry Chapman of the Metropolitan Toronto police force. They were convicted under section 423 of the Criminal Code on Mar. 28. Yesterday Messrs. Chapman and Grange were each sentenced by His Honour Judge Moore to a fine of $500, or, in default of payment, to 30 days' imprisonment.

The applications that I referred to originally were withdrawn. My understanding is that they have never been resubmitted.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister report, please, now that the date has passed for licence renewal, and so on, on the state of licensing of any company that comes close to that name, such as, not just Canadian Specialized Services, but Canadian Specialized Security at the moment, and another couple of companies which seem to be indirectly involved in providing private investigators and security guards—companies like Metro Car Leasing and Intercontinental Leasing?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that on Oct. 21 an application for a licence was received by Canadian Specialized Security. The directors of that firm were entirely different from the directors in the other firm. They have stated that they had nothing to do with the original request or with Canadian Driver Pool, but that was being investigated.

In February of this year, a new application for a licence under the name of Canadian Specialized Security Ltd. was filed. There was a sworn affidavit by the applicant that he was the sole owner.

Mr. Lewis: What was the name of that applicant?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The name of the applicant was James K. McEwan.

Mr. Lewis: Wasn't that name on the original Canadian Driver Pool application?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Just a minute, if I may, Mr. Speaker. I will just check that in my notes. No, I cannot answer that question at the moment as to whether it was on the original application. No, the name I have for the original application was Richard A. Grange.

Mr. Lewis: That is all?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is the name as I have it, yes. I have no further name. It is my understanding that it is the only name on the application. If there were other names, I was not aware. I was advised there was only one name.

Mr. Renwick: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Will the Attorney General give consideration to appealing the sentence that was imposed yesterday in order that a more appropriately heavy sentence will be imposed in that case?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the statement of His Honour Judge Moore when he gave sentence but I'll obtain that, and I'll also consult the Crown attorneys in reference to it.

I might point out though that the penalty for the offence under section 112 of the Telephone Act is only a fine of not more than $50 or imprisonment for 30 days, or both, whereas the penalty under the section under which they were charged is substantially higher.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, by way of a further supplementary question, will the minister not give consideration to the fact that the inconclusive state of the penalties imposed for that serious intrusion upon privacy are inadequate and may have affected the judge's decision as to the severity of the penalty which he should have imposed?

Hon. Mr. Bales: We have said before that they are inadequate, but it comes under the Criminal Code. I'll obtain the information from His Honour Judge Moore.

Mr. Lewis: A last supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister undertake to investigate the activities of these firms—many of which are, in the minds of some, interrelated and demonstrably interrelated—allegedly involved in professional strike-breaking in Ontario which the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton) finds "abhorrent"?

And may I ask, Mr. Speaker, through you to the Attorney General, whether, if he finds Specialized Security and these other services which are similarly engaged in these activities have similar ownership, will he conduct an inquiry with a role to abolishing such activities?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The investigation has been proceeding for some time.

Mr. Lewis: Oh. When will the Attorney General be able to give us the results of the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: When I have the final information on it.

Mr. Lewis: Does the Attorney General have a time?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Well, I hope to have it soon but it's important to find the result of this case before the courts.

FOREST MANAGEMENT POLICY FOR ALGONQUIN PARK

Mr. Lewis: Well, it's over.

One last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Natural Resources. Why is the minister making forest management policy for Algonquin Park, when the advisory committee on Algonquin Park, which is constituted, hasn't met, I believe, since the election? Am I right? It hasn't met for the last six months or more and the minister is now making policy decisions involving a very major use of the park.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the member has not understood my statement; I certainly was not making forest policy for Algonquin Park.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I understand it—and I think I do—the Weyerhaeuser-Sklar-federal government involvement will ultimately use hardwood from the park. That may be, but surely we have established an advisory committee of this Legislature to look into precisely such questions of forest management and we are destroying that committee if the minister arrogates to himself the right to make unilateral decisions?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, there is no unilateral decision at all in the statement made today. Not at all.

Mr. Lewis: When will the committee meet? It has been months since they have even met and the future of Algonquin Park, as a resource, is still unclear.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I do not know when the Algonquin Park advisory committee will meet, but I can tell the hon. member that one report is before the government and is being studied within my department right now.

Mr. J. F. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Supplementary: Would the minister inform the chairman of the Algonquin advisory committee that he intends to review the licence holdings in Algonquin Park and see whether it meets with their interim recommendations with regard to the multiple-use concept?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I'll look into that, but at this point in time I don't have any feelings about contacting the advisory committee on this point the member raises.

Mr. Bullbrook: Am I correct in understanding the minister's statement that Weyerhaeuser's cessation of business activity results from the antiquity of its mill? Could he tell me when it bought that mill?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I believe they have been in production for something like eight or 10 years, Mr. Speaker, and the antiquity of the mill is just one facet of their reason for closing down.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'm saying that was their prime reason, and wouldn't the mill have been fairly antiquated eight years ago, if it is today?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I don't think it was their prime reason. I think the lack of sufficient species for the making of veneer was the prime reason for closing.

Mr. Lewis: What about negotiating for imports of species from Quebec, which I gather are more readily available, rather than closing down the mill just across the river?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party is aware this is not possible. Quebec demands that those species cut within the province be manufactured in that province.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, I see.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): The government may do the same thing for natural resources here in Ontario.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I can hear quite well; I'm looking up the member's riding, if I may. The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, is it not true that these species were found for the owners of similar types of mills that had been established within 40 or 50 miles of this mill during the past three or four years? One has been established in South River, for example, which is not too far from the establishment at Mattawa.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to relate the operation of a plant of this size to the species that are available within a given distance of that particular plant, and 50 miles, I'm told is about a marginal operation. I'm not aware of the plant to which the member is referring, but it is quite likely that this plant that he speaks of can operate economically. But I would point out to him that the veneer mills within the Province of Ontario are in some dire straits because of the lack of sufficient quantity of sawlogs and butt materials.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If that's the case, why are new veneer mills allowed to come into production when the ones that are already there are in difficulty?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I know of no new veneer mills that are coming into production.

An hon. member: The one in South River.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West has further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Revenue has the answer to a question previously asked.

The hon. Minister of Revenue!

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Who is the Minister of Revenue?

An hon. member: Give him a few words in Chinese.

OHC FINANCIAL RECORDS

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) asked a series of questions on March 3 concerning the report—

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister will have to speak up; the member can't hear him.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That'll be the day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We never have that problem with the member for Sarnia.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Downsview asked me a series of questions on March 3—

Mr. Lewis: Well, this is fairly typical. The minister is afraid to reply to the member when he's here.

An hon. member: He's got to be kidding.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am getting heckling from both sides now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Why doesn't he give us the answer?

Mr. Speaker: Might I ask the hon. minister if his reply covers all of those sheets of paper?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. You can never tell with the supplementaries though, Mr. Speaker.

The member asked me a series of questions on March 3 concerning the report of the Provincial Auditor, and remarks made by the Auditor about the Ontario Housing Corp.

I have since had an opportunity to look at the paragraph in question and to contact the auditor for further information. In regard to this matter I make the following observations:

Firstly, the report refers to the year ended Dec. 31, 1970, and not to the present operations of OHC. Secondly, since that time there has been a strengthening, in accordance with the Auditor's recommendation, of the senior financial management of OHC. Mr. Brian Crowley, RIA, was appointed deputy managing director of corporate administration in November, 1971.

The problems of supplying timely annual financial statements for audit purposes have been overcome. In point of fact, the 1971 statements for Ontario Housing and Ontario Student Housing corporations were forwarded to the Auditor on March 15, 1972. Apparently there were in 1970, as the Auditor pointed out and as referred to by the hon. member for Scarborough West in a supplementary question, certain weaknesses in controls over some equipment. Since then, OHC has designed and installed improved controls which it believes are appropriate for the size and diversity of its operations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General also has the answer to a question previously asked.

STABBING AT YORK UNIVERSITY

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Speaker, I have given the answer in reference to the question from the member for Windsor West. The member for Wentworth North (Mr. Ewen) had a question for me concerning some charges laid in reference to an incident at York University. He asked how many charges had been laid. I would advise him that there were three and subsequently, by reason of investigation of events that occurred prior to that incident, 11 further charges were laid. I am advised that yesterday the accused appeared in court with his counsel and upon consent he has been remanded under the Mental Health Act to the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry for examination for 60 days.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

STATUS OF APPEALS FROM MUNICIPAL BOARD RULINGS

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. What commitee of cabinet deals with appeals from the OMB?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the ultimate decision is made by the total cabinet. This is the procedure—one that has been followed and is still followed.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Premier inform us approximately how many appeals are before the cabinet; whether the five-month period taken by a $75,000 curb and gutter appeal concerning Waterloo is customary and how soon we might expect a decision on the Oxley-Eaton appeal regarding the city of Kitchener for the development of the downtown area?

Mr. Speaker: I think that question would better be put on the notice paper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to get this information for the hon. member. I think it is obvious that the length of time that appeals are considered by cabinet relates to the content of the appeals. There is no set pattern or standard—

Mr. Bullbrook: The city of Sarnia has been waiting for years!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well it has taken a period of time, but I will try to get some information on the two that the member refers to.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

IMPORTS OF ORE BY STEEL COMPANIES

Mr. Stokes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. What action does his department propose to take, or what representation does this government propose to make, with regard to the expressed intentions of a consortium of steel companies—including Algoma Steel and the Steel Company of Canada—for the expenditure $165 million to develop an ore deposit in Marquette, Mich., for imports of iron ore into Canada?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, this particular matter has been brought to my attention and we have discussed it in great detail with the Algoma Steel Corp. I might mention that the member for Fort William (Mr. Jessiman) and also the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) expressed a very deep concern in this particular matter.

I think the member is well aware that Algoma Steel is planning an expansion at its mill in Sault Ste. Marie from about 2.6 million long tons to 4 million tons of iron ore pellets a year, which will add considerably to the employment prospects in that particular municipality.

Algoma did to some extent—to a great extent, I might add—look to all iron ore deposits in northern Ontario and northwestern Ontario. It was impossible to expand the plant at Wawa.

The Steep Rock Iron Mines could not provide sufficient reserves at that time so Algoma, together with the Steel Company of Canada, did enter into an agreement with this consortium for a 10-year period.

I would point out that to bring a new iron ore body into production in northern Ontario—and I think the area the member is referring to would be in the Nakina area—Algoma tells me that it would require sales of three or four million tons a year. Three or four million tons of iron ore pellets a year would have to be marketed; they only had requirements for a million-and-a-half tons. Therefore it is obvious they just couldn't bring this property into production at this particular time. Economically, it was much better for them of course, to go across Lake Superior and obtain this quantity from that particular site.

I would point out that the Province of Ontario does not have any controls for the import of iron ore; in fact there are about two million tons of iron ore now being imported into the Province of Ontario from mills in the United States for a number of purposes, and of course for the manufacture of steel. This matter would be strictly a matter for the federal government to control; we have no ways or means to control the import.

Mr. Stokes: Due to the fact that we do have hundreds of millions of tons of commercial grade iron ore in Ontario, particularly in northern Ontario, and in view of the fact that Algoma already has an option with Steep Rock on their Lake St. Joe property, with Can-Fer at Nakina and with Little Long Lac at Geraldton, surely this government should make representations to the federal government to bar any import into this province of a resource that we have in such abundance.

An hon. member: Right on, right on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well I would point out to the member that it is a matter of straight economics; and I think he is certainly well aware of that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You are the fellows; you are the fellows! Section 113! That's the section that you fellows wanted, and today we are reaping the benefits of section 113. Right with that member sitting right there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Sit down!

Mr. Stokes: Since there is a consortium with five or six steel producers in the United States, and Algoma and the Steel Company of Canada, why doesn't the government have a Canadian consortium that will make it necessary to produce that three million tons required to make a Canadian operation viable?

Some hon. members: Hear, hear! Absolutely!

Mr. Stokes: Instead of going to the United States for your consortium?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the markets are just not here for a quantity of that size; he knows that!

An hon. member: If the minister changed his attitude maybe he could help the situation a bit.

Mr. Stokes: Algoma and Stelco are both involved.

Mr. Lewis: If the minister is worried about 113, he is the responsible member of the government; he can amend it, though we don't recommend it, instead of dealing with the company—

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Five hundred and fifty jobs down the drain in northern Ontario!

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Order please!

Presenting reports.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): Mr. Speaker!

An hon. member: Pretty near got ahead of him!

Hon. Mr. Apps presented the report of the Department of Correctional Services for the year 1971.

Mr. Henderson from the standing private bills committee, in the absence of Mr. Clement, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill P28, An Act respecting the City of Vanier.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with a certain amendment:

Bill P4, An Act respecting the Peterborough Racing Association Ltd.

Your committee would recommend that the fees, less the actual cost of printing, and penalties if any, be remitted on Bill Pr3, An Act respecting Saint Peter's Seminary Corp. of London in Ontario.

Mrs. Birch from the standing social development committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report that in its opinion sections 6 and 7 of Regulation 810 of the Teachers' Superannuation Act, which is administered by the Teachers Superannuation Commission, should be reviewed by the government.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introductions of bills.

The hon. member for High Park.

PLANNING ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Planning Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give municipalities a discretion to refuse to allow the destruction of buildings. At the present time they have no such discretion, sir.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF SNOWMOBILES

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Control and Regulation of Snowmobiles.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill is drawn up by the council of state governments. It allows for comprehensive control of snowmobiles.

Mr. W. Hodgson: Did the member ever ride one?

Mr. Shulman: Yes, on a trap line, actually. It allows for—

Mr. Yakabuski: From the buildings this morning.

Mr. Shulman: —an omnibus and comprehensive control of snowmobiles in an effort to reduce the carnage that we are now having.

INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to withdraw the vicious law that was passed last July by the Conservative government which prevents the giving of proper advice to those persons buying insurance and makes it an offence

to advise persons to buy cheaper term insurance and turn in their whole-life insurance.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. In yesterday's Globe and Mail, an article on the front page stated that the Liberal financial critic, the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt), had said I was earning $54,442.

Mr. Lewis: One appears in today's Globe and Mail on the second page.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Does the member mean he is making more? Is he worth it?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member is getting jealous of—

Mr. Cassidy: It took him three weeks to answer the question. Talk about a—

Mr. Yakabuski: What about these people on city council who will not resign and have big mouths?

Mr. W. Ferrier: (Cochrane South): Yes; what about the member for Ottawa South?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege. For the past month there has been—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Root: —a consistent attempt to suggest that I was receiving public money improperly.

Some hon. members: Oh no.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on Mar. 6 suggested that I should be fired from OWRC, so he will be happy today. However, I did not comment on that remark, because I presumed it was off-the-cuff. He referred to me as a cattle drover from Fergus. I never was a cattle drover. I never lived in Fergus. I live in the township of Erin on a farm that my grandfather took from the bush in 1846.

Every dollar that I earned on the OWRC was related to hours of service that I rendered. We were on a per diem basis because I couldn't give full time to the OWRC as requested by the then Prime Minister, the Hon. Mr. Robarts, so I was left on per diem and I was paid for the hours I worked: I had to give some time to representing the people of Wellington-Dufferin.

Mr. Deans: What kind of rate did the member get?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It added up to $16,497. That is quite a good per diem rate, plus expenses, that's about 300 days.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: That is better than the Prime Minister.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is about $100 per word that the member has uttered in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Surely the hon. members can afford the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin the courtesy of hearing his point of privilege.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's get on with it.

An hon. member: We haven't heard it yet.

Mr. Root: It is a little difficult to be heard above the bedlam. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition had checked over three years he would find that the figure varied from year to year because I was paid for the hours I worked.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: That was $17,000 worth in the last public accounts. How many hours did the member work for that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: I'll have something for the member before I'm through. The last three years averaged $12,800 and it was related to the hours I worked.

The reason there was more money in the last year was because there had never been an adjustment in the per diem fee for the members of the OWRC from the time it was started. In the early part of 1970 there was an adjustment and it was made retroactive and some $1,200 that should have been in the previous year was in the last year. Now, that explains that.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): That is an honest man.

Mr. Cassidy: Honest?

Mr. Gilbertson: An honest man.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: How much is the per diem fee? What is the per diem fee?

An hon. member: The member ought to be ashamed.

Mr. Root: I am not ashamed.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Every dollar I earned on the OWRC was related to the work of the commission—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is it really $90 a day?

Mr. MacDonald: Just like Legge.

Mr. Root: Could the member be quiet. The OWRC was set up with a forecast it would require something like $2.25 billion worth of approvals over 20 years and in 15 years we approved over $2.4 billion worth of work. We did what we were asked to do and did more and we earned every dollar that we collected.

Mr. Martel: What does the member do and how much was it worth?

Mr. Root: On March 13, a week later, the hon. member for, I believe it was Ottawa Centre, who was aided and abetted by the Leader of the Opposition—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Speaking in the afternoon, he said that I had earned $10,000. No doubt he was looking at one of the older public accounts, and I accepted that.

Mr. Cassidy: Before that it was $17,000.

Mr. Root: After the supper hour, having been aided and abetted by the Leader of the Opposition who confessed that he had been doing research for the NDP—and you'll find that in Hansard on page 329—suggested that I had earned $36,000.

Mr. MacDonald: We have been doing research for the Tories for years.

Mr. Root: I got up on a point of order and said: "That is a complete distortion of facts." That's in Hansard; you will find it there.

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Cassidy: We said the member was being paid at the rate of $36,000 a year and that it what he is saying too.

Mr. Root: I am not saying anything of the kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: What the member is saying is that he served 170 days or better.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

An hon. member: Why don't you keep quiet for a minute and let the man have his say?

Mr. Deans: One hundred dollars a day for 170 days?

Mr. Lewis: What is the per diem rate?

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. members to please give the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin the courtesy of making his point.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is entitled to complete his remarks.

Mr. Root: The per diem rate was $65, before the rate adjustment. It was $55, and I have already told you that that $16,000 was because the increase was retroactive and that came into another fiscal year.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Sorry, I did not hear. Did the member say $65 a day?

An hon. member: Just let him tell you.

Mr. Root: Right.

Mr. Lewis: Has he divided that into $17,000? Where was he?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how you get through to the hon. member for Scarborough West. I have already told him $1,200 of that should have been in the previous fiscal year, but it wasn't.

Mr. Lewis: I don't care—

Mr. Deans: The member was paid to sit in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the hon. member for Ottawa Centre referred to $36,000, and I know he was aided and abetted, as I said, by the Leader of the Opposition. Whether he got that figure from him, I don't know.

Mr. Cassidy: It is in the public accounts.

Mr. Root: I never got $36,000. I told the member that night that it was a complete distortion of the facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The member was overpaid for what he got.

Mr. Root: Then on March 28 the leader of the NDP repeated the same figure. Now I know he is not above playing fast and loose with the statements, and I don't ignore that.

Mr. Martel: For 228 days.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the member is doing right now.

Mr. Deans: He is digging a hole for himself.

Mr. Lewis: What the member is saying is that he sat with the OWRC every working day of the year and—

Mr. Root: I haven't said anything of the kind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: It is disgusting.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Root: I haven't said anything of the kind. I said that for three years it averaged $12,800 a year. Then the other day the statement was made by the financial critic for the Liberal Party. I am sorry he is not in the House. However, that is not unusual.

Mr. Deans: The member is making an awful mistake. He'd better sit down. It is getting worse.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, if I could have order, I must say that I had left the House for a few minutes when he made the statement, or I would have contested it at the time. I wasn't aware of what was said until Miss Sally Barnes of the Toronto Star came to me that night and asked about it, and I told her that that statement had no relation to fact.

Mr. Deans: Isn't the member embarrassed?

Mr. Root: I am not embarrassed a bit.

Mr. Deans: He should be.

Mr. Lewis: That is every working day of the year the member sat on the OWRC.

Mr. Gilbertson: Wasn't the member opposite embarrassed last October?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: I was very embarrassed myself about the outcome in Algoma.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin would complete his statement instead of an extended speech at this point, complete his statement so that this matter may be disposed of.

Mr. Root: My point of personal privilege is the fact that the financial critic of the Liberal Party, who is a lawyer, would come into this House and make a statement that had no relation to facts. The $36,400 he is talking about was not my salary; it was the salary of a former chairman who was not a member of this Legislature. Because I was a member of this House and couldn't give full time to the OWRC, my salary was $15,000 per year, and I want to put that on the record.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: We think that is something new. The member had a salary of $15,000 on top of the per diem?

Mr. Root: I wanted to put on the record to clear up the misunderstanding that was created. That per diem stopped when I went on salary.

Mr. Deans: There is no misunderstanding.

Mr. Root: Well, all right, if the hon. member—

Mr. Lawlor: I am even more confused now than I was before. Was the member working on a per diem or on a salary?

Mr. Root: When I was made chairman of the commission I was put on a salary of $15,000 per year, not $36,000 or per diem. That is why I say the statement is a complete

distortion of facts, drawn either from a fertile imagination, bad research, or a deliberate attempt to mislead the House. I want to clear that up now, and I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for letting me have the opportunity.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on that point of privilege, just briefly, I feel I should bring to your attention, since the hon. member has mentioned me by name, that the Guelph Mercury in its report on Jan. 22 attempted to report the salary payable to the hon. member who has just spoken and he refused to give the information. The question in the name of the member for Ottawa Centre has been on the order paper for how long—three weeks, a month?

Mr. Cassidy: Two and a half weeks; that's right.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And it has never yet been answered. I am told by the hon. member for Kitchener that when he tried to get the facts, he phoned the secretary to the chairman of the Water Resources Commission. Evidently he was told that to her knowledge no revised salary schedule for the incoming chairman had been arrived at. We looked at the public accounts and found that the hon. member had ben paid $16,497 last year on a per diem basis; no indication of what it was per day. As the leader of the NDP has indicated, it would indicate that the member sat on the board every working day and at the same time received an $18,000 salary for his responsibilities here.

An hon. member: Plus his expenses.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Plus expenses, right.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Plus expenses. Expenses $3,100.

Mr. Lewis: That's the expense of getting to the water commission and from the water commission to the Legislature in time for adjournment.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: On this particular point of privilege, if we accept the figures given by the hon. member which indicate that he's worked and drawn government money, full-time, 48 weeks of the year, five days a week, is it proper for him to draw his salary here, sir, in addition? I ask you, he is drawing from the same government double salary. Whatever—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): The member might ask himself that question!

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): What is his outside income?

Mr. Shulman: I don't draw it from this government.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Shulman: I don't get a cent from this government. I'm not in the pork barrel like those members are.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: What does the member earn outside of his $18,000?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What are his office hours?

Mr. MacDonald: The trouble is they're all in the pork barrel.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Reid: They are a fine pair.

Mr. Lewis: Members will notice how the cabinet ministers feel when they know that the member for Wellington-Dufferin is making more than they are! We see what happens.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): If he keeps giving us help like that we will put him on the payroll. We really need that help.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has stated the facts that he thinks constitute a point of privilege. The members have responded; I think that disposes of the matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Wait till we see tomorrow morning's paper.

Mr. Deans: The member for Wellington-Dufferin ate it all up.

Mr. Speaker: To change the topic before we enter upon the orders of the day, I should like to remind the hon. members that the Speaker's dinner will be held next Wednesday, April 12. If any hon. members have not yet indicated to my secretary their intentions of going or not going to this function, it would be appreciated if they would indicate so as quickly as possible.

Mr. Lewis: The member for Wellington-Dufferin will be there if he is not busy with the commission.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TOURISM

Hon. Mr. White moves second reading of Bill 31, An Act to establish the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, once again the general remarks on reorganization were delivered on another occasion. Since the law officers of the Crown have indicated that separate legislation is necessary. I'd like to make one or two remarks on the bill which establishes the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

There are two things. The matter pertaining to the dissemination of information, let us say from the government as a whole, in the past was associated with the responsibilities that this minister now wields. There has been some general discussion about the need for a central information source. When the minister responds to this bill, I hope he can assure us that it is not in the ambit of the responsibility of the department as he sees it established in this bill, that something which might be called "Information Ontario" is contained within it. Frequently, the wording of a bill will give responsibilities that are not readily understood on first or second reading; I would like him to comment on that.

The second thing, and surely of more importance, has to do with the bill giving the minister responsibility for the Equalization of Industrial Opportunities programme. I don't intend to speak in detail about the programme of course, but only the way the branch or that area of responsibility would be constituted in the new ministry.

One of the serious shortcomings is that there is no legal requirement that the minister or those advising him have a well understood criteria under which designation does come forward. I feel that the bill is entirely too loose in this regard. All members of the House, and certainly taxpayers in general, would support programmes which tend to use public money, and channel private funds as well, toward the support of expanding industry for the creation of jobs.

We feel that there have to be well understood guidelines, or a list of criteria by which the minister would be required to grant such special rights to certain areas suffering from economic decline or other matters pertaining to it.

Just raising these two points, Mr. Speaker, I can say that we have no objections otherwise to this area of the reorganization.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are going to support this bill in principle on the establishment of the new department. There are some things to which we take exception. This one seems to us questionable on two or three counts, but the minister in his extraordinary capacity will undoubtedly be able to encompass it all.

Two areas in particular concern us around the "industry" portion of this bill. One has already been alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition, and that is the whole realm of the performance loan, indeed the granting of loans generally in the Province of Ontario.

This party believes that the performance loans, the EIO loans, have largely acted to diffuse development rather than to pattern it in an intelligible way across Ontario; that we have developed such an unhappy patchwork as a result of the performance loans that this has resulted in a great many plant layoffs and shutdowns presently being chronicled within the Department of Labour—even if that has not yet been shared with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon)—and we are accordingly concerned that this aspect of the minister's department be given a new pre-eminence, be given a pre-eminence in the sense that he re-evaluates the entire loan programme.

I may say in passing Mr. Speaker, that the research office of the NDP has been attempting to seek from the minister's office amounts and interest rates apportioned for conventional loans—I guess venture fund loans and other loans as distinct from performance loans. We have been told that we are entitled to such information. I would therefore hope that embodied in this department will be a new spirit of disclosure, that when public moneys are involved—be they for performance loans or conventional loans—the amounts involved and the interest rates which apply will be available for all members of the Legislature.

The second and minor aspect to which I would like to refer is the very considerable concern on the part of this party that the

northern Ontario dimension of this department not be given short shrift.

It is a conviction—whether or not it is shared by the minister is something entirely different of course—it is a conviction of the New Democratic Party that the NODC, in terms of the loans to which it has been entitled, has not received a fair apportionment. It is a conviction of this party that when one looks at the application of performance loans I think it works out to somethink like 12 per cent of the total loans and 15 per cent of the total jobs, or vice versa, apply to northern Ontario.

We view that, Mr. Speaker, as discriminatory. We view it as a continuing neglect of the north.

We notice, as the minister knows, that because of an oversight the bill on the NODC has not yet been given royal assent. I gather that there will be a correction involved in that. Nonetheless, it is indicative of the ease with which northern Ontario legislation is overlooked by this government.

We are concerned that when you subsume the NODC in this department it tends to be relegated to an inferior status.

Some of my colleagues may wish to make other points along this line, but we are very concerned that as we approve this bill in principle the minister recognize that where development is concerned we are absolutely of the conviction that the north has not been treated fairly and that that has been inherent in the practice of the past. Perhaps with this minister, who I concede has altered much in the departments that he has inherited, that may also be altered.

I think those are the only comments I would have at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak? The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the reorganization of this department, and specifically make mention to the minister that recent legislation passed in the United States, and that is the Domestic International Sales Corporation legislation, commonly known as DISC, apparently is having some harmful effect upon industries in the Province of Ontario.

I think the minister should have undertaken at this time some types of studies and should be able to inform the House as to the effects of this legislation, and likewise may be prepared to implement measures to counteract the effects of the legislation.

In my own community, as a result of—I shouldn't say as a result of DISC, but maybe as a result of DISC—there happen to have been a series of plant closures. Possibly if the government had made funds available to some of these plants when they were first approached—or maybe even not when they were approached, but if they had gone into the plants and tried to find out what the problems were as soon as they knew there was the danger of the plants closing—they might have counteracted the effects.

I can mention that in the auto specialities manufacturing industry, Duplate Glass, a subsidiary of Pittsburgh Glass Industries, is in the process of phasing out operations. Whether it is phasing out as a result of the DISC programme in the United States I can't answer, but maybe the minister should be able to make some type of answer.

I hope the legislation introduced by the minister here is wide enough to give him the authority not only to report plant closures but possibly to prevent them by financial assistance or by convincing those in authority to postpone or not consider any type of plant closure in the community because of its adverse effects.

DISC, as you are well aware Mr. Speaker, permits industries to delay paying certain types of taxes for any increase in productivity in their own country; as a result it does have this adverse effect in Canada.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister why the legislation he has here does not include the publishing industry? The Weekly Standard, a weekly newspaper in the city of Windsor, has tried and tried to get sufficient funds to make itself a viable operation. Were the government to come along and throw in some substantial financial assistance, that type of enterprise could survive, become viable and be an asset not only to the community but to the publishing industry in general.

The two points I would like to make, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, relate to the effects of the DISC programme in the United States and to assistance to the publishing industry.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to raise a few points with the minister that I think he should and would be happy to react to. One concerns a recent

statement he made regarding tourism. When he spoke to an august body a little while ago, surely he must have had his tongue in his cheek when he suggested he was going to put tourism on a strictly businesslike basis.

The minister is deluding himself, Mr. Speaker, if he thinks for one minute that tourism as a separate entity will provide any overall major stimulus to the economy of this province—and I'm talking about on anything more than a seasonal basis. I think that in many respects he and his colleagues have relied to too great an extent on the tourist potential to place the emphasis on it that they have, particularly in Design for Development, when they suggest that with regard to Northwestern Ontario, of a maximum of 20,000 jobs that will be created over the next 20 years, 8,000 to 10,000 of those jobs will be created in the tourist and service sectors of our economy.

I am sure I speak for everybody, in particular in northern Ontario, when I say to the minister that we don't accept the premise that a viable economic development programme can be based on tourism in this province—in northern Ontario or anywhere else. I suggest that at best it is seasonal, and if he is going to take what he considers to be a strict business approach to tourism within his department he's going to be missing the boat.

I do realize that a good many people are able to garner enough of an income from tourist outlets in many parts of the province and go south for the winter. I suggest to you this doesn't help the community at large. It doesn't help those, particularly native people, who must depend on our resource industries and tourism for a livelihood. If he thinks that anything more than seasonable benefits are going to accrue to the majority of the people in this province I think that he is deluding himself.

I want to ask the minister: As a result of the transfer of tourism from the Ministry of Government Services, is it the intention of this government to discontinue providing tourist information and folders at the front desk here at the Parliament buildings? I understand that if one wants this kind of information now one must go to the Department of Tourism at 185 Bloor St. E. I understand that somebody tried the other day and that's where they were directed.

Since the minister does place such emphasis on tourism, and since a lot of people who tour this building will be looking for information with regard to what is available to people looking for a recreational experience or an historical experience, where do they go for this information? I suggest that some clarification should be forthcoming from the minister.

Now getting to the other part of his responsibility, and that is industry—a very good example of the need for this minister, who is a very forceful and very active minister—and I welcome the indication from the government that he is going to get involved in this sort of thing. I hope he won't preoccupy himself with cutting sugar cane and scuba diving in Cuba, or playing ping-pong in China as some of his colleagues and predecessors are wont to do.

I suggest to the minister that if he had busied himself since he took over this responsibility, particularly with regard to a subject that we were talking about a little bit earlier—the import of iron ore from Michigan—he could have made very strong representations to Algoma Steel and to the Steel Company of Canada to find out what their problems were and what steps might have been taken by this government, in concert with the federal government, to make unnecessary this importation of a resource that we have in such abundance in this province.

I think it is a direct responsibility of this minister to sit down and talk with these people. I know that the former federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the hon. Joe Greene, knew of this undertaking over a year ago by which this consortium was to spend $165 million in the development of iron ore deposits in a foreign country. I think that if this minister's predecessor had preoccupied himself with these kinds of things, the interest of the public in Ontario generally would have been much better served.

I do hope the minister will continue to exercise his prerogative to make suggestions to his colleagues and to his counterpart, the hon. Jean-Luc Pepin and the hon. Donald Macdonald, who is the new Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I don't think it's too late yet to persuade Algoma Steel and the Steel Company of Canada that they should change their minds. Perhaps with some government assistance we can make it possible and attractive for them to develop these resources that we have.

I'm sure the hon. member for Rainy River would agree with me, when he says that a town like Atikokan with a population of about 7,000 people is going to be in real difficulty if we don't find additional markets,

either in Canada or elsewhere, for the ores that Steep Rock Iron Mines are mining there and at their property at Lake St. Joseph.

I did mention, to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), that other communities such as Geraldton and Nakina are going to be in real difficulty if we don't find a way to exploit this resource that we have in such abundance.

Mr. Speaker, that is only one instance of the way in which I think this minister can busy himself and make it possible for us to exploit, in an orderly fashion, the resources that we do have in such abundance. I am hoping that he will get involved with his colleague, the Minister of Natural Resources, to explore the possibility of exploiting to a much greater extent a renewable resource that we have in such abundance, and I speak of our forest products.

I am sure the minister does know—if he doesn't he should acquaint himself with the fact—that about 32 per cent of our total forest resources are being exploited at the present time; and only about 10 per cent of what the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) used to call the weed species, and which is in ever-increasing demand, and I am talking about our birch and our poplar forest resources.

Coming from northern Ontario, I am particularly concerned about the orderly exploitation of the resource sector of our economy; and I do hope that the minister, as he does get into his new responsibilities, will make very serious efforts to see that the Design for Development for northern Ontario, and northwestern and northeastern Ontario, does become a reality.

I want to assure him, on behalf of this party, that we will co-operate with him to any extent possible. We do give advice and assistance to ministers over there that we feel are responsible and are sincere in their efforts to bring northern Ontario into the mainstream of the provincial economy, and we stand willing and ready to do that. I wish the minister good luck in his new venture.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, you may recall that during the deliberations of the select committee on economic nationalism we found that a major problem of business in this province was that of lack of capital and management skill. I am sure that a great deal of this is really due to the fact that many who have capital are not aware of all the opportunities there are for investment. There is a very limited means of bringing these opportunities to their attention through the conventional financial community on Bay Street, which has not developed a sophistication in this field that perhaps is necessary to ensure that people who have capital are aware of the many opportunities that are available from time to time in this province for investment.

It was appalling to many of us recently to find that an Oakville firm, the Jelinek firm, was unable, they say, to find those in Canada who would finance its growth and expansion and had to seek capital outside this country. I would be interested in hearing the minister's view on whether he feels that his department or the Department of Consumer and Commercial Relations should be the one that should assist in bringing together those who have opportunities for investment and those who have capital for investment in this area; particularly having to do with smaller opportunities, ones that do not necessarily involve the preparation of securities issues, and should not have to undergo that cost and delay in time and expense.

Would the minister feel that he should be in a position, in this new Department of Industry and Tourism, to set up a facility for bringing together these two very important functions, that of those who have opportunities, who have developed ideas, and those who have capital? Would he be in a position to provide assistance to those who are seeking capital and financial assistance, or assistance, to prepare and publicize their situations? This is one of the aspects which was brought to this Legislature's attention in the report of that committee.

The second point I would ask is: Is the minister considering that his role will include analysis of the competitive problems in the establishment of business or good economic conditions in parts of this province other than the Golden Horseshoe, where for example there is a deterioration in business such as that we discussed in the question period—a plywood mill going out of business in one place, and not very far away another one being established.

Other things that his department should be doing are in the way of analysing the root causes of these shutdowns. They so dislocate the people and mean that their homes are no longer of any value; whereas maybe some expenditure, or some assistance from this minister's department could bring about a continuation of a strong community, where the values of the homes are maintained

and where people can look forward to having a source of income in those communities for a long time to come.

I think of, as examples, towns like Nakina or Armstrong, or some of these places along the CNR in northern Ontario, where this minister's department might be undertaking an analysis that indicates a new highway should be built to shortcut the present route along Highway 11 and Highway 17 between Winnipeg and Toronto. I understand that some 75 per cent of all freight shipped by road between Winnipeg and Toronto goes through the United States, even though the distances are greater. But the reason these transports go through the United States is because the time consumed is somewhat shorter.

A route through the present clay belt along the CNR route in northern Ontario would not only cut off considerable distance but considerable time. It could cause, I understand from freight authorities, a shift of maybe 50 per cent or more of the traffic so that it would move through Ontario. In doing so it would revitalize these communities and open up new opportunities close to them.

Is this the type of analysis this minister is thinking about? Or is this within the prerogative or the purview of the "Minister of everything"—the minister, or Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), or whatever his name is at this time?

I was wondering if there is another area that the minister is going to be covering in this new jurisdiction which brings in tourism, which is really a very important industry in this province. A great problem that people have as they come here is in knowing the quality of the facilities. If you travel in France or many countries of Europe it is possible for one to buy a guide which shows a star rating. But it is not possible in Ontario to tell from the guides that we provide what type, or what quality, or what standard of accommodation is available. Would the Minister consider this as an important means of ensuring that there is a certain standard of tourist facility available right across the province in the areas where tourism is certainly such an important—and can be an even more important—source of income?

Another area I wondered if the Minister is thinking about here is the importance of small business as an industry. A very major mistake in this province is that of building big shopping centres outside towns and in rural areas where there is no restriction as to hours of sale. As a result, business is sucked out of the core of these communities, and really, often destroys their economy.

Is the minister thinking in terms of bringing forward studies on the whole economics of small business—how can it be encouraged; how it can be revitalized in areas where business is going down? Does the minister consider that as part of his role in industry? Certainly we know now that bigness definitely is not always connected with the best of things, and often it is very much the reverse.

And lastly, I would hope that the minister, in keeping with a lot of his past statements, would be looking at the government role in this department as one of being a catalyst, rather than a—if I might use the word—"negativist". Because, through the Ontario Development Corp., we have found many instances in the past where it has been anything but a positive force in assisting the financing, particularly of smaller enterprises.

I think a real effort has been made to overcome this, but there is naturally a tendency on the part of those who work there to take the safer course—one which does not take as much work, or supervision or assistance, one which is usually associated with the bigger corporation with the better credit rating.

And I hope that the minister would recognize that by his department adopting the role of a catalyst to bring together individuals —individuals who have capital and individuals who have ideas—the role which facilitates rather than one which dominates, it will be the way for this department to become a very important force for the continuing prosperity of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to deal with this bill on any diffused basis. I do not think we can expect this particular ministry to accomplish all of the things which the last member has indicated he would like the department to achieve.

I have a much more simple and direct appreciation, I believe, of the importance of this particular ministry. I would venture to suggest that, in the long run, this particular ministry is the ministry which will, in fact, determine the capacity of this province to develop and expand and to adopt programmes for the society which we all wish; but which we will not be able to achieve unless we meet

the requirements that are placed upon this ministry.

I think it is quite simple. There is an elaboration in the bill of the objectives of the ministry, and I would agree with each and every one of them if they had been put as subheadings of the principle objective of this ministry; and that is to promote the export trade of this province. In that regard I of course consider tourism in its traditional sense as an invisible export.

I think that it is all very well for us to talk about attracting capital and ideas and putting them together; and about government assistance of industry in order that industry will establish its base in the province. But I think that this ministry—and I think this minister will in fact recognize this—relates not just to the development of industry in the province for the purpose of satisfying our own local and domestic needs. In fact the capacity of this province to deal in the export markets of the world on a competitive basis—and I reiterate that tourism is in that sense an invisible export, and therefore we are in a highly-competitive world when we talk about the tourist industry of the Province of Ontario—that the capacity of this province to deal in the export markets of the world on a competitive basis will determine whether or not we are able to deal with our own internal problems on social and other levels.

Let me make the point quite clear—or as clear as I can make it to the new minister. Let us for the moment assume that we have an undue dependence on the United States and that we have a lack of capacity to exploit the resources, the exports of the province of Ontario, in world markets. And let us assume for the moment that we are talking about secondary industry and we are talking about the processing in Ontario of our natural resources and exporting the products to the markets of the world. In that sense include in the phrase "secondary industry" that kind of secondary industry, as well as the traditional meaning of that term.

As far as the United States is concerned, it is quite obvious that whatever levels of contact there were between the federal government of Canada and the federal government in the United States, they were not on the basis which would lead the government of the United States to have any conception of the importance to Canada, and particularly of the importance of the Province of Ontario, of a specific knowledge of the economy of the Province of Ontario.

Therefore I welcome the indication in the Throne Speech that the ministry will be opening a trade office in the city of Washington. I think that is an essential ingredient of this province's being in a position, at the appropriate levels of the government of the United States, to let them know specifically what the impact of United States government policies on this province will be.

I think, of course, it can act in co-operation with the Canadian embassy in Washington, but it has a very clear and specific role to play so that we are not faced with unilateral actions by the government of the United States which have direct impact on the Province of Ontario more so than on other parts of Canada. And this in a very real sense, because this is the centre, at the present time, of the secondary manufacturing industry. It is a place for us to express our viewpoint and to lay the groundwork of continuing information to that government.

So far as we here are concerned, I don't think there is anybody in the Province of Ontario who wants to be faced in the long-run with a choice between continentalism and economic nationalism. As I said in the Speech from the Throne, I think that is a loser's game, and that so far as Canada is concerned the only solution to that conundrum is not to pose the one alternative against the other alternative, but to indicate that we are part of an international community in all its senses, but particularly in the sense of recognizing the importance, and the basic importance to the Province of Ontario, of international trade; and that we've got to be able to play in that league.

If we look abroad then it means, so far as we are concerned, that we have got to shift the reliance of the Ontario economy—and in that sense in a very real sense I speak of the reliance of the Canadian economy—on an undue basis of trade with the United States. We have got to expand our trade with other countries in the world, because Mr. Speaker, if we can achieve a competitive place in the world markets, then we are going to have industry in the Province of Ontario which is cushioned against shutdowns. We are going to have industry in the Province of Ontario which is not going to be subject to an undue degree of foreign control simply because they've been established for the purpose of serving our own limited and very small market. But we are going to have, whether they be multinational corporations from abroad or multinational corporations established in the Province of Ontario, we are going to have them

here because they are contributing to the capacity of the Province of Ontario to export and to trade in the world market.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we can just recognize the fundamental importance of that export trade to the Province of Ontario we can gain some sense of what to me is the importance of this particular ministry. In that regard, we have got to get from this ministry, and from this particular minister, a redirection of the kind of thrust which went on under his predecessor, however apt and appropriate that may have been, and we all had questions sometimes about it.

But the minister has got to recognize that the criterion—and all of the other consequences I think flow from this particular criterion, that is all the other objectives which are set out in the bill—that the criterion, whether it has to do with the rationalization of industry in the Province of Ontario whether it has to do with support by government in introducing technological and other changes, whether it has to do with the subsidies of industries in the Province of Ontario, whether it has to do with the introduction of new industries into the Province of Ontario; the criterion has got to be fundamentally what are the company's plans in this particular field of the secondary manufacturing industry for exporting to the markets of the world.

The precondition of government assistance is for the government to obtain the coherent, sane and sensible plans of industry to work in the world markets. That, it seems to me, is a way of solving the question of the extent to which the government of the Province of Ontario can intervene in the decision-making processes of industry.

If an industry is in a position to give to the minister its plans for exploiting its products in the markets of the world, I think the minister is in a position to say: "We will help you in accomplishing that particular objective because that is what we in the Province of Ontario want." I would hope that we would see the end of the indiscriminate invitation to industry to locate in the Province of Ontario for the purpose solely of exploiting the Ontario or Canadian markets.

If the minister will look at the advertisements which have been placed by the present department in magazines and in newspapers such as The Economist, he will find not only the government of Ontario advertisements but the advertisements of the Canadian National Railway and the advertisements of the banks reflect an open, indiscriminate invitation to industry to come and locate here for the purpose of exploiting the Canadian market. I think that the whole tone of the ministry must reflect this other criteria: That we welcome managerial talent; that we welcome technological or innovative techniques; that we welcome capital; that we welcome whatever the other ingredients are into the Province of Ontario for the establishment of industry, provided that industry has got plans by which the products of the plants located in the Province of Ontario are going to be exported to the markets of the world at competitive prices.

We cannot any longer, in this province, afford the luxury of having an industry say to us, "We're going to come here now and we're going to establish a plant to supply the Ontario market and then we're going to look at the export market." I think the Province of Ontario is strategically situated and is powerful enough to be selective and to insist that as part and parcel of all industrial development in the Province of Ontario the criterion of support and assistance from this ministry and from this particular minister should be on the question of the ability of the industry, its willingness and its concern about operating in the international markets of the world on a competitive basis.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that within that framework that is, in substance, the importance of this ministry. In my particular view, I happen to think that in the long run it is the essential ingredient for providing in the Province of Ontario the tax revenues that will permit us to expend the moneys for social purposes that all of us, regardless of our differences, would in many ways want to achieve.

Therefore we certainly support the bill. We support the ministry but we emphasize again the importance to Canada and to the Province of Ontario of solving the basic fact of Canadian tradition and Canadian history that we live adjacent to the United States of America and that we are part of a world trading community, let alone being part of a world social and governmental community. I hope the minister will respond in his remarks as to whether or not he conceives of his department somewhat along those lines.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few remarks in regard to this bill, because I believe it sets up a

ministry that, along with the Ministry of Natural Resources, will be perhaps the most important aspect of government in the economic growth of the northern part of the province.

Previous ministers concerned most specifically with tourism, and with the previous Department of Lands and Forests, usually were representative of the northern part of the province—and during the last session we had the establishment of the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs.

I would like to point out that I'm not one of those who believes a minister, to be effective in the north, has to come from the northern part of the province. But from the experiences that we had over the past few years we hope that the minister, along with the Minister of Natural Resources, will be more effective in establishing programmes that have specific relevance to the northern part of the province.

I would suggest that as far as NODC is concerned, a revamping of that organization along the lines of the Ontario Development Corp., will have to take place. The biggest complaint of the people in northern Ontario who deal directly with NODC is that it takes some months to get even a first answer in regard to an application. In many cases, by the time an answer is supplied by NODC the entrepreneurs have been forced to go to other agencies where they can obtain assistance and financing much more quickly.

The tourist operators in the northern part of the province, the people most concerned with the Department of Tourism, expressed to the Prime Minister, I believe, their concern that they had lost the image of a department which dealt solely with them. But on the other hand, I do believe that they've come to realize that no longer will the Minister of Tourism be able to say to them that there can't be provisions made under NODC or ODC to provide more assistance to them because he's unable to indicate to the minister concerned that this is necessary.

For the reason that they are looking for development and assistance, both through ODC and NODC, I think the tourist operators realize that with a minister concerned with both their specific requirements, as well as the assistance programmes under those two programmes, they may be in a better position to look forward to the development of workable programmes to provide assistance to the tourist industry.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I indicate that I would like to support the bill on the basis that I believe the combination of these two departments will be good for the northern part of the province.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak before the minister sums up? The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I would like to make a short contribution to the debate, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I want to make a brief comment in connection with section 3(f), that it is the responsibility of the minister to "publicize the tourist industry and the resources, attractions and advantages of Ontario."

During the course of my five years here, it has been my unhappy realization that really the department, or the predecessor department, the Department of Tourism and Information, hasn't adequately undertaken that responsibility as vested in it in the continuing statute we're relating to Tourism and Information.

The only really great dissemination that has taken place, I think, was the expenditure of $450,000 about 18 months ago to invite the people of Ontario to recognize that there's no place that they should rather live in. We've talked about this before, and I see the minister smiles with some degree of relief—

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): The member still believes that, doesn't he?

Mr. Bullbrook: —that he wasn't then the responsible minister, because that rhetorical question, at a cost of half a million dollars, caused us all a great deal of concern at the time.

I recall saying once on a television programme over CFPL TV in London that driving down Front St., into one of the worst junkyards that we have in the city of Sarnia and right over the fence that enclosed that junkyard was that great sign: "Ontario. Is there any place you would rather live?"

I thought it was well-positioned. I don't know whether the then minister had anything to do with the positioning of that sign, but I thought it really was relevant—very appropriate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He personally selects the sites west of London.

Mr. Bullbrook: But I know with the acumen and sense of taste of the incumbent of this department as it will be in the future, that we won't be faced with that. We won't

be faced with anybody who wants to go skiing, going anywhere in the world but here in the Province of Ontario. Whether they can go for free or not, they will want to stay right here in Ontario, because that minister will bring that vigour and charm that he has shown in his other portfolio responsibilities into this department itself.

I know the Premier (Mr. Davis) will think a second time before he ever considers Stowe, Vermont, in the future. It will be right up here in the Muskoka highlands that he will want to take his family. He will want to grace some place there.

Mr. Stokes: Up in Thunder country!

Mr. Bullbrook: It will have the collateral effect and great benefit to all in that we won't have to waste the time of the ministry investigating who paid for the trip or not.

So I say in connection with tourism that, as my colleague for York Centre says, it is a great industry and one of which we can be duly proud because of our great natural resources. But I suggest that also the minister has the power under the statute, and the predecessor statute—the minister wanted me to say something?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): The member hasn't said anything yet.

Mr. Bullbrook: I will get to it.

An hon. member: Could it be the minister is considered worthy of it? Is there any place you'd rather be?

Mr. Bullbrook: Surely Mr. Speaker, we don't have to be that serious all the time? I was just complimenting the Chairman of the Management Board outside. I said to him he is one of the few ministers that likes the Legislature and the debate.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Besides, it was getting pretty quiet in here.

Mr. Bullbrook: And we look forward, as soon as I sit down—because it appeared to me, Mr. Speaker, that I was going to be the last private member to rise on this—and so we look forward now to the fact that the Chairman of the Management Board will get up and speak in favour of the bill, as I am speaking in favour of the bill.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He hasn't said anything since the new House convened.

Mr. Bullbrook: And since he wants to hear something we want him to know that we always want to listen to him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right.

Mr. Bullbrook: And we are going to listen to him as soon as I sit down.

So I hope, in connection with tourism, that we just won't find ourselves, especially in the proximity of an election announcement, among a proliferation of billboards—

An hon. member: Oh, indeed, he'll never do that!

Mr. Bullbrook: —and television advertising telling the people of Ontario what a magnificent political and geographical location they have chosen for their adventure in life.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Hear, hear; that is better!

Mr. Bullbrook: I hope that he will do better than that and I am sure he will.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He is improving a little, starting to say something.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now, the one thing that strikes me more than anything else about the bill is that it really shows the development of a total government posture. To look back, I think the original predecessor of the department was called the Department of Commerce and Development, and then it became, if I recall correctly, the Department of Planning and Development, and then—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Reverse the order!

Mr. Bullbrook: Planning and Development first, Commerce and Development thereafter. It then became Trade and Development—Economics and Development, I am sorry—and it then became—

An hon. member: That is when it had a little meaning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is when it was really a department with power.

Mr Bullbrook: —Trade and Development; and the one thing that causes me more concern than anything else in this particular statute, along the lines expressed by both the member for York Centre and the member for Riverdale, is the responsibilities of the minister in connection with the development of business opportunities, income opportunity and employment opportunity in the Province of Ontario; and concurrent therewith,

the equalization of that type of opportunity to all the people of Ontario.

I just wonder to myself, Mr. Speaker, how that can be done, if that minister is not also graced with the powers relative to economic planning throughout the Province of Ontario. He was at one time. For some reason I think there has been an undue infiltration by the bureaucrats here.

I really say to the Chairman of the Management Board, through you Mr. Speaker, that when he did have those concurrent responsibilities and when he was able to come to the St. Clair region and speak to the St. Clair Regional Development Council, he was able to do so in the context of a responsibility relating to economic planning and business opportunity, and I think those must come together.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot recall speaking to the St. Clair Development Council.

Mr. Bullbrook: I was being hypothetical, I really was.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh St. Clair, of course, that—

Mr. Bullbrook: I was being hypothetical. I recognize that at times the minister didn't take his responsibilities as significantly as I thought he did. He didn't go the St. Clair regional office. No wonder we had 13 per cent unemployment in Sarnia if he is not coming down there. Why, as a matter of interest, since the chairman is going to join the debate, he might like to tell me why he never did go to address the St. Clair Regional Development Council? Because, you see, those councils are totally populated with the local Tory underlings; every one of them. They really have no function to perform—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The party is pretty well washed out anyway in Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think they are a $50 per diem type of thing, where they get together about once a month and bandy around what they think should be done for the area.

I want to say frankly if I might, in closing, that I think the great lack in planning here is to remove from the trade and development responsibility the concurrent responsibility for economic planning in Ontario. You see, this bill is replete with platitudes; it really is. If I might read one section to you here just for a moment to give you some idea. This, of course, is just a continuation of the same words in the former statute, "To identify and assist those industries that require special measures to develop an unrealized potential or to cope with exceptional problems of adjustment."

What that means I really don't know. I invite the minister, if he might, to make a comment as to when that was done before. That particular subsection has been in the statute for eight years now, and I'd like him to give us one example today of where he has assisted or his predecessor has assisted an industry to develop an unrealized potential or more importantly to cope with exceptional problems of adjustment. I don't really think that we ever have any report during the course of the estimates of this department or its predecessor department showing where the minister has realized the potential with respect to exceptional problems of adjustment — if he does know what that means.

There is one function here that the department has been extremely lax in undertaking. That's the responsibility concurrent with subsection (c) of section 4 of the statute, that gives the responsibility to the minister to encourage research for the advancement of industry and tourism. It goes without saying that no industry can compete either internally or externally as far as market availability is concerned unless it has significant research involvement.

We have seen that in the Sarnia area, with the abdication of the Polymer Corp. and the government of Canada from their responsibilities in shutting down the total research availability of Polymer Corp. That's what they did there. How can they possibly diversify? The method they undertook to diversify was to buy licensing arrangements from an American corporation relative to modular construction. That's the idea of that type of corporation on diversification. At the same time they let go 200 people who were employed in their research staff.

Essentially what this government has done in connection with research is the development of Sheridan Park, hand in hand with industry. That is fine and good and the government is to be complimented, Mr. Speaker, for so doing; but it is not sufficient an undertaking.

There is one other technical matter that should be brought up, I imagine. The minister might want to consider the effect of section 8, the repeal of the Department of Trade and Development Act. He is going to be in some difficulty, I think, in relating subsection 2 of section 7: "A reference in

any Act or regulation to the Trade and Development Act . . . ." More so in subsection 1; "A reference in any Act or regulation to the Minister of Trade and Development or the Minister of Tourism shall be deemed to be a reference to the Minister of Industry and Tourism." If the minister is going to repeal his precedent Act, he is going to find this throughout the other statutes relating to his powers and responsibilities, mainly, for example, the Planning Act. The minister is referred to there as the Minister of Planning and Development.

This is just a technical matter that probably should be brought up in committee, but the minister might want to consider the effect of that section.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words, before the minister makes a reply, about this Act setting up an Industry and Tourism minister.

I might say that, under the former Minister of Trade and Development (Mr. Grossman), industrial development in small towns, not only in southern Ontario but also in northern Ontario, hasn't been taking place under the EIO programmes. Of course when we went over and met the officials in the Department of Trade and Development in the past we were received in a very, very kind and pleasant way, but after we left there these places are designated and no development takes place. We never know what industry is going to establish in any place or any town or any city in the Province of Ontario.

What is the minister going to do from now on after this bill is passed? Shouldn't the members of this House have an opportunity to know what industries are going to establish in the province, or will establish, so they can do something to assist, without just leaving the minister as the only one to know what industries are going to establish or want to establish in this province; because no development is taking place.

We get these places designated; the whole town is greatly enthused about being designated for development, and nothing takes place. So I hope when the minister makes a reply to these statements or speeches or remarks that he'll tell us what change he is going to make. In the past development has not taken place, and development should be taking place in some of our towns and villages.

It has been most discouraging. I'd like to hear what changes the minister intends to make, and if members of this House would have an opportunity to know what industries wish to establish or are considering establishing in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate before the minister replies? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to invite the members of the Legislature to support the establishment of the new Ministry of Industry and Tourism, or as we will no doubt be saying from time to time in the future, the Minister of IT. I'm gratified—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is that in reference to the minister?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That is a new minister.

Hon. Mr. White: —to hear from some of the members opposite—

Mr. Stokes: Sounds like a case of too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

Hon. Mr. White: —that they indeed do propose to support this bill. I'm personally gratified at some of the rather generous remarks that have been made.

As members know, the committee on government productivity, in making a number of recommendations concerning the organization of government, suggested that the Department of Trade and Development and the Department of Tourism and Information has certain similarities in common, which meant that separating the functions was inefficient and perhaps to some extent ineffective.

Our objective, needless to say, in bringing the two departments together under the new Ministry of Industry and Tourism is to utilize the moneys voted by the Legislature more efficiently and to have a better balanced and more well rounded programme for all segments of our business community, of which tourism is one of the most important. So, the decision having been made, subject of course to the approval by a vote in this Legislature, it seemed to me the appropriate way to approach the reorganization would be to deal initially with the structure of a new department. I'm glad to report that this has been very largely done. I can report having approved on Tuesday last, two days ago, the new structure which is going to be radically different, I think, than most other departments of government here and elsewhere. We are, in fact, patterning the new Ministry of

Industry and Tourism after a market incorporation in the private sector. We are having a number of highly specialized head office units, if I may use this business analogy. We are having a much stronger system of regional offices in Ontario and outside of Ontario.

The Department of Tourism and Information did have 14 offices dealing only with tourism here in the province. We have had two Northern Ontario Development Corp. offices here in the province. We have had 15 offices for the old Department of Trade and Development outside of the province, and that number is going to be increased by five this year. So you will see that we have 36 offices in Ontario and outside of Ontario; in the past half of them devoted only to tourism and half of them outside of the province devoted only to trade.

Now, in restructuring this department, as I say along the lines of a marketing corporation in the private sector, we are making each of these 36 offices universally competent. So the personnel in the Windsor office who have been responsible only for tourism will now call on every type of business there; and as they call on a stamping plant, let us say, and observe that the stamping plant is making widgets for the automotive industry in Windsor or Detroit, we will say: "Can we help you sell your widgets through our foreign offices?" —to the car makers in Germany or Japan or some other such place.

By the same token the man in Frankfurt who has been dealing only with trade will now be called upon to offer tourism services. As one of my hon. friends—I think perhaps the member for Riverdale—said, this is a very competitive business we are in now and we must mount package tours and such like and we must require of our overseas representatives some degree of salesmanship so far as the tourist industry is concerned.

So, very briefly, this is the concept behind the structure of the new department, and, as I say, this chart has now been decided upon. I hope we will have an opportunity later during the estimates to go into this in greater detail.

I think the second in this sequence of changes is to assign appropriate personnel. I was disappointed, quite frankly, that we couldn't go further in phase number one, because of the 719 employees, civil servants, in this new combined department, approximately 550 are in the head office and approximately 150 are in the regional offices.

I have had two very helpful conferences with the deans of business administration from across this province, and we spent half of one of those conferences dealing with this problem. I was satisfied, after hearing their advice and after hearing the advice of senior specialists in the systems division of the Treasury department, that it will take quite a lot of doing to move this number of people down into these enlarged and strengthened regional offices and that it would be a mistake to try to do any more than this in phase one. I would hope very much, however, that we can embark upon phase two, starting perhaps Oct. 1 of this year, at which time I would hope that we can move additional resources down into the regional level.

I think decentralizing in this fashion will have several consequences. I think that the people in the stronger and larger regional offices will be more cognizant of the needs of the people in the area and of the industries in that area. I think the response will be much more flexible and much faster.

Mr. Stokes: Sounds like a case of too many chiefs and not enough Indians.

Hon. Mr. White: I was told not long ago by a businessman who had succeeded in borrowing $100,000 from ODC that something like 21 approvals had been necessary although this chap quite frankly is very creditworthy—he comes from the north.

I would like very much if we could give the regional manager authority to lend or guarantee a certain amount of money, just as a local bank manager has certain lending limits, so that he can say very quickly, without going through this rather large bureaucracy at Queen's Park: "Yes, we will lend you $15,000" or whatever it may be. Of course the more experienced the regional manager and the larger his responsibilities, the higher his lending limit would be. So that is one of the possibilities I am exploring. I am hoping that the personnel will be selected by May 1, which is just three or four weeks from now. When that has been accomplished I will be requiring my officers to examine every policy and every programme of this new ministry. And I am going to touch on that in a minute or two as I deal briefly with various questions and suggestions that have come from across the floor.

As we examine these policies, it is my intention that there should be a relative shift of resources, financial and otherwise, from foreign corporations to Canadian corporations, from large corporations to small corporations—for reasons we can deal with

later if you wish—and from the manufacturing sector to the service sector. I would be glad to go into that in greater detail.

Speaking briefly of the several emanations of my department, we have now put before the House all of the financial data at our disposal regarding Ontario Place; I have informed the House of my interest in establishing Ontario Place as a Crown corporation, with its own board of directors. We can go into this later in greater detail if you wish.

So far as Sheridan Park is concerned, we are exploring the possibility of putting in place some incubator laboratories, which could be leased for a month, a year or something by business enterprises that haven't the resources or the needs to get into a large permanent installation immediately. The managing director of the Ontario Development Corp. is in San Francisco now looking at some incubator laboratories.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What is an incubator laboratory?

Hon. Mr. White: Well it's a small laboratory which an enterprise can rent for a very short period of time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: For hatching their chickens!

Hon. Mr. White: For hatching some ideas; and if the ideas hatch, then presumably they can move into something more ambitious.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is that a new jargon?

Hon. Mr. White: Well it was new to me.

Mr. Bullbrook: Should we know what an incubator laboratory is?

Hon. Mr. White: It was new to me; now the member knows as much about it as I do.

Now to deal in particular with the Ontario Development Corp., I think it has served its purpose reasonably satisfactorily. I think the time has come now for some very bold changes, and I will be recommending those to my colleagues in the government. I think the board itself should be enlarged, strengthened and broadened so that there is representation on the board from the tourist industry and the service sector, and particularly from small businesses—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister hasn't got any more campaigners left up in London South to appoint.

Hon. Mr. White: And this is what we intend to do. In re-examining these policies, I must say that I think that we can dispense very largely with the elaborate procedures I mentioned earlier. The decentralization of the department should make this possible, because I visualize either an ODC officer being in a regional office, or alternatively one of the employees from my department proper being an agent for the ODC.

I am exploring the possibility of abandoning performance loans, which really is a euphemism for grants. In putting this proposition to the Canadian Manufacturers Association, as I did yesterday, to the Canadian auto parts industry, as I did today, and to the tourist industry, as I did not long ago, I seem to find almost universal agreement that nobody is looking for a handout of cash and it might be very appropriate now to switch off grants and to use the limited amount of money we have for the purpose of either loans or guarantees. If we use the moneys made available by the Legislature for loans, as opposed to grants called "performance loans", of course our money will stretch five or 10 times as far over a period of time. If we get into guarantees, I think we might stretch them on 50 or 100 times as far.

I have had conferences with chartered bankers and others on this subject and I am glad to say that technicians in that complicated industry are now working up data for me on nine questions which I have put to them.

Well Mr. Speaker, this is very briefly the intention of the new ministry. You will be interested to note perhaps that at 4 o'clock today we started a 24-hour think-in of the 25 or 35 senior officers in this new combined department and these are some of the matters which we will be discussing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How can they do that without the minister?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): How can they do that without him?

Hon. Mr. White: Now to respond to some of the queries. We have no intention, certainly, of establishing Information Ontario. We look to the federal government as a model, and if they do something we try to choose another course on the supposition that they are wrong more often than right.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. White: When I look at the Information Canada model, it certainly con-

vinces me that there has not to be a better way of doing it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sounds like one of the speeches he made in Ottawa.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: As far as EIO designation is concerned, this is entirely an objective set of criteria. It does not call for a judgement on the part of anybody. There are certain factors given for unemployment; there are certain factors given for location. There are a variety of factors that they add up to a certain number at the municipalities designated—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think that has been asked for and never tabled. I wonder if the minister would undertake to do that.

Hon. Mr. White: Well I will be glad to get that for the member.

And now, having said that, I am wondering if it would not be wise to abandon the programme altogether. I mentioned earlier that if we were to use the limited funds available to us for bank guarantees or loans instead of this form of grant, this money would stretch a lot farther and I think we will have a great deal more leverage.

If we do in fact make such a decision—I don't want to plunge into this too quickly; I want to get the new department and the strengthened ODC operating before we come to grips with this—but if we do make such a move, then of course, the EIO designation falls by the wayside, because this designation is used only for these grants called performance loans. I would be glad to get the member the criteria.

Mr. Stokes: Does this mean the minister is going to use the same criteria right across the province?

Hon. Mr. White: Well it does not mean that, no. It just means we stop giving money away, and start guaranteeing it, and in the process—

Mr. Stokes: In fact that is what it would be without designation.

Hon. Mr. White: —have a multiplier effect of perhaps 50 or 100. And then, instead of having a few million dollars available through NODC, we would have tens of millions of dollars available for the member's part of the country. So don't knock it until we have a chance to go into it and explain it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is the way Bob Macaulay set it up 15 years ago.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It seems to me Bob Macaulay described it just that way in 1963. Remember he said, "We will spend a hundred million, and when that's gone we will get a hundred million more."

Hon. Mr. White: Now, the leader of the New Democratic Party said the research group within his party offices had requested the amounts and interest for conventional and venture loans. I had not been aware of that. Unless there is some legal impediment, I will undertake to put that information before the House.

I reiterate something I said a couple of weeks ago. There are to be no secrets at all as far as this department or the ODC is concerned, unless we are dealing with confidential information from a private citizen or from a private organization, and my hon. friend will understand that possibility.

Certainly the instruction to my officials are to give whatever information is requested by the members of this Legislature, and that is the way it is going to be.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): That is a refreshing change I think.

Hon. Mr. White: The status of NODC is not in any way affected by this particular legislation, as was intimated by the leader of the NDP. I think there are perhaps improvements to be made there, but this bill does not touch upon them, and I am not in a position at the present time to advance any ideas insofar as that operation is concerned.

Mr. Stokes: Well, the Throne Speech indicated changes were going to be made.

Hon. Mr. White: Now, one of the hon. members mentioned DISC. I think it will be recognized that this is freely a federal responsibility, and I rather think if I had been the person responsible in Ottawa, I would have moved immediately to establish DISC legislation for Canada.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the threat of the provincial Treasurer to consider DISC for the province?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): How can you threaten to consider?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. White: We are getting—I think I am correct—something like 12 of the 52 points on the corporations tax, so you will see that the federal government has a much larger responsibility.

The publishing industry is being studied now by the royal commission on publishing, whose final recommendation is yet to be received. We will, no doubt, be making some special provision in certain circumstances; but I question, really, the desirability of this government making moneys available to newspapers or other periodicals. I question if members really want this government to embark upon that kind of subsidization of news media—

Mr. B. Newman: Or loaning money!

Hon. Mr. White: —or loaning money, yes. I think that should be very carefully considered, perhaps, before it's pressed too far by the opposition—

Mr. Renwick: Yes, that is how the Times of London got started in the 18th century.

Mr. MacDonald: The Telegram could have used about $5 million.

Hon. Mr. White: My hon. friend from Thunder Bay, who is conservative in such matters, is afraid that we are going to put too much emphasis on tourism. Well, in fact, we are. We are going to put a lot of emphasis on tourism.

I frankly see no particular merit in making more things if people want services. This is a rather radical point of view and I expect my hon. friend will not entirely share it. Having a second or a third or a fourth car in one's garage may be the least satisfactory way in which to spend several thousand dollars, and in my personal opinion it may be ever so much better to go to a symphony concert or to a pop band, whatever they call them, or sit down and enjoy the outdoor—

Mr. Renwick: Draft beer!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Go ahead; tax-free draft beer!

Hon. Mr. White: —joys of northwestern Ontario. We are very deliberately going to try to assist the tourist industry in ways not attempted before—and indeed the entire service sector.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How does the government plan to get the people there? What sort of things are they going to use?

Hon. Mr. White: Somebody asked about pamphlets in the lobby. I really didn't know anything about that, but I will undertake to make sure there are some pamphlets down there.

Insofar as ministerial trips are concerned, I have a number planned. Members may be interested in a brief summary. I am going to go to Timmins on Monday. I am going to Victoria—

Mr. Ferrier: I will be glad to see the minister in Timmins.

Mr. Stokes: I hope he has got Hamilton and Sault Ste. Marie on his list.

Hon. Mr. White: —on May 7 and 8.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Sarnia!

Hon. Mr. White: I think I am going to Ottawa again on May 12. I am going to England on May 14.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That will be a great meeting with the new agent general. Won't that be a great meeting? Disraeli's room at the Carlton Club.

Hon. Mr. White: I am going to Niagara Falls on May 30. I am going to New York on June 5 and 6 and I will be going all over the world selling Ontario goods and services.

Mr. Stokes: When is the minister going to come to Stelco and Algoma Steel?

Hon. Mr. White: "Wish me luck as you wave me goodbye. . . ."

Mr. Stokes: When is the minister going to talk to Algoma Steel and Stelco? He's going to fiddle while Rome burns.

Hon. Mr. White: If members thought Stan Randall and my colleague, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), had their running shoes on: "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

Mr. Deans: Has the minister practised cutting sugar cane?

Mr. Stokes: Is that a threat or a promise?

Hon. Mr. White: The iron ore problem, I know, is very distressing to my hon. friend—

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister work in the rice paddies when he goes to China?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This will cut into his fishing trips more often.

Hon. Mr. White: —and I would like to inform myself more thoroughly about it. The

Minister of Natural Resources has provided a lengthy answer today and I certainly propose to work closely with him—

Mr. Cassidy: Or shoot wild boar in East Germany?

Hon. Mr. White: —to see if these resources could be utilized here in Canada.

The member for York Centre I think it was, suggested that there be a clearing house of information for financial opportunities. I like that idea very much. I had not thought of it before.

I am wondering, however, if an idea of mine might be combined with that. Would it be a good idea—I have been asking myself and my colleagues—to establish a joint venture corporation into which the private sector would put some number of millions of dollars by way of equity capital and in which we as a government might provide a loan, perhaps on a two-to-one ratio or on a three-to-one ratio, or even better a loan guarantee.

Mr. Deans: Why not equity?

Hon. Mr. White: Small and medium size companies needing equity capital but being unable to go to the market because of the economics of floating a private issue—which as members know, must reach a certain size before it can be undertaken economically—I wonder if this kind of financing couldn't be attempted by such a joint venture. And perhaps if such a joint venture were undertaken it could indeed become a clearing house of information about those who have money to invest and those who need capital for their enterprises. This is an idea that no doubt deserves further consideration.

The Jelinek firm at no time approached the Ontario Development Corp. for money. We haven't access to their balance sheet or their profit-and-loss statement, therefore we have no idea whether or not be would have been able to lend them money. But the suggestion is simply not correct that they explored all avenues for Canadian capital.

The hon. member for Riverdale has pointed out the need for analysis. In our new structure we have something like 75 people in a research group in several categories. I, myself, think that is too many. I think the time has come to rigorously assign the research responsibilities of this group within my new ministry to the Ontario Economic Council and to the research people within the Treasury Department.

No doubt these tremendously complicated economic matters must be investigated by the best brains we have available. And to that end the Ontario Economic Council, which last year had a budget of $250,000—of which $230,000 was expended—this year, as members will see in the estimates, is asking the Legislature to vote $375,000.

The chairman of the Ontario Economic Council, Dr. James Gillies, proposes to set up four research areas; which we can develop in greater detail during the estimates. And certainly the change in the international situation looms very large in these matters. I think we should not attempt to duplicate that. I think perhaps our role should be applied research; although quite frankly I am not certain at this stage of the game just what I mean by that phrase.

It was mentioned by one of the hon. members that we should have a tourist-rating service. We have—just last Friday—published the most ambitious description of accommodations offered in any North American jurisdiction. It does not provide stars, but it does show the facilities; whether it is a private bath, or a communal bath—that's not the word, maybe—

Mr. Ferrier: That sounds interesting!

Hon. Mr. White: Common bathroom, I think is the terminology.

An hon. member: Hot and cold running maids!

Mr. MacDonald: The minister thinks he is still in Japan.

Hon. Mr. White: —the type of meal service they provide, the range of prices, and certain other things. So without awarding stars as do private guides, we are at least giving a very full description of the services offered and the prices charged. I think a reasonably intelligent person can decide whether it is the kind of accommodation he wants, or if he should look at an alternative facility.

My hon. friend from Riverdale dealt with the need for exports, and he put this down as a very important, or maybe the most important, source of financial resources for social purposes. Without disagreeing with that particular argument, which I listened to with great interest, I think we have to go beyond that, and say not only exports but sales of goods and services within the country and outside of the country.

And if I may say so, the federal government is deliberately putting people out of work to fight inflation over an extended

period of time—by their own admission. It is something one didn't have to infer. Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Benson said on a number of occasions: "We are putting people out of work to fight inflation."

We have argued since October, 1969, that that's the worst of all possible solutions. I hope we have a chance some day soon to debate this issue, because in recent weeks I have been formulating a new set of opinions—I hesitate to call it a theory—namely that if we deliberately curtail our gross national product while attempting to perpetuate a relatively high standard of living, we are throwing ourselves upon the markets of the world, and upon foreign capital markets, which may in the long run be very, very destructive to this nation.

I had an interesting chat with Mr. Mori, the managing director of Mitsubishi, a week and, and he told me that that great trading corporation, with a $12 billion annual volume—$33 million every day of the year, including Sundays and holidays—was switching its emphasis from being middleman to being an investor. And Mr. Mori said that the Japanese trading company was interested in investing money here in Ontario. That's something I would like very much to consider. I would like to think about that a little bit. I wouldn't want to say yes or no too quickly.

Mr. Renwick: Provided we can sell abroad.

Hon. Mr. White: But the fact of the matter is, if we have seven per cent of our people out of work we are losing approximately $7 billion a year on goods and services, of which perhaps $2 billion would go into investment. I'm talking now about the country as a whole. That $2 billion, when invested, turns up an increase in goods and services.

So projected forward over even a rather short period of time, the cost of unemployment in strict economic terms becomes very, very large, and eventually, infinite—

Mr. Cassidy: It's a pity the policies of the minister's government don't match the quality of these revelations.

Hon. Mr. White: —without any regard to the social costs, which are incalculable.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): They have never paid much attention.

Mr. Deans: What does the minister think of the budget?

Hon. Mr. White: We are opening a Washington office, as you know—

Mr. Cassidy: Why doesn't the minister get the Treasurer to change his budget?

Hon. Mr. White: We are opening up a Washington office. I don't know just what kind of results we're going to get for it, but the cost, relative to the potential benefit, is such a small ratio that I'm looking forward to trying it.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister going to ask Foster Hewitt to be our agent general there?

Hon. Mr. White: We won't have to get very many yesses out of that administration down there to make that a very worthwhile operation.

Mr. Cassidy: The reservoir in London has run dry.

Mr. Renwick: Where else is the minister planning on opening offices?

Hon. Mr. White: The member for Riverdale also suggested that we co-operate with industry in tackling world-wide markets, and certainly this is exactly what we intend to do in a variety of ways.

I'm wondering, quite frankly, if we shouldn't set up a joint venture, perhaps with the private sector providing the equity capital and the government coming in behind it with loan capital, or loan guarantees, to establish a foreign trading corporation of our own to offer the products of small and medium sized Ontario firms, in a way which they themselves cannot do because of their lack of resources or expertise. So that's another idea I'd like to explore.

Design becomes extremely important, and I think my hon. friends will be interested to know that in the new department we have what we call—it's a very small unit, three people in all—the office of Standards, Design and Innovation.

Mr. Renwick: One for each of the three people.

Mr. Bullbrook: Those fellows are submerging in titles.

Hon. Mr. White: The standards part of the job is to—

Mr. Bullbrook: They are going down for the third time.

Hon. Mr. White: —work with Ottawa on metric conversion and with our own private sector here in Ontario.

An hon. member: He thinks he's in his office.

Hon. Mr. White: I gave an undertaking to the chairman of the National Design Council that we would establish a focal point here with which they could communicate, and which would disseminate information ideas to our industries.

The innovation part relates to a notion of my own, which is that we should have some number of innovation teams, the first of which I hope will be an innovation team relating to education, as it affects the business sector and presumably explore a number of ideas. Four of the deans of business would like to see this proceeded with.

For instance, should we have a foreign trade institute? I learned from Tovarich Vassili N. Myschkov—

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is name dropping again.

Hon. Mr. White: —over a few "na zdorowlas", that an Academy of Foreign Trade was commenced in Moscow in 1943. He was recalled by Premier Stalin from Siberia to take a course of study there. When I heard that story I thought to myself that maybe the time has come for us to have a sophisticated Academy of Foreign Trade. At any rate, that is the kind of idea which an innovation team or exploration team could look into.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister reconsidering his retirement now that he has got this exciting portfolio?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He has lined up a few small directorships.

Hon. Mr. White: Any time I waver I just look across the House and my will is strengthened.

I agree that we should elicit pledges of export performance as we make financial and other resources available. I learned from Mr. Pepin, three weeks ago last Monday I think it was, that certain of the assistance available from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa is conditional upon there being no constraints on foreign subsidiaries located in Canada. At that time I asked the officials responsible in my department to explore the possibility of ensuring that there are no inhibitions placed in the way of a foreign subsidiary located in Ontario if that firm is given some kind of help from us.

Mr. Renwick: Plus positive export plans.

Hon. Mr. White: I am not denying that; I just say we haven't had a chance really to work up these criteria at the present time.

That would appear to deal with most of the matters—I appreciate the suggestion concerning section 8 of this bill, and I will have that investigated by experts from the legislative counsel's office.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? What about a comment relating to his inability to involve himself with economic planning on a regional or provincial basis?

Hon. Mr. White: No, I see that is a function of the Treasury Department.

Mr. Renwick: He won't be here enough.

Hon. Mr. White: Actually I think it would be unthinkable to have it separated. When that was separated, I think one could say it was the result of the determination of a very vigorous and aggressive minister to enlarge his area of responsibility, and that enormous vitality was accommodated in that way. But I think we have proved by that experiment that the major policies and economic planning must remain in the Treasury Department.

Of course we have a very important input, and I have no doubt that the Treasurer will find it possible to say "yes" to every proposal which I bring to him for additional resources. If indeed that proves to be the case, then it will be a very happy balance of responsibilities.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, by way of a question, I wonder if I might avail myself of the minister's offer to elaborate on his suggestion that the government's economic thrust, if I may borrow that dynamic phrase, is going to be of assistance to small industries rather than large industries in the province.

I ask the question because my recollection is that one of the main points in the government's Oct. 14 revolutionary document last fall on the pattern of economic development in Ontario was that for greater efficiency we must concentrate our investment in areas where we have an economic advantage to be able to compete in the growing competition in the world, rather than have the kind of fragmentization of our economic development after the fashion of Stan Randall who would have built a new industry at every crossroads of the province if he could have done it.

Hon. Mr. White: That is a real problem. I think there are reasons other than economic for trying to nurture small business. The federal DREE programme makes enormous amounts of money available for major undertakings of a specialized type. I think this is probably all right, although I must say that in doing so they have made some decisions which adversely affect this province. For instance—

Mr. MacDonald: How does the minister reconcile that with the major objective spelled out in the Oct. 14 document last fall?

Hon. Mr. White: I think the federal government, in investing tens of millions of dollars in high technology and large scale endeavour, is accommodating that particular purpose. We have not got the funds at this level at this time to do anything dramatic with these large scale, very expensive modern industries.

Now if we had X number of dollars to lend I would far rather see one one-thousandth X made available to 1,000 small enterprises than one-tenth X made available to 10 larger industries. I point out to members that if we do so we will give a larger number of smaller, lagging municipalities, such as those mentioned to us today by the member for Kent, a crack at the wheel so to speak. We will nurture the independent businessman in this province, whom I see to be a buttress against encroaching bureaucracy and over-large governments.

I think there are social reasons for it. The amount of money taken per job in this kind of enterprise is very much less than in larger enterprises. For instance, in the tourist industry it takes $5,000 or $10,000 to create a job whereas in a high technology industry it takes $30,000 or more than $30,000 to create a job.

I believe there are a number of reasons for reorienting our programmes in ways that I have hinted at but which have yet to be decided precisely.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

(*continued*)

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments I want to make on the bill. Let me deal first of all with the way the politics of the government come through to us because I think there is a very real political aspect to the reorganization of the government.

It comes through to us quite bluntly that of the competitors for the leadership of the Progressive Conservative Party three of them are provincial secretaries with anonymous responsibilities so far as the Legislature and the public are concerned. One of them, who apparently at the present moment is the heir apparent, is very publicly visible. I say to him that there is nothing very really wrong with that kind of organization by the government, but to deny that there is a political aspect in the selection and appointment of these persons who were concerned seems to me to run in the face of reality.

Having said that it seems to me that the fundamental problem which this bill presents to the Legislature is, I suspect, an almost intractable one. The Cronyn committee has put the best complexion which it could upon that kind of an intractable problem. It has very logically and one could say sensibly allocated the various areas under the aegis of the co-ordinating minister, the Provincial Secretary for Social Development. The areas of co-ordination assigned to him make very good sense and we have had very little criticism of them. The same can be said with respect to the allocation of the co-ordinating functions of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and the same can be said for the Provincial Secretary for Justice. As the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) very clearly pointed out, the role of the provincial secretaries, with respect to the generation of policy in the various interrelated fields covered by the particular ministries that come under the co-ordination responsibilities for the provincial secretaries, permits what appears to be a very sensible way for developing policies and for making certain that in policy development those departments or ministries which appear to be interrelated all have a role and a place to play in the co-ordination of policy.

The obvious matter, of course, is that the fault, in the geological sense, that runs through it is that they are entirely and completely divorced from the ministry which is charged with the financial responsibility of

the government of the Province of Ontario. Looked at from that point of view—and I'll come back to that point again—there is, in fact, a series of provincial secretaries co-ordinating the policy development work of related ministries, but carrying out that co-ordination and that development of policies totally separate and distinct from the minister who, ultimately, will have the main say as to whether or not funds can or will be or should be made available for that particular programme.

I recognize that the Planning and Priorities Board, and finally, the cabinet are going to decide those particular questions, but it's perfectly clear that the major input into discussions of that type, that is, what policies can be implemented, what policies cannot be implemented, what programmes are to be implemented, what programmes are to be abandoned, what new ones are to be developed, has to be developed within the resources available to the government, and this minister is going to have to have the major say about those matters.

I express concern because we are not in charge of the government and there is no point for us, academically or from our particular point of view, voting against a bill such as this which relates to the internal organization of government. But I do point out to the minister that it seems to me that the point at which the financial questions, that is, the capacity of the government to carry out its programmes, whether they be existing programmes, new programmes or the ordering of the priorities, is going to depend in the last analysis upon financial capacity of the province. It seems to me that, if you separate the minister who has that total responsibility and has no connecting links from his ministry with the provincial secretaries for the various related areas to carry out their co-ordination, you are, in a sense, setting the provincial secretaries to develop policies which may very well turn out to be simply academic exercises because of the financial limitations on the capacities of the revenue sources of the government to implement them.

I think a similar point can be made that the extent of the responsibilities being assumed by this particular minister seems to me in a very personal sense to deprive the government of one of the major purposes that it wanted to achieve and that was the availability of the ministers to each other for the purpose of policy formulation. It seems to me that, if this minister in his many roles is, for example, as he said the other day, going to Japan for a period of time, certainly he is not going to be available for any sort of co-ordinated work with other ministries. I suspect—and I use Japan only as one example—he is, in fact, going to be either out of the country or at Canadian conferences at the federal level or at the provincial level or at the municipal level in a way which will make him for practical purposes personally unavailable for many of the co-ordinating purposes that the Cronyn committee was designed to solve. Mr. Speaker, I don't happen, to view the report of a Cronyn committee as some blueprint that has to be followed slavishly and I don't think that the government did follow it slavishly.

I think that it was not just the creation of a structure, but it was the creation of a structure within the very real sense of the individual personages within the government who were available for the roles which were to be carried out. I think it's fair to say that this kind of a ministry could only be conceived in relation to a very limited number of men, of which this minister is one, who appear to have the capacity and the ability and the industry to carry that kind of burden and I say this not for the purpose particularly of patting him on the back.

The fact of the matter is that there isn't always going to be a person with the background of experience and knowledge and the wide grasp of concerns that can take on this kind of a burden. I think in a very real sense the Cronyn committee, I am sure, would recognize the fact that in drawing this pattern of government, they didn't draw it divorced from the actual persons who are going to be involved in carrying out the project.

It was not, as I see it, simply for the purpose of drawing a management chart. What they were really engaged in and why, overall, we have supported the government's plans for reorganization is that we are talking about basically a framework within which men, charged with the responsibility of the government of Ontario, can exercise intelligent judgement and make sensible decisions within the limitations which are involved.

We sat through the previous Parliament and we saw very clearly the structures for inner communication within the government, the departmental vertical system, the lack of co-ordination between various areas of government, were something which had to be corrected. The Cronyn committee, in our view, came up with what I think is a sensible and realistic solution to some of the problems.

But let's not overstep in our enthusiasm for that Cronyn committee. Regardless of the rationale which they have put forward to support this particular ministry with these responsibilities—I come back to my first point —I rather suspect that the first part of it, dealing with the provincial secretaries for these various areas, was relatively simple compared to dealing with this intractable problem of how you deal with the financial administration of a province such as the Province of Ontario.

They very clearly decided that the financial administration of the Province of Ontario, in its broadest sense, had to be and had to remain centralized. In the absence of being able to spell out any alternative suggestion, I think we have to go along with that. But I don't want anyone to underestimate the fact that we think it is a kind of intractable problem.

The minister is responsible for the financial management of the Province of Ontario—that is, in the very real financial managerial sense. He is also responsible for the financial arrangements with respect to municipal government throughout the Province of Ontario. Included in that is the regionalization of government. Included in that must, of necessity, also be the plans for the Design for Development and the regionalization of the Province of Ontario which is taking place.

Included in that must, of necessity, be all of the matters related to sharing of revenue resources with the municipalities. Included in that must be the vexed questions of a more equitable tax structure and a less regressive one, so far as the municipalities are concerned.

On the other hand we have the relationship, in a financial sense, of the provincial government with the federal government and the whole of the tax structure problems that are involved in that. There is also the whole of the continuing problem with respect to the allocation of the overall resources of Canada as between the federal government and each of the provinces and the larger question of dealing with regional disparities and regional development.

So I say that the only convenient sort of subsuming principle that the Cronyn committee could come up with was the extreme necessity of having this centralization of the financial arrangements of the province in a single ministry. But we are talking about people being available, and I emphasize the point that I don't think kthe minister, with all of the facilities of this massive department of government and all of the skill of the senior members of that civil service—indeed throughout the whole of that department—can make up for the fact that he is not going to be all that much available.

It would seem to me, again without empire building or even suggesting anything such as empire building, that this minister could very well use, rather than parliamentary assistants, something in the nature of associate ministers, not for the purpose of redepartmentalizing his department at all—because that is what we are trying to get away from. Their function, as I conceive it, would be to cross this geological fault to which I refer and to have a role to play with the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, for example, so that whenever that group of ministers meets together to co-ordinate policies, an associate minister, or whatever designation could be used, would also be there as those policies were developed.

He would have an opportunity to convey to the provincial secretary the financial limitations or financial problems that were involved, and to make certain that whatever cost projections were involved in the evolving policies —worked up, say, by the Provincial Secretary for Social Development—were available at the initial impact. We would have a very close relationship with the minister himself so that this kind of input could take place.

Similarly, an associate minister would be available to the group of ministers who meet under the aegis of the Provincial Secretary for Justice and similarly with the ministers who meet under the aegis of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

All I am really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there seems to me to be too much of a split between those provincial secretaries in their co-ordinating role and this intractable problem relating to the whole of the financial administration and the fiscal policies and the relationships of this ministry with other levels of government, be they municipal, regional or the federal government, and in the roles which the minister also has to perform, of going to the other markets of the world to find out whether or not capital resources are available, if and when the province has to borrow in those markets.

It is just not possible to send to a country such as Japan, or any country, anyone other than the man who has the ultimate responsibility. You cannot send an associate minister or a parliamentary assistant of this minister to Japan to talk about the availability of

capital in those markets for borrowing by the provincial government, or vice versa. You have to send the person who has got the status of the senior ministry in the government.

Therefore, again, I come back to that particular point that the fault, in the organizational sense, is too much of a split in the structural sense between the financial aspect and the roles being played in the development of policies by the provincial secretaries, and on the very human basis the simple unavailability of this minister regardless of the extent of the workload which he is being asked to carry and which, as far as I can see, he welcomes and enjoys.

I would say to the minister that there is one area where I think we need much advice and assistance and I think he is the minister to provide it. And the important factor, insofar as I am concerned, is because we are about to engage on the basic fundamental question. The basic problem of government today is how do you phase out existing programmes in order to institute new programmes which are required by the times.

Every existing programme, in a sense, has developed a political constituency which makes it extremely difficult to phase it out. You can't simply add programme after programme on top of other programmes without having new revenue and quite obviously you do not have the kind of revenue which is required to simply institute one programme after another.

Therefore you have a very real problem of shifting and phasing out programmes on the one hand and introducing new programmes on the other hand, within the available financial resources. This exists whether the available financial resources are spoken about in a static sense of the present revenues of the provincial government, or whether you include in the development the so-called fiscal dividend we get from the increasing revenues of the tax structure in an expanding economy.

We are faced with, and we are entering upon, the discussion of the estimates. And really, this system of dealing with the estimates militates against any overall view of programme substitution, new programme priority and any consideration of anything but a piecemeal approach to each of the programmes. I say that the system really frustrates all of us who participate in it.

We will be dealing, for example, with the Ministry of Colleges and Universities—or take a larger one, the Ministry of Health. And there are built-in programmes for which we do not have cost projections for the next 10 years. Cost projections would indicate that, for example, the health structure of the province is going to be a tremendously expensive bite out of the province's total available revenues for some long period to come.

Now, within the overall programmes of the Health department, how do we, going through the estimates, ever give consideration to the question of whether this programme should be phased out, of whether that programme should be phased out, of whether this is a necessary programme, of what the total projections are, or of whether the $1 million or $10 million or $25 million spent here and now on this programme would be better spent on some other programme?

When we have to deal with estimates on such a piecemeal basis, it is almost impossible for the Legislature as such to participate in a meaningful way about this basic problem, which is subsumed these days under the term priority. Because "priorities" tend really to hide the problem.

The real problem is with the programmes in government which are structured and built in and which restrict the elbow room of the government because they are committed in advance, and no ministry can do very much about them. How do we get to the basic questions in the estimates about what is the benefit of this programme related to its economic cost, regardless of what the cost-benefit analysis may be of the programme, and what is its projected cost over a number of years as compared with alternative programmes for which this money could be much better used?

We have a different philosophy, in a sense, about this than the government, but even within those differences of philosophy, the problem is not going to go away. I think that to make the Legislature somewhat more meaningful, this minister's department, charged as he is with this overall sense of financial responsibility for the province, has an obligation, again through either his parliamentary assistants or otherwise to have available when we are discussing, for example again, the Ministry of Health, a parliamentary assistant from that department who, either fed through the minister or given directly in the informal give and take of it, would have the information with respect to the 10-year cost projections of a given programme. He would have available for the committee on estimates, "This programme 10

years from now is going to cost us this number of dollars. We have chosen to continue this programme. Other programmes we have not been able to institute because we don't have the available resources."

In a very roundabout way I am asking the minister, because of his assuming this sense of responsibility for the overall financial administration of the Province of Ontario that he also specifically give consideration to establishing within his department a small secretariat of experts who can, in fact, provide this assembly with the kind of finanicial information so that we can intelligently discuss this question of the programmes which are reflected in the departmental estimates of each of the departments of government.

Mr. Speaker, that is really about the substance of what I want to say. I think that we wish the minister well in carrying out these responsibilities. I don't really think that we have—and I don't think we're constrained to think that we can, in this situation, not having had the experience of government—out of whole cloth, come up with some alternative method. We have raised questions about it and we pointed out the problems as we see them. In summary I am saying basically two things to the minister.

One is, he needs more people who can talk on an equal level with the provincial secretaries in the co-ordination of policies. Secondly, he has got to have that connection between the provincial secretaries and the co-ordinating policy development aspect of the reorganization of government; a relationship within the financial limitations, restrictions and administration of the province.

A third and auxiliary point which constantly concerns us is whether we can make this system of dealing with the estimates something more than the non-system which it presently is. That revolves around the whole question of the methods of choice made between continuing programmes, expanding programmes, instituting new programmes, the revenue restrictions and limitations which are upon the province regardless of the generation of additional revenue which may result from the ongoing development, in an economic sense, of the province.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the comments that I wanted to address to the minister. I hope when he replies that he might see fit to comment on some of them.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments to the minister in relation to this new department. I think he will agree that all members, starting with my leader, were very complimentary as far as the minister's capacities, possibly compared to others on the other side, were concerned. In any event they were all very complimentary in his regard, but their concern was about the overwhelming responsibility that he has and the burden for one particular individual.

The query that I would like to put in at this stage is why, in this particular department, was not the same format followed as in other departments? In other words, establishing a sort of policy minister along with various other ministers; for instance, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, a minister for Finance, Treasury, Intergovernmental Affairs. I listened with interest the other evening as the minister went on for some time, and he must have spent at least an hour, just outlining the various sub-departments and individual bureaucrats who are going to be within his department. I have nothing but sympathy for any individual who is going to try to reach him at any time. I can't seem to understand why so much responsibility would be under one individual no matter how competent. Yet we have in the justice field a split where we seem to have about three ministers too many. I notice that the COGP report—

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): There is no justice.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Don't say that.

Mr. Roy: The Solicitor General is one of them, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that, when one looks at all the criticism about this particular department we are left with only one conclusion—that possibly you just did not want to go into policy, that in fact, there is some merit to saying the minister's confreres were kicked upstairs, because he is in a situation right now where he is not only in policy, but he is going to be running the show, federal-provincial relations, Finance—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Not federal-provincial relations.

Mr. Roy: I understood last night from the Treasurer's comments that he would be involved in federal-provincial relations.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is a great difference between being involved and running the show.

Mr. Roy: The Treasurer has a habit of not only being involved but running the show. He will have Municipal Affairs. I don't see how many municipalities can ever be able to reach him. I agree with the hon. member for Riverdale that should he ever take a trip—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He'd be wasting his time.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): They don't get anywhere anyway.

Mr. Roy: His parliamentary assistants, in my opinion, will have possibly more responsibility than someone, for instance, like the proposed Solicitor General, who is going to be looking after the Lightning Rod Act, and things like that.

Mr. Reid: That is in line with his particular competence.

Mr. Roy: I can't understand why, and I think it will work out as the McRuer report said. The Treasurer went on for some time naming these various bureaucrats within his department. I look back to 1969 at the McRuer report, which mentioned at that time that the individual felt somewhat frustrated by the bureaucracy just within the former department. Now in his present department I don't see how there is going to be any communication with him as a minister responsible to the people in this province. Basically, these are the only comments I have to make.

Mr. Speaker: Any other speaker?

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word of thanks to the minister first. I have heard from picking up scuttle-butt, or talking to members of the House before, that one of the frustrations here has occasionally been, or has often been, in fact, that ministers of the Crown toss a bill on the table before the House, leave members to debate it, and so on, and then they get up at the end and say, "Ah, but you didn't understand."

In fact, the Treasurer gave a very full explanation the other evening at the commencement of the debate on this bill. I would hope that it is a precedent which is taken up by other members of the government opposite rather than leaving us, occasionally perhaps, to make mistakes. But, certainly, if we make mistakes about legislation, on which the minister has not had the courtesy to explain it, it is inadvertent and the blame should be put over on that side and not on this side.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): He didn't always do that, though.

Mr. Cassidy: I hope that he himself follows the precedent, too, and that he will ensure that he follows this very worthwhile precedent. The committee on Ontario government productivity, which the minister certainly is an adherent of, says a number of things that I think are interesting in relation to the bill, and to the decision to amalgamate so many functions under the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

It wanted to ensure the responsibility of elected representatives, better communications between the public and the government, and to create a system which provided the greatest possible assurance of some decision-making. In going through this—I think the Treasurer would be interested in this one—it stated as well that, "If an organization is to be judged on its productivity and on its success in delivering programmes, then variety as opposed to uniformity must be appreciated and encouraged."

And this is really one point that I want to come to, because the minister in his speech the other night put forward a number of arguments why the Treasury could not be organized as a policy field. Why it could not be made uniform, if you will, with the other policy fields.

And, in fact, the arguments that he put forward were reasonably cogent. He suggested, for example, that if you separate economic planning from the function of financial control—the functions of the Minister of Finance—then, in experience, it tends to get somewhat weak.

He talked about the need to integrate provincial and municipal property tax fields, and this kind of thing. He talked about the need, and in some rather interesting language, in fact, about the need of having a personal staff—that would work with him in his capacity as Treasurer when he gets to the process of budget preparation.

The thing that bothers me is that the government and the Cronyn committee, having come to a conclusion that a policy field might not be applicable in this particular area—in the same way as the field of social development or justice, or natural resources—then proceeded to go back to where they were before, and not only leave the Treasurer with his job as he has had it before but, in fact, lump in another ministry along side it by putting in the functions of municipal affairs.

In other words, was there no way in which variety—in order to increase productivity and effectiveness and so on—could not have been used rather than simply falling back on a solution which, I hope the minister himself will admit, carries some very grave dangers, and about which grave doubts have been expressed.

Many people on this side of the House really wonder whether anybody else but the present Treasurer can do the job, and I think there is doubt as well whether even super-Darcy is capable of carrying on the job, and doing it on a regular basis.

I asked the minister last week, just before we adjourned for the Easter weekend, whether he would reply to the question of how to ensure the kind of responsiveness which is certainly a pre-eminent need in this particular ministry. I had it in the back of my mind then—I wasn't quoting it, it was late in the day and we all wanted to go home—but some of the thoughts that led the COGP to proposed the creation of policy ministers.

Basically what the COGP said was that there isn't enough ministerial time if you have everybody carrying the very heavy departmental loads of administering large departments. And they talked about the increasing demands of the Legislature, and of legitimate political activity that ministers have to carry out in their responsibilities in the constituency—and this kind of thing. And they finally came to the conclusion that somebody, somewhere had to be available to think about policy; to sit in on the Policy and Priorities Board and have an overall, overview of the programmes and decision-making of the government; and also in order to improve relationships with the public. Now Bill Davis' love affair with the people, which presumably extends to his—

Mr. Speaker: Order please! I would ask the hon. member if he would discontinue referring to the hon. ministers and the members by their first names.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm sorry. The Hon. Mr. Davis' infatuation—

Mr. Speaker: Refer to "the hon. member" or "the hon. minister."

Mr. Cassidy: —with the people was something which we grew rather tired of hearing about during the provincial election. However, one has to assume that there was some meaning in that particular kind of approach or style that he took then. What it is, I'm not quite sure.

But certainly if one reads the COGP report, which we received shortly afterwards, there is an echo of this kind of approach in talking about a policy minister's role with the general public. And that is that once freed from the administrative responsibilities of the portfolio, the minister of a policy ministry would be in a position to devote more time and thought to improving the linkages between government and citizens—a task of major importance, the report said, but one that is additionally significant at a time when citizens are no longer content to simply leave it up to George, or leave it up to the people in the government. It talked about other forms of policy development, but the essential thing was to spend more time in relations with the public.

Now one has to assume that as the minister whose co-ordinating and integrating functions are the broadest of any minister in the cabinet, apart from the Premier, the Hon. Mr. McKeough likewise ought to be able to have this kind of time to respond to the public. He said when he made his statement that some of the duties which he had as Treasurer or as Minister of Municipal Affairs have been relieved from him through the transfer of the civil service and the OMB and the assessment function, and so on, to other departments. In fact 40 per cent of the work, he said, had disappeared.

Now I don't want to be pernickety. I am not sure whether he means 40 per cent of the combined work of the two ministries—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh no.

Mr. Cassidy: —or 40 per cent of the work that he had been doing in the last couple of months just prior—that is what you are saying is it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. What I am saying is, at a guess, 40 per cent of what I have done in the last year as Treasurer and as chairman of the Treasury Board, and also Minister responsible for the civil service.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay. Well 40 per cent of the work that the minister has been doing as Treasurer has in fact been taken off his shoulders. Moreover, certain administrative jobs in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs have also been shifted to the revenue department or other areas, and therefore the minister is not taking 100 per cent of the Municipal Affairs ministry, but is taking maybe 75 or 80 per cent of it.

All the same, however you add these things up you have a job which is more than either job was originally, I would suggest, and which doesn't give any additional time for the minister to do the kinds of things that policy ministers in other areas are in fact being given their full time to do; that is, to think about questions of policy and to seek to improve the government's relationships with the Legislature and with the public.

An hon. member: And with foreign companies.

Mr. Cassidy: Now we do have some respect for the capacities of the Treasurer, but in effect what is being suggested is that he, with no time at his disposal, can do an equally good job in responding to the public as the policy ministers who have been given their full time to do that particular job.

When I spoke last week on the reorganization bill, I drew an analogy which I thought wasn't perhaps totally fair at the time, in referring to the problems that I had recently had in trying to get some communications with Bell Canada and about how I had been shunted along through the ranks from assistant deputy regional managers to regional managers to associate deputy regional vice-presidents and this kind of thing, and that even when I wrote to the president, Mr. Scrivener, up in Montreal, that in fact the letter got shunted back to somebody here. I should really have written to his sister-in-law, I might have gotten a better answer.

At any rate when I read Mr. McKeough's statement about the reorganization in his ministry I had the feeling, my God, I have seen it all before, this is what happened to me when I went to Bell Canada and in fact it is happening here as well. The minister tried to explain the reorganization of his ministry and the way in which it was being put together. He said that it was being reorganized like a new ministry and not just amalgamating some functions that were there before. That is fine. I have an impression that there is a tremendous jumble and a tremendous reshuffling of jobs and that an awful lot of people are being put into areas where they are not particularly familiar and that the department is going to have some real teething troubles as a result of that. Nevertheless, that is the decision that he has made.

But if you want to talk about the municipal area, which is one area where there is a large number of units—a large number of mayors, and controllers and municipal treasurers and people like that who will want to relate to the minister—you can see that in fact it has been very severely buried in a dense thicket of bureaucratic structure which has been created as a consequence of uniting so many functions under one minister and with no others in there really able to assist him. I really dismiss the parliamentary assistants. One of them as we know has responsibilities up in Ottawa and the minister himself said that they really will be doing special jobs and that they don't be engaged in any of the more normal work of the ministry.

Anyway, to take the structure of the economic policy and intergovernmental relations stream, to use the minister's term, by the time you get down to that level you have already gone through three levels, so you are three levels removed from the minister.

You have Mr. Don Stevenson, a capable civil servant, reporting to Mr. Ian Macdonald, the deputy minister, who in turn reports to the minister.

Then you come down another level and you have secretariat for intergovernmental relations, with Mr. Greathed. That's four levels removed from the minister.

Finally if you're a mayor or if you are a clerk-treasurer, or something like that and you want to get some answers from the department, you are down in the secretariat for provincial-municipal relations, which is five levels removed from the minister. And, unless you are involved at a senior level in one of the major municipalities of the province, quite likely you are down one or two levels below that; six or seven levels removed from the minister.

I suggest that—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What about the member over there?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Martel: Who knows, you might get down to him.

Mr. Cassidy: It might do you more good. I suggest that this is going to have a couple of results. One is that municipalities which should be able to deal in many questions with the bureaucracy, will be put off because the thicket of bureaucracy is so great. Outside groups within the municipal arena—citizens' groups and so forth—which want to get in touch with the department will have the same problem as well.

They don't want to see the guy who is sixth and seventh in line in the hierarchy from the minister. They will try that route. They will go up a couple of stages and back a couple of stages and they will be rebuffed and eventually they'll come banging at the doors at the political level, because they will be saying the bureaucratic structure that you have erected just doesn't work.

If you turn to the level of finance you have very much the same thing. You have under the minister and the deputy minister an assistant deputy for finance, who has not yet been appointed. Then you have a section for tax and fiscal policy under Terry Russell, and then, finally, deep down—five levels again removed from the minister—you have a section for municipal fiscal development.

Mr. Martel: Well insulated.

Mr. Cassidy: Very well insulated. And that's the level where probably municipal treasurers, who are pretty important people will have to relate.

Mr. Lawlor: Does the Treasurer's head know what his toes are doing?

Mr. Cassidy: Likewise, in the field of planning you have an assistant deputy minister for urban and regional affairs, a position which is vacant right now for reasons which the minister hasn't explained. Then there is an executive director for urban and regional development and then, underneath that, again five levels removed from the minister, is where the long-term thinking about municipal planning is going to go. Five levels removed from the minister. How the minister reaches down, or how the municipal planning people who are tucked away in a corner of the department can in turn reach back to the minister, is very hard for me to tell.

Likewise, the plans administration branch, which takes over the functions of the old community planning branch and is responsible for liaison on a more short-term basis with community planning—that too is five levels removed from the minister.

I suggest that this jungle could have been made an awful lot easier and more workable had the government sought to accept the views of the Cronyn commissiion that variety in these things was probably a good thing and, having accepted their views, tried to adapt the idea which was implemented in policy ministers and policy areas for other parts of the government to the particular exigencies that exist in the policy area, or the responsibility area, which is commanded or superintended by the Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I shall be short, Mr. Speaker. Brief, but not to the point.

I think enough has been said and all that can be said about the capacities, the grasp, the devotion of this minister. I haven't any notion, nor do I suppose he has either really, as to whether he can encompass the massive structure and work that he has taken upon himself in this particular department. Lord, let him do so if he possibly can.

It does show, though, that the entrepreneurial talent is not all in the world out there in private industry; that even within the circumspect wage restrictions a young man of some degree of talent, yet to be fully tested, emerges once in a while willing to take in the wide swathe and to put the aggressive punch—as he puts it, thrust—into everything on very diminutive salary, I say.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Think when the minister reads this 40 years from now!

Mr. Lawlor: They say that the only other thing that motivates men in contemporary civilization is power. Now I wouldn't want to demean the Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs to attribute such motivation to him. The only thing left that could possibly carry him into these diverse and labyrinthine tracks into which he has taken himself is public devotion and the cause in the public weal. If that's the case, and who is to gainsay that, there's nothing really that can be said while he gets his baptism of fire.

I would point out, though, something that hasn't been mentioned somewhat ad nauseam in the House. On page 64 of the government productivity report there is a most interesting schedule. Over against the static structural features of the encompassing geography of his department, however wide it may be, the far more important thing I suspect, and I'm glad they didn't totally omit it although they put it in the appendix, is the flow feature. That is, the processes inside government and inside his department and with respect to his department vis-à-vis the others as to what are the interrelationships in everyday life and in the working world, not just in some diagram presented to us.

When members look at that, the flow structure on page 64, they will see how massive and really how important, of salient overriding importance, his department really is in reaching decisions in all areas of government leading to cabinet priorities and in the setting down of the lines. That's where the gist comes and where the weight of his office falls and nowhere else. I wish the Cronyn committee had taken greater time to analyse the system, by a systems analysis, the way in which the decision process actually is being ventured upon and what the redistribution of power inside the cabinet structure was going to mean in terms of the flowing interrelationship from day to day.

Process is infinitely more important than structure and governments and others are gradually coming to realize that. The only other thing I would ask the minister to consider is on some page—I think it's page 31. It mentions that two other departments which I didn't hear him mention the other night, although I listened closely to his fine delineation of responsibilities and the hewing out of the flesh and what he could slim down to where this young Olympian could bear the weight of the world on his shoulders, largely taken from manuals by Charles Atlas and others. Looking around Argus-eyed and taking in the whole field of human possibility, the young Leonardo da Vinci of the Ontario Legislature takes over his various tasks smilingly. Such is importunity; it smiles.

Anyway, what I was after here is that at page 31 it says there are two departments, one is Mines and Northern Affairs and the other is Provincial Secretary as they then were, in which you take some responsibilities. I can see that would be so in the regional development aspect of Mines and Northern Affairs, but just where in Provincial Secretary puzzles me somewhat. I would ask the minister, if he would, to tell me what that means. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will comment briefly on some of the newer points, Mr. Speaker, since I think I covered a number of these points in my opening remarks.

To the member for Lakeshore, I say I think the matter of the northern affairs branch has been explained in the House. It is presently with the Ministry of Natural Resources and may take some sorting out from there, but it is not in Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

With further respect to what my friend from Lakeshore has had to say, I cannot attest to the veracity of much of what he has to say, nor would I want to in this House, but perhaps some time he might sit down with my wife and find out how very wrong he is in some of the remarks that he has just made.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is disclaiming, is he?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would say to the member for Ottawa Centre and others—well, first of all, let me deal with what he referred to as the bureaucratic structure. Lord knows I am not an expert in organization charts and I have been told by the two deputy ministers who have worked with me that I have done more to foul up organization charts by the way I particularly operated within a department than anyone else they have ever known. So whether they are terribly good charts, I can't attest. The Management Board accepted them.

Formerly there were about 10 directors reporting to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and there were four executive directors reporting to the deputy Treasurer. In the new chart there will actually be four senior people reporting to the deputy, who in turn will report to me. We think it is much less of a bureaucratic structure than either department was before or than the parts of the two of them put together.

I think the other point that has to—

Mr. Cassidy: Do we have to have a fifth level though? The fourth I can understand—but the fifth?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, wait until you see some of the other charts.

Mr. Cassidy: They're even worse, are they?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs and I were trying to remember the one we looked at in Management Board the other day which probably goes down to the 20th level. We chose to stop that particular chart at that particular level.

Mr. Cassidy: So, there are worse ones?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are ones which are much worse.

Mr. Martel: How sharp will our axe have to be to get through to the Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In total, of course, I repeat what I said the other day, that

actually we are talking of a total of about 800 employees--I think that is the complement--versus about 1,100 that I had prior to becoming Minister of Municipal Affairs. Actually there are fewer people; how well they are organized, we'll have to wait and see.

The Management Board, as I say, has approved the chart. We will just have to wait and see how that works out.

The member for Ottawa East asked why not a policy field. I really thought I had covered that rather well the other evening.

An hon. member: Even if you do say so yourself!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Wentworth, I don't think I have any specific comments. I have some very specific comments about the comments of the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), but perhaps we should leave those for another day and for another time. He is not with us today—

An hon. member: That's par for the course.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): They never know when he's going to here anyway.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —so perhaps we should leave those remarks off the record. I was intrigued by the remarks of the member for Riverdale—

Mr. Stokes: The minister will deal with those with a shovel anyway.

An hon. member: And not a very sharp-nosed one either!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —the remarks of the member for Riverdale; particularly the question of how do we phase programmes. I think that is one of the most difficult problems which I have faced since becoming a member of Treasury Board some four years ago, and as Treasurer for the last year. I don't know the answer to that.

The Leader of the Opposition reminds me from time to time that I say unkind things about the present Prime Minister of Canada, which is true. Really, one of the nice things I say about the present Prime Minister of Canada is that he probably is living testimony that you can phase out, and he has, phased out four or five examples of what were considered to be popular programmes —the old winter works programme, the urban renewal programme. I beg your pardon?

Mr. Cassidy: We got a new one instead, yes.

Mr. Lawlor: He just calls it by a different name.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, but what is phased out at a time of high employment? It's been brought back in at a time of high unemployment, and I don't care whether he was right or not, the point is he did it, and I admire and I have some high regard for him doing it—

Mr. Lawlor: Look what the minister did with tax rebates.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —because it is not an easy thing to do.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister phased out tax rebates completely for this year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right, yes.

An hon. member: The following year?

Mr. Lawlor: The minister did it forthrightly.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I hope that I won't be betraying any great secret from my oath of secrecy, but I really wondered whether the member for Riverdale had been at a certain place yesterday afternoon and had been listening. Oh, I know he would have been visible had he been there. Really, yesterday, or in the last few weeks—and this is staggering to me—having completed a budget one week and two days ago, we are actively pursuing how we are formulating what will be next year's budget, I suppose, in February or March of 1973, and it is in the very preliminary steps at the ministerial and deputy minister level, which is incredible. When we have not yet started to debate these estimates here, when the administration has had, what, six days to spend some of this year's money, we are turning our attention to next year.

Very much along the lines which the member has pointed out: How do you sort out priorities? How do you get rid of redundant programmes? A variety of methods have been tried. The alternative to what we have been looking at, I suppose, is to go back to a very old system, and what we have been looking at in a variety of ways is various forms of planned programme budgeting. But in particular, let me go this far in asking

the policy fields to do more of the sorting out and ranking of priorities.

There is no magic in that, it is completely impossible to do with 22 people. It may be more possible to do with four or five people in a policy field and then bring those priorities together at a later date. That is one of the things which are going to be tried this year.

I was talking after that meeting yesterday, I say to my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Food, to his deputy, and he recalled that when he was in that department in 1954 and 1955, which were perhaps palmier days in terms of provincial finances, literally the deputy minister was summoned over to see the secretary of the Treasury Board and he gathered up a few papers and over he went and an hour later he had his budget. If there were any broad problems to be settled, of course, the then Premier, Mr. Frost, did it. I suppose my friend from Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan) would deny it, but things were easier in his day, and he settled a great number of problems.

Mr. Renwick: What was the last sunshine budget we had.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is right. It became very apparent during my predecessor's time and he has related this to the House, that it was completely impossible for a Treasurer or a chairman of the Treasury Board, even with the fullest possible support from the Prime Minister, to do that kind of sorting out or to make those sort of decisions.

So that we are trying a variety of different methods. I don't know whether we will find perfection; I doubt that we ever will.

Let me add perhaps one other thought in this, that we perhaps use the words "broad policy" too loosely. What I have to do in trying to ration my time and the time of my staff, what we have to adjust ourselves to is that we are no longer directly involved with the Management Board process. I, on the Treasury side, and to some extent on the Municipal Affairs side, will have to not get into the nitty gritty, not even get into the specific programmes, but worry about and think about the very broad policy areas. We'll know, I suppose, in the next two or three years, whether that is possible or not.

The member for Riverdale had another question about the multi-year forecast. The preparation of the estimates is the responsibility of the Chairman of the Management Board. During the course of the Management Board estimates, he might want to pursue that particular question a little bit further.

I think there was one other point as to how there is co-ordination between the policy fields, and this also applies to the Management Board and to Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. We receive agendas; we are there often, not at the ministerial level, although I have been presently to two of the policy fields for specific items. Basically, we will make our input on the broad level from Treasury's point of view, as will Management Board, at the Policy and Priorities Board and, if necessary, at the full cabinet.

But the point the member has made is well taken, that we can be of assistance and we can be on guard, if you want to put it that way, or enthusiastic or otherwise, if we get in early enough into the game and at the beginning of the discussion, rather than coming along in a confrontation at the end of the discussion. This is one of the things we are in the process of sorting out.

Perhaps, coming back to what I said at the conclusion of my remarks on Tuesday night, what we are doing is innovative. Let me say that no one will be watching more closely than the present incumbent to see if this legislation imposes too heavy a strain. The member for Lakeshore might discuss that with my wife in that conversation which he is going to have. I imagine she will be watching. The Premier (Mr. Davis) assures me that he is. We will see and, if it isn't right, there is the concept of assistant ministers. Associate ministers have been mentioned, and there are a variety of things. I can understand why the member for Ottawa Centre would dismiss somewhat lightly the parliamentary secretary concept. That would be related to situations in Ottawa perhaps more than to what is going here.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, not at all. No, not at all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Oh, that was a little bit personal, I thought really, just a little bit personal.

Mr. Martel: Is that the fellow they sent to Sudbury?

Mr. Cassidy: They promised him a cabinet post, actually.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Frankly—Lord knows—three weeks or four weeks are much too soon to tell. I am amazed, frankly amazed and very pleased. I think my associates who

have parliamentary assistants would say the same thing. I am amazed at how terribly well it is working and how much assistance they can be.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): How about giving us secretaries? That would be great.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): That would be a real step forward.

Mr. Martel: A real boon.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is exactly the point I was making. If the member is concerned about secretarial help, he should go to the Chairman of the Management Board and not to the Treasurer. On the other hand, there is some of the nitty gritty that I might want to preserve to myself so—

Mr. Martel: We might as well talk to the wall.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —so I would look into that on behalf of the member for Wentworth.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Will the Treasurer give him the money to pay for it?

Mr. Martel: You sign the cheque.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, could this bill go to the committee of the whole House for a brief period of time?

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Ask me a question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He wants the question now.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House?

Mr. Renwick: Oh, all right, Mr. Speaker, if I can ask it now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Ask. Mr. Speaker will let the member ask that question.

Mr. Renwick: All right. If Mr. Speaker will permit.

Mr. Speaker: Well, let me put it this way. If it is with the unanimous consent of the House to sit beyond the recess time, let's put the question.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, let's ask it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What question?

Mr. Renwick: May I do it at 8 o'clock?

Mr. Martel: I know. The minister wants to watch the hockey game.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I don't want to watch the hockey game.

Mr. Speaker: We will hold the question, then, until we resume at 8.

It being 6 o'clock, the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 6, 1972

Canadian Curriculum Materials publication issued, statement by Mr. Wells ... 861

Employment situation in logging industry at Mattawa, statement by Mr. Bernier ... 861

Hearings of committee on resource development, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. Roy ... 862

Action on allegations at WCB hearing, questions of Mr. A. F. Lawrence and Mr. Bales: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bullbrook ... 864

Report on costs of post-secondary education, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis ... 866

Study of layoff impact on provincial grants, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis ... 867

Licence to firm supplying guards, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Renwick ... 868

Forest management policy for Algonquin Park, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Stokes, Mr. Bullbrook, Mr. R. S. Smith ... 869

OHC financial records re Provincial Auditor's report, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Singer ... 870

Stabbing at York University, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Ewen ... 871

Status of appeals from municipal board rulings, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Good ... 871

Imports of ore by steel companies, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Stokes ... 872

Presenting report, Department of Correctional Services, 1971, Mr. Apps ... 873

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Henderson ... 873

Presenting report, standing social development committee, Mrs. Birch ... 873

Planning Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 873

Control and regulation of snowmobiles, bill respecting, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 873

Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 873

Ministry of Industry and Tourism, bill to establish, Mr. White, second reading ... 878

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, bill to establish, Mr. McKeough, second reading ... 896

Recess, 6 o'clock ... 908

No. 24

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 6, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the business with which we were dealing at the 6 o'clock recess, I know the hon. members would want to know that we have guests in the west gallery who are Scouts from the 2nd Erindale Scout Troop, of Mississaugua.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): What riding would that be from, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: (Leader of the Opposition): Can't you guess?

Mr. Speaker: We were dealing with Bill 29 which had received second reading, and the question was whether or not the bill would stand referred for third reading. The hon. member for Riverdale had a question which we agreed to accept, so perhaps the hon. member would put that question now.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would take it that other members may ask questions in this way.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it wouldn't be more in order simply to go to committee and deal with it that way.

Mr. Speaker: Then with the concurrence of the House and the minister, it shall go to committee of the whole House.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole: Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

House in committee on Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Are there any questions, comments or amendments to section 1?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): My question is on section 9.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 9?

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): My question is on section 8.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): My question is on section 4.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 4? The member for Ottawa Centre on section 4.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, I seem to have won the draw there, Mr. Chairman.

Last Friday the Treasurer and I had a short exchange about this and I still haven't had an answer. I raised the question again today with the Treasurer and again he didn't answer. He has sought to deal with how he can handle his departmental responsibilities; he has not yet in this House dealt with the question of how he can continually be responsive and deal with his extra administrative responsibilities—the responsibilities of being responsive to all of the innumerable groups and agencies and municipalities and so on. They will want his attention and want his time, and, in fact, will have grown to expect it, because the other policy ministers have their jobs designed in such a way that they can give this kind of attention. From all of the evidence the Treasurer does not.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): I think that is a very legitimate question. I suppose that's at the—I was going to use an unparliamentary word—but I suppose it is at the root of many of the questions which have been asked in the course of the debate on second reading of this bill. I can't, to my complete satisfaction, answer that question.

I said this afternoon that I think that the parliamentary secretaries will be a large part of that process, in a much broader sense, than this ministry or policy field. I think it is a problem that we have in government; the whole question of our—not relationship, that is not the word—our contacts; perhaps relationship is the right word; our continuing

discussing with and listening to people. I do not think—and I hope I have expressed that during the course of the debate—it is any worse than it was before Bill 29. I think it is a very large part of our collective problems in this House.

We have tried a number of vehicles; one of the vehicles for which I am presently responsible is called regional development councils: In terms of citizen participation in the broad sense that has not been an effective vehicle. I am hoping that the reference in the Speech from the Throne on the role of the members—and I include myself in that —is going to throw some light on this matter. But I have no quick, easy answer, and I mean this most sincerely.

I recognize particularly from my former ministry, Municipal Affairs, what the hon. member is aiming at, the concern of citizens. Conscious of the fact that my dear friend and colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), is sitting two seats away, I would suspect that it could largely be described as an urban problem rather than an Ontario-wide problem. I do not think there is an easy answer to it and I am not entirely sure where our thinking and our studies will lead us.

I am very intrigued, and this may please the members of the member's party, as minister now responsible for one segment of this problem with what is being proposed in greater Winnipeg. We have held back in our thinking on one-tier municipalities, purely on that basis; purely and simply on the basis which I think is behind the member's question.

Let me put it in this over-simplistic way; I think the member, as a student of local government, would probably be all in favour of a one-tier municipality in Ottawa-Carleton from the administrative point of view except for the point that he raises. I have not resolved that and I do not know that in the life of this particular Legislature we will resolve it.

It is a vexing problem from the point of view of this bill and this probably is not the time to debate the whole subject of citizen participation from the point of view of this bill. I do not think the situation has been lessened or worsened or bettered or made worse because of what we are doing here. As I said this afternoon, from the point of view of the constituency of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I can only say we should have had parliamentary assistants a long time ago.

That comes back to another debate which we will have some day in this House and which is beginning now in the long-term sense, and that is the role of the member. I think the role of my parliamentary assistants—I can only speak after four weeks of experience and I should not be commenting on whether or not it is a success—I can only say that I think it is making the position of the minister easier, which is perhaps the reason it was designed. I think it is helping to get at the problem in terms of the Minister of Municipal Affairs' constituency—i.e., the municipalities. I think it's improving that situation. It may be part of the answer to the larger question which the member has described, or is behind his question.

Mr. Cassidy: I am really concentrating on the question of people getting access to him. I didn't mean to digress.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would have to say that has not been a problem. That has not been a problem. Aside from the combining of ministries, I can honestly say that there have been things which were formerly being done by bureaucrats, in the best sense of the word, and well done –

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): This is certainly going to establish a bureaucracy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: – that are now being done, in my particular case, by parliamentary assistants. I think it is a great step forward that we have moved some of that process into the political realm, which perhaps it should never have left. But that is happening.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): May I ask a question, perhaps out of ignorance? How does the minister relate the duties that he is going to have, including the innovative end of the job, to the duties that are performed, perhaps by the new provincial secretaries for the various jurisdictions? How is it that he obviously must have 10 times as much work as any one of them, just in administering the department and providing the kind of thinking function to which the member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) continuously refers?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He is absent. He is thinking again tonight.

Mr. Deans: It just strikes me that there is a tremendous imbalance in the functions of the cabinet, where you have one minister

—and I said this earlier in the debate—who obviously has tremendous responsibilities and other ministers whose responsibilities are considerably less, and others whose responsibilities are quite obscure. In spite of the fact that I say go to it and good luck to you, I wonder, really, how he is going to be able to perform all of those functions, including the administrative one, make himself available to all of the delegations that pour into Queen's Park from time to time from municipalities, and see to his own constituent problems. It just strikes me as an overburdening task, and I think that perhaps his colleagues are being a mite unfair to him.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Part of the answer is, I think, better office management. In looking back on my three years in Municipal Affairs, and now having resumed the function and making certain changes because we had to, I am amazed at how many appointments are suggested to the minister of Municipal Affairs, appointments letters which are more appropriately dealt with by other ministers of the Crown. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs—I am taking part of the responsibility for this because I was there for 3½ years—has been a hand-holding operation for too long. If Hamilton has a problem with landfill—and Hamilton doesn't, by the way; Hamilton is dealing directly with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld), and properly so—but you would be amazed how many delegations could end up in my office, when they would be so much more appropriate in the Ministry of the Environment, in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in the Ministry of—well, name any ministry you want to. We must still have a co-ordinating role. But if we are to create—this is a complete change in my thinking, I might say, over the course of the last year—if we are to create truly strong local government then that strong local government will not look to a department to hold its hand when it goes to see the Ministry of the Environment, or the Ministry of Correctional Services, or the Ministry of Labour—they're a bit uptight about him at this moment; I have written to him about that. That is not the role of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs —

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is not meant to do that now.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —if we are to have a partnership, a strong local government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Minister of Labour should have stayed as chairman of the parks.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That boils down then to staff work. That boils down to my secretary saying to your secretary, "Why does an alderman from Hamilton want to come and see the Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs?" She is going to have to be a little persistent with your secretary—she'll find that out. But we will sort that out and instead of my holding his hand and saying, "You should go and see that so-and-so, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon), and you go with my blessing. I will arrange the appointment"—

Mr. Deans: Don't pick on him any more. He has been picked on enough.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He'll go to see the Minister of Labour directly—who, by the way, will handle the situation very well, no problems about that. But part of it is that what we on all these benches must do is sort out what is important—and I don't mean that in an important sense, because sorting out what is important in terms of our time may well mean dealing with the lowliest citizen in Hamilton.

Mr. Deans: We are all equal.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right. But it may also mean, and I think does mean, sorting out where that citizen should be directed. I am sure this is the experience in the member's clinic, or whatever he calls it. I was interested to learn from the people in my particular clinic operation—I am not going to be here tomorrow so they phoned through this afternoon—that there were 11 appointments on Saturday morning. I asked someone who works for me to phone as many of those 11 as he could and see if he could sort some of the problems out ahead of time and perhaps see if the meetings were even necessary. Three of those problems happened to be related to unemployment insurance, and those dear people—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Three?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Three.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I do 25 a weekend.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It was explained to them that they should contact their federal member, and they were given the phone number; and that's three appointments of mine which I will not have to have on Saturday morning. Two of them related to the Workmen's Compensation Board; we were able to take things down—

Mr. Deans: That is a "no-no."

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and we'll get a file on that before I meet with those people. That's nothing more than staff work.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You are not alone

Mr. Renwick: We don't understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And when we are talking about riding offices what we are talking about is making better use of our time. But the danger in that is—and let's be very honest about this—I was to see 11 people on Saturday morning; as of 6 o'clock tonight, because we have done some staff work, I am going to see six. I have no doubt that by Saturday morning there will be five more people to take those places and I'll see them. But we have sorted out some of those problems ahead of time and we have given them some better service.

Right down these Treasury benches this is what we have to do, remembering with great respect for my very good friend John Cronyn and for the Cronyn commission, that you don't run a government quite the same way—and I'm not being political when I say this—as you run John Labatt or General Motors or the Steel Co. of Canada.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Tell that to the Minister of Industry (Mr. White).

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because there is an ingredient called democracy. The Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) sees people and hears about problems which the president or the chairman of the board of General Motors would never in God's green earth deal with. That's why our process will always be separate from the chamber of commerce approach—and I'm not knocking it.

On the other hand, when we talk about riding offices — returning to the particular question about Bill 29, Mr. Chairman, we can improve what we are doing at the ministry and riding levels to give better service to people and to make better use of my time as minister and your time as members of the Legislature. That's a very large problem which, with respect, sir, for having allowed me to ramble on about for some minutes, is not really part of either the question or the bill presently before us.

Mr. Deans: The minister is right, of course; it isn't part of the bill before us. But as I was listening to him speaking about it, I wondered whether or not the Department of Municipal Affairs, as we once knew it, is being relegated to rather secondary status, in this process of bringing together all of the functions that may well fit together. The Department of Municipal Affairs and its day-to-day dealings with all of those local politicians who have problems that they normally took to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for resolution—are going to be extremely difficult to fit in.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: No way.

Mr. Deans: No, I'm not being critical, and I think the government has got to appreciate it. I think the minister in charge of the department understands what I'm saying. It's okay to say so in Hamilton, where maybe they're a little more sophisticated because of the internal machinery of the operation of the city, but there are a lot of smaller municipalities and the only access that they have to the machinery that they need is through the Department of Municipal Affairs. The only person that they could go to, at least up until recently, was the minister, or someone delegated by the minister.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: It's much easier now.

Mr. Deans: It's much easier now? It must have changed overnight, because it wasn't any easier yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Almost.

Mr. Deans: It's all done, is it? Okay. I can only say then that I worry a little bit about the kind of access that those people are going to have to the ministry.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Then he'll put the pressure on to get the bigger units.

Mr. Deans: I think that the kinds of problems that municipalities have faced over the last number of years have become compounded in the last two or three years, because of tax difficulties, because of planning difficulties, because of the threats of regional government that never materialized. I think that all of those things will create tremendous headaches for this minister. It will require a great deal more of his time to try to resolve those problems to bring the movement of municipal government into the 20th century. I think that this minister is going to find the job of trying to meet with and talk with and resolve the problems of those people will take up considerably more time than he anticipates, and I hope he doesn't pass it off to a —

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Deans: —parliamentary assistant. I

think when the mayor of a municipality wants to talk to the Minister of Municipal Affairs he considers himself, for some reason or other, to be equal. You know that's the status that people have. He doesn't want to talk to his parliamentary assistant; he wants to talk directly to the man that made the decision in the first place, the man that's capable of making the change. I just warn the government that there'll be problems, I think. I appreciate the minister's suggesting that he might, in fact, deal through the members of the Legislature in trying to resolve some of the problems that come up from time to time. It would be a pleasant change in the legislative process —

Mr. Good: I'll believe it when I see it.

Mr. Deans: — if this minister or any other minister were to have his secretary call the secretary of a member, an opposition member, who happens, perhaps, to know just a little bit about what's going on, because it's in his constituency, and ask him or her if, perhaps, he could be of some assistance in resolving the problem. I think the member for Waterloo North said it correctly, "I'll believe it when I see it."

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): There'll be two moons in the sky.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 4 then stand as part of the bill? The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a few comments. This is section 4 of Bill 29, is it not?

Mr. Chairman: We are on section 4.

Mr. Haggerty: Pardon?

Mr. Chairman: We are on section 4.

Mr. Haggerty: Section 4, the duties of the Treasurer?

Mr. Chairman: Right.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, I would like to add a few comments to this. From what I gather from being a member of local council, I can see this section moves the power, perhaps, directly to the minister. I think, in this particular instance, he has more power than Hitler had during his reign in Germany. He had it by military force, but this bill gives to the minister the full power of authority in the Province of Ontario by legislation. When we talk about local autonomy, I think this section will remove that local autonomy from local council. I mean we've seen it already by the actions taken by the cabinet here, which can override the principles set down by the Ontario Municipal Board. For these reasons, I just can't quite go along with seeing all this power being delegated to one minister in the Province of Ontario. I can see eventually that all tax bills in the Province of Ontario will be calculated through this minister and sent out by his department. You can see it coming. Sitting back and saying what is the need for local government, I can tell you this much, being in the region of Niagara, there is very little left for local government to do. About all they can do at the present time in local legislation is that they can pass a local bylaw to cover—what would you call it—a bylaw inspection officer, I guess that is the word I am looking for. That is about all that remains now in the Niagara region. They have nothing to say any more. They have very little to say in planning matters which are controlled by this minister through this bill and yet the purpose, I think, of the Ontario Municipal Board was to set the guidelines for municipalities.

I can say this much. I have great respect for local municipalities and if this government would run its business like local councils we would be in a much healthier position than perhaps any province in Canada. We have controls on local municipalities now so that they can't spend beyond their limit of income from local taxes but this government can go out and spend to a $600 billion deficit this year. Last year it was the same thing; there is no limit; there is no questioning. Nobody questions what this government spends, but the minister is given the powers here to say what they can do in local municipalities. I don't think this is good legislation at all.

Mr. Good The deficit is $600 million.

Mr. Haggerty: It's $600 million. Right.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, can I ask one question of the Treasurer while we are speaking about section 4 because certainly that is one of the key sections?

The Treasurer spent some time sort of what I call minimizing his real importance and considering surely that he has had some input—a word he obviously knows—in the decisions made in relation to policy in other ministries, could he explain to me this: Why we would have, for instance, five ministers

in the Justice policy field; they are supposed to be equal now? There are five ministers in the Justice policy field and in the Treasurer's field, which I consider to be more important —I mean the cities are where the action is going to be in the future; urbanization is the key to this province—why in this ministry does he have the whole responsibility? The government decided, for instance, to have five ministers in Justice—and he must have had some say in that. They are all supposed to be equal.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, with respect, I really think that to the best of my ability, which is limited, I answered this on second reading. I think we are not only back to the principle of this bill, we are referring back to the principle of the omnibus bill. Obviously my friend from Ottawa Centre and I disagree but —

Mr. Roy: Ottawa East.

Mr. Cassidy: He is East; I am Centre.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: — some night we will have dinner together and discuss this further.

Mr. Lawlor: If he was any further east, he would be out of the debate entirely.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 stand as part of the Bill? Anything before section 8?

Sections 4 to 7 inclusive agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore on section 8.

Mr. Lawlor: The members who have spoken before me, Mr. Chairman, could have saved a good deal of breath and time by perhaps simply describing the Treasurer as the minister of this government who strides Chatham Creek like a Colossus.

On section 8, we could spend, I think the minister will agree, considerable time because it has reference to the Audit Act, sections 6, 7, 8, 10, and 15. I won't do that. I mean you can go over each one of these sections and ask the —

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just to save the member some time, section 8 is lifted out of the previous Act. This will give the authority for departments to conduct their own pre-audit and switch them over one by one from present pre-audit by the auditor to pre-audit by themselves. That is what section 8 is all about.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, well, take section 7; it is the only one I really want to discuss with the minister for the moment. In that section it gives the auditor, in effect, access to the departments of government. In what circumstances, under what conditions, would the Treasurer not want the auditor to exercise the powers that he already has? Has he any specific ministries in mind?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When it's a pre-audit.

Mr. Lawlor: I quite appreciate that, but it's not just a question of pre-auditing. If you read section 7 it has very wide implications: post-audit, pre-audit, in the middle of the audit, it doesn't matter, he has access —

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Although we talk about switching the pre-audit function from the provincial auditor to the ministries, what we are really doing is bypassing the bookkeeper of government in that simplistic explanation, in real fact, because it's my name which will appear the next fiscal year on the public accounts. The auditor's name will still be on the auditor's report, but the Treasurer of Ontario and in actual fact the Deputy Treasurer and in actual fact what used to be the controller of accounts—whatever his title is—before he turns over to a department the responsibility which is now to be vested in the Treasurer, will certify that cheque, as it is being written, which the auditor will no longer do.

This gives us the protection to say, before we turn this over to the Department of Transportation and Communications — which now, I believe, is happening — this gives me the authority to say, "I want to make very sure that there are sufficient audit standards in DTC before I delegate my authority as a pre-auditor to that department." Follow me?

Mr. Lawlor: I think, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to labour the matter. I just don't think that's the effect that flows from the wording that the Treasurer sets up in the statute. Let's just take an example. Take section 10.

Section 10 says: "The auditor may station one or more members of staff" — I only take this example for its simplicity — "in any department of the public service to enable him to carry out his duties under this Act." Not his duties of pre-auditing, because they have been wiped out, just "his duties," which involves an ongoing check, post-audit check if you will, but an ongoing check which is initiated by the Treasurer, but which is surveyed and overlooked by the auditor.

This section that the Treasurer has put into the Act says that there may be certain circumstances where the Lieutenant Governor in Council, on the recommendation, etc., would think that that section of the Audit Act ought not to apply. I can't imagine when I read it over what those circumstances conceivably might be and –

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, with respect I can't either, but this section – and I'm looking at Crown counsel – this section is right out of the previous Act.

Mr. Lawlor: Well, why bother writing it in then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's right out of the previous Act. I am not equipped, either with staff, with Crown counsel, or anyone else here tonight to debate whether section 8 makes sense or not. All I can tell the member is that those are the amendments which we passed a year ago, lifted out of the previous Act and put in this Act. I think I am correct in saying –

Mr. Lawlor: That's a terrifying admission, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman. The minister stands up and tells us he is not equipped, nor did he come here in order to defend this legislation.

It somehow emerges before us, it has no doubt a clout–on some future occasion it may ruin the government of this province – in the year 1722, but "what difference does it make?" he says of it. I do think it's mere machinery and I won't push it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale on section 9.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on section 9, I don't know whether this had its origin in some other bill. I assume it probably does have its origin elsewhere. I simply ask the question why do we have to have this secret service account in the government of the Province of Ontario. As this is likely one of the rare occasions where we will have an opportunity to consider it, I think we should have specific answers from the minister.

I'd just simply point out to the committee that this is the section which permits the Treasurer of the province to pay on the certificate of the Attorney General any amount of money if the Attorney General certifies that it's on account of the investigation, detection or punishment of any offence against the laws of Ontario or Canada, or on account of special services or disbursements in connection with inquests, or any purpose connected with the administration of justice in either criminal or civil matters. It then goes on in this extraordinary section to say that the certificate of the Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General that any moneys received by an officer or other person under this section have been duly accounted for, are final and conclusive and the account shall not be subject to any further examination. I assume that that's how they finance the Secret Service in Great Britain. I just wonder why we have to have it here and why it has to be unaccountable so far as this assembly is concerned.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Admitting my great ignorance, I can't argue that point with the member. That is lifted from an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act, supplement to RSO 1970-1971, volume 2, assented to July 23, 1971, which is when we passed that particular section, and I am reasonably sure that that has been in the statutes for a long time.

Mr. Renwick: I am sure it has too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: My friend the Solicitor General-designate (Mr. Yaremko) is somewhat concerned and I think will be looking at this in an ongoing examination as to whether the reference should not now be to the Solicitor General rather than to the Attorney General.

Mr. Renwick: God forbid.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sure he will be looking at that section and will, either in a subsequent Act to his Act, or in amendments to my Act, be bringing it back before the House. I suppose that is really a section which is wreathed in a great deal of antiquity and I would undertake with the Solicitor General to take a look at its relevance in this year of Our Lord 1972.

Mr. Renwick: I am quite happy with that, if the minister would indicate that he or his advisers in checking through the debate on this bill would make a special note that during the estimates of the minister or at some appropriate time we do in fact have an explanation of this section and of the section which my colleague the member for Lakeshore dealt with earlier.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am sure this section was put in the bill at some point before there was a petty cash account. Why wouldn't you just take it out of petty cash, really?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Maybe it isn't petty.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We accept the term now as "accountable advance", I think.

Mr. Lawlor: The section is verbatim, section 12 of the present Audit Act, and has been there for a very long time. If my colleague would only learn to consult me instead of turning to the ignorance of alien powers over there I would be pleased on occasion to inform him that this has been long in British legislation for the precise reason because the Minister of Justice is considered not just *primus inter pares* of the other cabinet ministers but on his own hook, and apart from the Treasury, can dictate to the Treasury, and always has been and done.

If justice is to operate it must not be subservient to the almighty dollar. Even Edward the Third knew that. It was the only thing about the almighty dollar he did know. And with that in mind it seemed to be necessary in constitutional law to allow Ministers of Justice this very rarefied and heightened function that they may look down their noses on occasion at even Treasurers of the land.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom that the debates between the hon. member for Lakeshore and myself are recorded for posterity, so I would like to pursue this very briefly with him. I understand it is wreathed in antiquity; I just questioned whether or not we have to continue to provide for unaccountable advances to the Attorney General on his certificate—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Sock it to him.

Mr. Renwick: —despite the origins in history.

Mr. Stokes: Tell him, Pat.

Mr. Lawlor: You know, there are some things good about conservatism. This bullheaded going forward and clashing with the ancient simply because it happens to be old. That seems to me to be a kind of purblind attitude for the member to take.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 9 stand as part of the bill?

Section 9 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments in any later section of the bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: You know, section 13, the business about the 10th day—the 11th hour, the 25th hour. That has caused some difficulty. Need that stay? Can't we have a day to be designated? What is so sacrosanct about that 10th day after the Legislature gets going?

As members know, it caused some difficulty in the Throne debate this year because it was expected that that debate would end prior to launching into the budget and there had to be an extension of time. Ten days is certainly not sufficient in certain circumstances, particularly if the Throne debate has merit and some weight and to have to truncate that debate in order to work in a minor thing like the budget seems to me to be pushing it. In other words, is any consideration being given to extend that time?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: For the public accounts?

Mr. Lawlor: Section 13.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, but—

Mr. Lawlor: Where the government has to introduce the public accounts within 10 days after the opening of—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. That, of course, is really a great protection to the members of the House that we must put the public accounts before the House for the—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): For the preceding year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —for the preceding year. Not the estimates, the public accounts.

Mr. Renwick: If the member for Lakeshore had just consulted with me before—

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 13 then stand as part of the bill?

Section 13 agreed to.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 15.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: The security requirements that are being called for here. If one peruses the Audit Act, for instance, there is nothing comparable to this in that Act. This covers everybody. This covers the auditor; this covers the waterfront. Anybody who touches anything connected with this ministry is under these very severe security and secrecy measures. Why did the Treasurer introduce this section into the statute? Why did he

think it was so necessary? It has never been used before.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is repeating it, but really it is—perhaps the member might let me take a look at this section and perhaps at some point—it does seem awfully restrictive. I suppose it is there because—

Mr. Cassidy: Why doesn't the minister take it out?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well, I suppose if it isn't there, every person—I don't want it to sound this way either—but every person off the street could come in and demand to see the accounts of the province. I suppose there has to be some protection that every person off the street does not come in and demand to see, at his convenience, the books of the province. The language perhaps could be improved.

Perhaps I might examine that section at some point with the public accounts committee to see if we couldn't arrive at something which is more in tune with what the member for Ottawa Centre is concerned about—1972 participatory democracy. Really you could read that as meaning the member for Lakeshore couldn't get the information that he wanted from the member for Riverdale and was sort of forced to phone and say "Has so-and-so been paid his bill yet?" One might have to take an oath of secrecy before the question could be answered.

Mr. Lawlor: One might even be driven to speak to the minister's department!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If one couldn't get it from the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right.

Mr. Chairman: Does section 15 stand as part of the bill?

Section 15 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Any other comments, questions or amendments in any other section? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 29 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

MINISTRY OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Mr. Yaremko moves second reading of Bill 28, An Act to establish the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Is the minister not going to give an explanation to follow the admirable example of the Treasurer in explaining his duties under the bill?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I can do so. The bill literally speaks for itself, but, in order to establish for the hon. member the parameters of the debate that can take place, this is the bill setting up the ministry.

Mr. Speaker, the jurisdiction falls into two very broad spheres. The first sphere is the law enforcement sphere. The relevant statutes relating to law enforcement are set out, chiefly, the Police Act of the Province of Ontario, under which are set out the Ontario Provincial Police, the Ontario Police Commission, and the relationships with the municipal forces across the province. The other very broad sphere is that related to the field of public safety, which encompasses basically the Centre of Forensic Sciences, emergency measures, the fire safety services and coroners' investigations and inquests. Those are the two very broad spheres which have been lifted out of the former Department of the Attorney General and Minister of Justice which now has literally been divided in two between the functions of the Attorney General and the functions of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J. Roy (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, when I was first going to make a few comments about this particular bill, the first question I was going to ask was why, hoping to get some explanation from the minister. After his explanation, I am still asking the question why.

Obviously, looking at the bill, looking first of all at the explanatory note, there should be more of an outline there for somebody who is wondering why in the name of heaven

did the government set up a Department of the Solicitor General in this province.

First of all, one has to turn up the bill to see from the note if there is any explanation. There is none. I have heard the minister's explanation and I really don't feel that the government is going to do anything that the previous Attorney General could not accomplish anyway. Of course, the key, when you are criticizing or you are looking at all these bills, is always to turn over to the bible – the COGP report.

From intuition right away I turn over to this report and I notice in the report there is no mention whatsoever of establishing a Solicitor General in this province. So, I am left to wonder why and really I come to the conclusion that the Solicitor General in this case is going to have to be a superfluous ministry. I looked then at its responsibilities, and I am left certainly with the same conclusion.

Really, very fairly, I think the government was looking for a place for this minister and thought Solicitor General might be a good place for, if I can say the words, "John Yaremko," without offending the particular member. But here he is with an important title like Solicitor General and, really, what for?

I mentioned this before when we were talking about the other bill – Bill 29. The ministers are supposed to be all equal; that is what the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) said on a number of occasions, that they are all equal. It was never my opinion that the Attorney General's portfolio was all that heavy. It was tricky. There are times when this could be a very tricky department, but as far as onerous responsibilities, no. Now the government has five ministers in that department, overnight – five ministers in that department. But the Treasury, where the action is going to be in the Seventies and the Eighties – the cities, federal-provincial relations; that is where the action is going to be – it has one minister. Here we are with really five ministers who are going to be dealing with Justice, which is three too many.

Let me just look at some of these different ministers. There are really three too many. First of all the policy minister. What is he going to be doing? The leader of the New Democratic Party asked him some time ago, which was a perfectly proper question, "What do you do?" What is he going to do? Apparently nothing. My confrère, the member for Sarnia, was saying on television tonight that obviously when the policy minister for Justice picks up his pay cheque, his hand has got to be shaking, really. He has nothing to do.

And then you have got, respectfully, Correctional Services. Why does that have to be a separate ministry?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): How many institutions are there now?

Mr. Roy: Whether you have got 50, they run themselves. Is the minister going to say that running a county jail is an onerous responsibility, really?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It sure is, and they are not county jails any more.

An hon. member: Not for you.

Mr. Roy: Look at Ottawa. You haven't got –

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): You gave us a compliment. We will still be here about 1998.

Mr. Roy: Look at Ottawa. There is the Solicitor General who is running the RCMP, the security of the whole of the country. He is running all of the penitentiaries, and he has got –

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Not doing a very good job, either.

Mr. Roy: Never mind the job. Just look at the responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well I think that is important.

Mr. Roy: If the minister starts getting personal in talking about jobs, you know, we could start being pretty offensive in this regard.

An hon. member: Sock it to 'im.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is the member's privilege. He does a poor job of that too.

Mr. Roy: Well, I mean, I don't get too excited when comments are coming from the minister's direction.

But in any event, I think that really a Solicitor General in this province is superfluous. As I said, the COGP report did not mention anything about it. I am just interested in why the government – I know it does not want to follow this slavishly because it wants to give the appearance of some independence – why the government decided not to follow the report and decided

to set up this particular ministry of the Solicitor General.

Now, in the area of Justice, if the government had looked into where justice is going for the Seventies or Eighties, it might have considered that a department like Environment might well be one of the departments that should go into Justice. As we keep getting more and more people on this globe, and as the concentration keeps increasing, we have got to realize the fact that in the area of environment it is going to be a criminal offence, or it is going to be considered just as serious an offence for someone to pollute or throw away a paper bag or set a fire, or something of this nature, as it is to go into a store and pick up a book without paying for it.

So that if the government had included other departments in Justice I could see added responsibilities; I could see why it would set up more ministers in that department. But considering that it has not done so, why it has come up with the conclusion of a separate department for the Solicitor General, I really do not know.

Now, as I said before, I looked in the bill, and I thought, well, in the explanatory note I cannot very well make out why they set it up and I cannot make it out from COGP report. So then I went back to the bill and I looked at the Acts that the minister is going to have to deal with. I considered, as well, his comments. In his comments in the explanation here, he talked about two broad fields for the Solicitor General. He talked about a law enforcement sphere and a public safety sphere. Very frankly, I don't see the clear distinction in the bill itself between one Act or the other. I think he was talking possibly about the whole policy of Justice, about the distinction between law enforcement and public safety. In any event, all the accent in the particular field of the Solicitor General is going to have to be in the area of public safety.

I look at the Acts he is going to have deal with and the onerous responsibilities that he, as Solicitor General, is going to have to fulfil. First of all, there's the Anatomy Act. What is there to the Anatomy Act? What does that stand for?

An hon. member: Nothing.

Mr. Roy: Where is the responsibility there?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Can't the member read it and see?

Mr. Roy: The member for Wentworth should read it sometime and he will agree with me.

Then there is the Coroners Act. If there are any onerous responsibilities in this field, I suppose they might well be under the Coroners Act, because if the minister wanted to show a certain amount of leadership he could start making amendments to that particular Act to make it operate for 1972 and not 1877. I'm not optimistic; I'm just putting in this particular comment.

Then he's got the Emergency Measures Act.

An hon. member: That's a good issue.

Mr. Roy: Again that is not something anyone is going to get too excited about.

We carry on: the Fire Accidents Act, the Fire Departments Act, the Fire Fighters' Exemption Act, the Fire Marshals Act. These are all areas that administer themselves. Surely we don't need a special minister to do this.

Then there's the Hotel Fire Safety Act—I don't think he'll lose sleep at night thinking about the Hotel Fire Safety Act. Then one of the big things within his jurisdiction is the Lightning Rods Act.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Oh, that's going to strike someone.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): We should throw the Warble Fly Control Act in here too.

Mr. Roy: The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) was mentioning the other day about Ontario Place being one of the major projects of this particular government. Well, there's a certain amount of potential when one talks about the Lightning Rods Act, I'll tell you.

An hon. member: It takes a lot of plumbing.

Mr. Roy: The bill talks about the Police Act as well. Again, the minister might find a few challenges in this particular area. I have limited experience in this House, but I have heard it mentioned that the minister sometime ran into certain problems in trying to control the Indians of this province. He might have a handful when he starts talking with the police. In any event, I don't think that is sufficient to create a full department to govern.

Then we come to the Private Investigators and Security Guards Act and the Public Works Protection Act. What is all this about? All these are Acts, just like the Warble Fly

Control Act, that have got important or long titles but really don't amount to much.

The minister can't seriously tell me he agrees with the Premier when he stands up in this House and says his ministers are all equal. When this minister looks at his responsibilities and compares them with those of the Treasurer, surely he's got to sit back down.

Mr. Deans: The Premier is more equal.

Mr. Roy: In any event, it has got to be superfluous, especially when one considers that the policy minister is not really doing anything – and we've had evidence of this. Since Oct. 21 the only thing the member has done is he went to Japan and got a tan. Really, that's the only thing that he has done.

Mr. Haggerty: That's better than going to Cuba though.

Mr. Roy: At times this government has taken a certain amount of initiative to criticize the federal government, but quite frankly I think it has made an attempt to copy Ottawa in this case.

Mr. Haggerty: Copycats.

Mr. Roy: They thought that Solicitor General sounded like something that was pretty exciting. I don't particularly agree with all that the present Solicitor General is doing, and maybe if they had him in mind when they thought about Solicitor General they wouldn't have bothered.

It seems like an important title, Solicitor General, but look at the responsibilities he's got. As I mentioned before, he's got the RCMP, the security of the nation, the whole parole system and the penitentiaries. But this province, where there is less to do, there is a separate minister in the Justice field, for Correctional Services, and the Solicitor General. Really, the only thing he is going to have to look after is the OPP, and the OPP can take care of itself. There is no problem there.

An hon. member: The Lightning Rods Act.

Mr. Roy: Well, he has the Lightning Rods Act, yes.

Mr. Good: A flash in the pan.

Mr. Roy: You know, very frankly and objectively one has to come to the conclusion that the Premier thought, "What are we going to do with the former Provincial Secretary?" Solicitor General is enough to satisfy his ego, and to keep him quiet and there he goes!

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It sounded better when it was "designate."

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, on the birth, the genesis, the coming into being of the Solicitor General of this province, may it first be said there is no precedent for it within the whole compendium of volumes issued by the Committee on Government Productivity.

They saw fit to elaborate at some length a whole restructuring of government which we have debated for the past three or four days in this House, which is labyrinthine in its proportions and is a thorough revamping of the whole of the apparatus of government over there. Lost in the shuffle by some fortuitous oversight, I am sure, the poor Solicitor General didn't even emerge. We know why the position of Solicitor General has presently been created in this government—because they have to find a job for the minister. That is it originally. I am in a rather benign mood this evening and won't lock horns with the hon. minister on this occasion unless severely provoked.

He has excellent duties to fulfil throughout this province, Mr. Speaker. His yeoman service in going around among the ethnic communities, shaking hands with a little smile, radiating a sort of goodness, charity, and hardly any light at all in a wide area of the community pays dividends to this government at times of election. Whatever he may do in the interim, except stoking the fires and keeping the souls alight, is neither here nor there, and we may as well sort of admit it in this particular contingency. That is really what this piece of legislation comes to at the end of the day. However it has been, under different auspices, a rather historic and important office.

I would like to read into the record some of the background, position, the role and significance the honoured office of the Solicitor General has had throughout human history against the miniscule proportions it has achieved among the latter day saints in the Province of Ontario.

The office was first instituted under Edward IV, back in the 12th century. There were three major offices of the Crown: The Attorney General advised him in particular ways; the office of the Solicitor General be-

gan about that time, the late 12th-early 13th century; and there was the king's Advocate General who performed quite distinct functions until the year 1876 when that office was extinguished and merged into that of the Attorney General.

Now as that office developed in the strains of the law the Solicitor General was the king's adviser through the courts of chancery in contradistinction to the courts of the common law, which were the domain of the Attorney General. The courts of chancery offered equity in the old sense of equity, of seeking to remedy the law in its harshness, and finding ways in which to plug those holes and to cut off the edges of the strict interpretation of the law so that appeals would go, for the common pleas, into the chancery courts. There was more concept of mercy operative there and the particularizing of justice; which mercy means looking at the colour of other people's eyes, seeing their precise circumstance when the civil wrong was committed.

Now as it grew up, they grew up in two chains so to speak, and it became the portion that the man from chancery, the Solicitor General, was in the House of Lords, whereas the Attorney General was a Commons man. There was a transference of that at one time in history, when Lord Bacon, the famous Bacon who wrote "The Lost Atlantis," who wrote all the plays of Shakespeare, and who has –

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): The member is pretty sure of himself there.

Mr. Lawlor: – and who in the process was pillorized and thrown out of his job of Lord Chancellorship because he accepted bribes. This was just one of his minor foibles.

Mr. N. G. Leluk (Humber): Shame!

Mr. Lawlor: You can see he was a great creative genius in his day–Lord Bacon–he gave British philosophy its major lift. The man was a monumental figure who also had a good deal to do with what we're talking about tonight in this legislation.

Well, coming down over the years they grew closer together and the Solicitor Generalship became an office somewhat inferior or subordinate to and complementary to the operations of the Attorney Generalship. When the Attorney General was ill or was absent for any reason, or there was a conflict of interest on the part of the Attorney General, then it was the office and position of the Solicitor General to fill his shoes, to step into them.

Now both of them went into the courts argued the cases; and it was the certain kinds of cases, such as murder and treason cases, which had to be argued by the Attorney General of the day. Now was the Solicitor General more concerned about easements, about wills and trusts and certain aspects of the laws of restrictions on property and that sort of thing in the courts of equity.

Mr. Stokes: What about lightning rods?

Mr. Lawlor: Now what it has come down to in these days, if one looks at Chambers Encyclopaedia, in that encyclopaedia they describe the office as follows:

> The Solicitor General, the second law officer of the English Crown: In origin the Solicitor General was one of the two attorneys appointed to defend the King's interest in the courts. During Tudor times it became customary for the Solicitor General to be also a member of the House of Commons. And from the same period, also, it became customary for him to enjoy the reversion to the office of the Attorney General. From the end of the 18th century, appointment to this office also carried the honor of knighthood.

Well wouldn't you like that, John!

Mr. Stokes: Sir John!

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

> And by an Act of 1945 the Solicitor General was made formally what he had long been in fact, the Attorney General's deputy, so that he was able to discharge the duties of the Attorney General if the Attorney General was not available.

If you look at the official handbook of the law of Britain in 1972, page 54, it describes at some length the position of the Solicitor General:

> Responsibility for the legal advice given to the government; in addition he has a wide range of duties in relation to the courts.

The minister has, as far as I can see, no responsibilities whatsoever in relation to the courts. It goes on to say:

> Under the British dispensation the Attorney General too is the senior law officer to the Crown's representative in the courts, and legal proceedings for the enforcement of public rights and on behalf of the interest of charity are conducted in his name.

> He is assisted by the Solicitor General, who is the junior law officer –

And it goes on in that vein.

Turning to the Canadian experience as cited in the Encyclopaedia Canadiana at page 365, the minister's office is described as follows:

> A Solicitor General, one of the two federal law officers to the Crown–the other is the Attorney General – whose offices combine that with the Minister of Justice.
>
> The original intent of the Solicitor General's Act was that the office should be subordinate to the Attorney General, as in the United Kingdom. It has become, however, to have an equal and independent status, and since 1926 has ranked as a cabinet post.
>
> In this respect it has served a role not unlike that of the Lord Privy Seal in Great Britain. Both are posts of cabinet rank and prestige but light administrative duties permitting the holders of this office to undertake other work for the government–

and as I said as preface to these remarks, doesn't that describe it rather well, Mr. Speaker?

> –light administrative duties permitting the holders to undertake other work for the government.

It goes on:

> It has been used, for example, as the official office of the government leader in the Senate and to give the holder time for important committee work in the House of Commons.

But under the federal legislation there are fairly wide functions to perform. The Act of 1415, Elizabeth, Chapter 25, the federal statutes of this country, assented to in June of 1966, describes the duties and powers of the Solicitor General of Canada to extend to include all matters over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction, not by law assigned to any other department, branch or agency of the government of Canada, relating to:

(a) reformatories, prisons and penitentiaries. Now that is the height, width and depth; that is the job being performed by the present member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Apps), and is the role performed by the Solicitor General at the federal level;

(b) parole and remissions. Again that falls within the basic jurisdiction of the Minister of Correctional Services in this province, and in this Act before us the Solicitor General has no suzerainty or role or say whatsoever over that matter. Of course, the argument is going to be that perhaps he should have; perhaps he ought not, we will see;

(c) he has control over the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, which is similar to the sole major function that the provincial Solicitor General is being asked to perform as a minister of the Crown.

The threefold responsibilities given under the federal Act seem to me to fulfil the full functions and range of a ministerial position, and if the government is going to be streamlined and there is going to be an encapsulation of ministries to make the internal workings easier and give greater cohesion, because more matters are in the head of one man who can cohere them, if that is the purpose, then the minister must consider his ministry as it presently stands as somehow unique, egregious and out of line with the intent in all of the heads of the government as it stood.

If they had made the Solicitor General the Minister of Correctional Services or brought what are presently Correctional Services under his wing, then there would have been some sense. Two ministries would have been encapsulated into one; the purposes of keeping ministerial status down and the number of cohering ministries to a smaller number rather than branching out would have been abided by and the total rationale of the recent reorganization would have made sense. But here he is hanging out, so to speak, as the sole, awkward, non-fitting cog in that great machine. It requires some explanation; it really requires some thought.

Now the alternative–whether that would be a satisfactory thing, one could spend some time on. Whether it is good to have the training schools and reformatories of this province and the jails and the training that goes into the guards in those institutions, under the same roof as the police, is a philosophical point which in the estimates will no doubt receive some credence. You can argue both ways. I would say not.

I would say that the functions and the kinds of activity performed by the guards is somehow different, but certainly that could even be accommodated under the head of a single department, and the Solicitor General's philosophy of what the police function and role is is extremely important now that he has assumed this particular post.

My colleague will shortly address the House on a matter of which the Solicitor

General may not be too aware, but which we have brought to the attention of the former Attorney General of this province, regarding what is set forth in British law and within the concepts of our parliamentary heritage and institutions as to what the true role of the police is in the Province of Ontario and Dominion of Canada. I don't think it is abided by, known by, or given any credence by, the people over there and never has been. Yet, it makes all the difference in the world as to the approach of the police to the public, the kind of training the police get, the social sense of responsibility inbred into the police forces of this province in solid contradistinction to the military hierarchizing and peculiar forms of education visited upon the heads of the police in the United States—which we seek to emulate, to our detriment, and quite wrongly an introjection of our own heritage. But this will be brought out eventually.

When this minister, Mr. Speaker, occupied the position of Provincial Secretary I thought he did quite well. This is a job upon which, you know, the halo might have been slightly over one eye but it was there. It was a job working in citizenship, working among citizens' groups, the kind of thing he likes to do, moving in that area. And then he shone superlatively when he was the chief master over the Hospitality Fund of this province for instance. Who could dispense hospitality with greater fervour and with a more open hand than the hon. minister? And he did.

The job was totally innocuous anyhow, and he wasn't the subject of abuse and pillory which he takes so badly—with that sensitive nature, that not wishing to offend. But now he's the minister of all the police forces and you can't help but offend on occasions; I mean that's a tough job. It may be just in these circumstances that they are trying to slot him in somewhere and not finding a spot; and that having to create one out of the whole cloth is just going to be the ruination both of him and the government.

I would step very lightly. No wonder he doesn't describe his functions here tonight. I think he is hardly aware of what they are, they are so negligible. Just what does he propose to do? What are his great reforms, if any? What is his notion of what the function of the police in the province is? Just give us a hint. After all, it's a new ministry. This is something that one can pour a little water on, like some neglected flower, and make grow. He's the boy. He's starting from scratch.

Mr. Cassidy: Water boy!

Mr. Lawlor: And you're telling me there'll be a lot of scratching. The underbrush is pretty thick.

And so in the coming into being of this completely superfluous and, I hope, innocuous ministry we are making a false step. Even if the function were widened—leave out reform institutions; let the present minister handle them. The present minister of that particular department is not an innovative soul. Unlike our minister from China he didn't carve out the little spaces where we could give him accolades; he hasn't done that to any extensive scale yet. There's time, there is always time before we lay down our heads to see that the world wags a little better.

But in this particular context the Solicitor General could expand his role, could be subordinate to the Attorney General, could perform some of the functions of that office. They are going to make a lot of fun about the lightning rods with the Solicitor General and can you blame them? Why not get some meat into it? The Attorney Generalship and the Provincial Secretary for Justice's job is wide enough, has enough girth and meat in it to give the Solicitor General something worthwhile to do instead of edging him out onto the sidelines like that.

He should perform that function. Perhaps he can be the assistant in the old traditional way in that particular regard, and work in the Ministry of Justice, and directly in that.

But as he presently stands we on this side of the fence cannot vote for this bill. We will have to oppose it; we do not think there is sufficient substance to his department to warrant the establishment of the department under this head. We will bide upon his services, and too, if he articulates a philosophy with respect to the police that meets our approval and that would not be that difficult to do, then we may take it a little bit more benignly. But as things presently stand, and I do not mean this personally, he is not merely not a superminister, he is a supernumerary minister.

Mr. Speaker: Any other member wish to participate?

The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this bill we are constrained in this party to vote against this particular bill. All of the other bills related to the reorganization of the government we have supported. I think we would support

the bill if it were not for the transfer to the Solicitor General of the administration of the Police Act. If all of the other Acts were in there I think we might have found ourselves able to support the bill in principle and to wish the minister well in the discharge of his responsibilities.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Wish him well?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: But the inclusion of the Police Act –

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That is serious.

Mr. Renwick: The inclusion of the Police Act in this bill gave us very serious pause –

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): It gave him some responsibility.

Mr. Renwick: – so much in fact that we have decided that we will vote against it. In voting against it, I think it is essential for us to have a very clear understanding in the assembly of the role of the police officer in our society and the function which the police officer performs, why he exists, and what distinguishes the police officer from other persons who hold offices of a particular status in our society.

That means we've got to go back to first principles. The first principle basically is the administration of justice. The society in which we live by and large delegates – the community delegates, not the state; not the state in the sense that Thomas Hobbes evoked the state – but the community as such delegates to certain persons in its society certain responsibilities and powers all of which are intimately involved with the administration of justice. If you make a separation between the administration of justice and establish the police under a separate ministry you go some way to destroying the very nature of the police constable in the society.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): The member has argued the other side.

Mr. Renwick: You know, some members of this caucus pointed that out to me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I imagine they did.

Mr. Renwick: Because I gave consideration at one point to thinking that there was some merit in the viewpoint that was put forward by the then Minister of Justice and Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) when he held that portfolio because he seemed to be enamoured of this view that the department should be split and that the police should be assigned to the Solicitor General's department. I thought there was some merit to it at that particular point in time. I'm quite –

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): He wasn't enamoured, he was entrenched; He was completely entrenched with that proposition.

Mr. Renwick: Well, it may well be.

Mr. Bullbrook: And the member supported it.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, it may well be –

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The member supported it.

Mr. Bullbrook: No, I didn't support it!

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Not that member – the member for Riverdale!

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Renwick: At that time, I had spoken in favour of it. I'm reversing the position that I took at that time to the extent that we did debate it, because now the matter is before us as a question of principle as to whether or not we should make that change.

We do two things with the police officer. We charge him with the responsibility for practical purposes of laying all of the charges against citizens in the society for breaches of behaviour which bring in the sanctions of the state under the Criminal Code or under the other statutes of this assembly or of the Parliament of Canada. In a very real sense he is a delegate of ours to do things which we ourselves do not do and that is to lay the informations which begin the whole of the system of the administration of justice and put it all in operation. If we were to take back to ourselves as individual citizens the responsibility for laying informations we would realize the extent of the delegation we have imposed upon the police constable – not the police forces, the police constable – in the society.

The second thing that we have done, and it is partly a corollary of that, is that we have delegated to the police the authority and the power under certain restrictive conditions to use force in the society.

It is true that we all have a residual right to use force in the society for certain limited purposes – for self-protection, de-

fence of property, and so on. But, by and large, again the accepted method by which force is applied in the society is by the police constable, not by the police forces, not by a mounted police force, but by the individual police constable. Because in a fundamental sense we as citizens in this society have delegated that authority to the police officers to carry on the initial stages of the administration of justice. I, for one, do not think that we should separate it out into a separate ministry and away from the Attorney General who is responsible overall for the administration of justice.

I want to dwell upon the basic essential ingredients of the position of the police constable and to make the distinction perfectly clear, because I think that it tends to be lost in our thinking about the problem. If you look in the Criminal Code, there is no such thing as a definition of a police officer. The term which is used in the code is "peace officer" and that includes a constable and others. I think it is essential to point out that our criminal law, as such, does not refer to the police but refers to a peace officer which is, of course, the particular main function which the police officer carries out in the society, and that goes back to a very basic principle.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, two or three of the basic ingredients of the responsibilities of a police constable and of the distinctions which separate his office from the office of other persons in our society. I quote from Halsbury's Laws of England, volume 30, on the police, which is a repository of the laws of England and from which our concept of the police constable is drawn. Halsbury states in this particular edition:

> The history of the police is the history of the office of constable and, notwithstanding that present-day police forces are the creation of statute and that the police have numerous statutory powers and duties, in essence a police force is neither more nor less than a number of individual constables, whose status derives from the common law, organized together in the interests of efficiency.

He then goes on to reiterate:

> A member of a police force of whatever rank, when carrying out his duties as a constable, acts as an officer of the Crown and a public servant. His powers, whether conferred by common law or statute, are exercised by him by virtue of his office and, unless he is acting in execution of a warrant lawfully issued, can only be exercised on his own responsibility.

Mr. Lawlor: Very important.

Mr. Renwick: To continue:

> It follows that a chief constable or other member of a police force is not in law responsible by virtue of his superior rank for the actions of a member holding a subordinate rank.

Or to put it the other way, a police constable, acting in his capacity as a police constable, cannot plead the justification of superior orders under any circumstance so long as he is carrying out that particular function which he is charged with carrying out on his own and sole responsibility.

There are other similar statements which can be used to illustrate the unique nature of the office and the unique function which the police constable carries out in our society. But I think it is also important to indicate very clearly that the police officer, the police constable, has certain duties, which again go back to the common law in England.

The first duty of a constable is always to prevent the commission of crime and, if a constable reasonably apprehends that the action of any person may result in a breach of the peace, it is his duty to prevent that action. It is his general duty to protect life and property, and the general function of controlling traffic on the roads is derived from this duty. Although it is the duty of police to obtain all possible information regarding crimes and offences which have been committed, they have, in general, no power to compel any person to disclose facts within his knowledge and to answer questions put to him. The primary function of the constable remains, as in the 17th century, the preservation of the Queen's peace. From this general function stem a number of particular duties additional to those conferred by statute and including those mentioned hereafter.

I draw again the House's attention to facts which I am sure are well known, but we have carried over into our Police Act very much the substance of the statement of the role of the police officer in our society. We will find in the Police Act of the Province of Ontario a statutory enshrinement of those obligations with respect to municipal police forces and with respect to the Ontario Provincial Police. I quote, particularly, the section dealing with the municipal police forces: "The members of police forces are

charged with the duty of preserving the peace, preventing robberies at all times, and offences –"

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would relate to the Chair exactly what relationship he is establishing between this particular bill and his reading of these extra Acts. I don't get the relationship to the bill before us.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Speaker, Bill 28 is a bill establishing the Ministry of the Solicitor General. The principle of the bill is really that the Solicitor General is assigned the specific responsibility for the administration of this Act and of the other Acts which are listed in the bill. Included among those Acts, and the principal and major one, is the administration of the Police Act of the Province of Ontario, which is the Act from which I am presently quoting in order to point out the basic and fundamental responsibility which is being shifted from the Attorney General's department to this department of the Solicitor General. I assumed for that reason that the matters were clearly within the framework of the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, it wasn't very clear to me. I suppose the hon. member is relating the functions of the police departments to make the point that there is, in fact, no responsibility in this department – that the police departments are themselves responsible. I cannot follow the thing any further than that. I fail to see the relationship to the debate that is taking place on the principle of this bill.

Mr. Renwick: Well, I wouldn't want to have to repeat everything that I have said, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

An hon. member: That'll teach you.

Mr. Renwick: What I was drawing to the attention of the House is that when we are talking about the transfer of the administration of the police in the Province of Ontario from the Ministry of the Attorney General, who is charged with the administration of justice, and when we are taking an important segment of the administration of justice and giving it to the new Ministry of the Solicitor General, it is very important that we in the Legislature clearly understand what exactly we are doing.

For that reason I felt that it was important to put on the record of the House the nature of the office of constable, because there is some indication and some continuing pressure, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the police force as though it were some kind of military or paramilitary organization which derives its authority from the state.

A point that I want to make, and I am sure that the Solicitor General-designate recognizes the point, is that they are an integral part of the administration of justice, going back in antiquity and in the tradition of this country, for the purpose of the preservation of peace and for the preservation of property, and to perform certain functions which are set out in the Police Act. If we accept the premise that that is the role of the police constable, then it seems to me that we should be very chary about transferring and severing the organizational and administrative structure related to the police from the Attorney General, who is involved with and responsible for the administration of justice.

It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we accept this principle we go back to various matters which we argued and debated and voted on and opposed the government on, in the Legislature on other occasions– that is the attempt to create the police force as a separate force, as if it were a corporate body, as if it were a body which in some way was changing in its nature from the fundamental nature of the individual role and responsibility of the particular police constable.

I had hoped, and I think we all had hoped, that the minister in introducing the bill would have given some indication to us of why he felt it made sense to transfer the administration of the police from the Attorney General and into his department. It would appear to me that in the United Kingdom, from what little I am aware of it, the responsibility for the administration of the police is not in any way centralized in a particular ministry. It is quite true that the Secretary of State, the Home Secretary, has certain responsibilities with respect to the administration of the police. It is also true, on the other hand, that the administration of justice in the United Kingdom is not so clearly a responsibility of the Attorney General in the United Kingdom as it is under our system of government here, because, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that the Lord Chancellor, who is the top of the administration of justice in England, is also a political figure and has a role, not only in the House of Lords but a role in a political sense with respect to the overall administration of justice. I do not think that the minister can derive any solace from an endeavour to compare what is being done here with what is

done in the United Kingdom. I am, however, very much concerned that there is a tendency, because of the pressure of events in the United States, for the forces in the United States to develop as paramilitary operations. We do not need to recite the incidents of other years that illustrate the extent to which the police force in certain areas in the United States is, in fact, a paramilitary operation. One need only tonight have watched the training and the exercises being taken by the San Diego police force in anticipation of the Republican convention in San Diego, Calif., to understand what I mean when I say that we in the Province of Ontario have got to preserve the traditional meaning of the police constable. This we must do in order that we can withstand the continuing pressures to translate the police constable in the Province of Ontario in his individual role into a mere member of a collective force, analogous in some way to a separate institution of the society with its own rules, its own internal loyalties, its own internal pressures. Because everyone knows that one of the principal problems that the society faces in having made this delegation is that they appear to act in many instances as a cohesive body with an in-group loyalty which acts in many instances adversely to the interests of the citizen. This is one of the matters that we here have got to be very careful of, to safeguard the citizens of the province from this kind of a development. I know that we await with a great deal of interest the report of the royal commission—which this minister was responsible, in its initial instances, for instigating the government to appoint—on the role of the police in the incidents which occurred at the Ontario Science Centre.

But it is with that kind of concern that we in this party are constrained to vote against this bill, because we cannot understand why it should be that a clear and keen appreciation of the nature of the role of the police constable, his function in this society, what distinguishes him from a soldier, what distinguishes him from an ordinary citizen, are matters which are very important to preserve the kind of tradition of the administration of justice which we have.

There is here in our society and should not be, an endeavour to separate out the police constable in his individual role, the police constable as a member of an organized police force, from his essential involvement within the structure of the administration of justice.

That leaves aside all of the questions related to the criminal investigative role of the police, the funds which are made available to them, the special task which they on many occasions have to perform. In the estimates of this department—because I assume that this bill will pass—we can deal in more detail with the fact that there are many areas in the Police Act where regulatory power has been granted by this assembly but there are no regulations; and there should very well be regulations under a number of the heads. We can also deal with other aspects of the policing operation.

But on the principle of the bill, I would ask the minister to justify, clearly and cogently, the reasons why it is the decision of the government to remove the administration of the police forces from the responsibility of that minister who is charged with the administration of justice.

We have decided, in this caucus, that there appears to be no such reason given, either in the Cronyn report or by this minister, or by the leader of the government when he introduced these bills. And therefore, on the information which we have, we must vote against the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Welland South.

Mr. Good: Waterloo North.

Mr. Speaker: Waterloo North, I am sorry.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Pretty close!

Mr. Good: There are a few comments I would like to make regarding one principle involved in this bill. That is on second reading I would like to deal with the aspects of the bill dealing with the transfer of powers of the Anatomy Act and the Coroners Act to the Solicitor General.

These two Acts of course deal with the medical-legal aspects with which the minister will have to deal. At the outset let me say this, that I would like to have a complete explanation of why the Human Tissue Act is not also included with the other two Acts which deal with medical-legal aspects within the province.

The Anatomy Act, as the minister probably knows, deals with the transfer of unclaimed dead human bodies within the province to medical institutions for medical research and education purposes. Similarly, the Human Tissue Act deals with the taking of part or all of dead human bodies for therapeutic purposes or for medical education or medical re-

search. Therefore I can see no reason why, under this same jurisdiction, the Human Tissue Act should not be incorporated.

The Coroners Act is very badly in need of rewriting. This has been promised for the last year or more within the province, and I would ask that the minister take into consideration, completely and very seriously, that this work be expedited as quickly as possible.

There are many aspects of the present Coroners Act which need to be changed and many which need to be rewritten. There are fee schedules in the Coroners Act which are completely outdated and hamper the work of coroners within our province because they should not be in the Act, they should be handled in the regulations of the Act.

I would respectfully ask that the minister give careful consideration to the rewriting of the Coroners Act and also to the inclusion of the Human Tissue Act under his jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members who wish to speak to this bill? The member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes; thank you Mr. Speaker.

I want to just relate a few comments in connection with the statute itself, and without going into the history of the tradition of the establishment of Solicitors General throughout the British system of justice.

I want to say that I associate myself with the remarks of the member for Riverdale to a great extent. I want to except that he felt that some police forces were paramilitary bodies.

I have taken the position throughout during my tenure in this House that every police force is a quasi military body. They operate in that fashion whether they are in San Diego or Sarnia, Ont., and really this should cause great concern to all the members of this House, especially the minister who hopes to be invested with the responsibility of being the chief law enforcement officer of the Crown, because that is going to be a responsibility second to none. It is going to be a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, not in any way fettered by, restricted by, or tempered by the fact that he is also responsible for the administration of justice.

I am personally going to vote against this bill on second reading. I am going to vote against this bill on every opportunity that I have because we are removing a sense of equity and justice from the administration of law in the Province of Ontario—law including the enforcement of law and the dissemination of justice through the courts. One minister cannot be responsible for one and be responsible for the other.

I am not going to personalize and talk about the sense of equity and values that repose within the minister who will be responsible, having regard to the—what would you call it?—the scoreboard syndrome that we are involved with here now, 79 to 39 or whatever it is. The fact is that he is going to be responsible here. I don't want to personalize about comments that he has made in the past that bear not well for him in connection with prejudging police activities in the Province of Ontario because we are not dealing with the incumbent, we are dealing with the principle and the principle is not a proper one.

I want to say that at one time predecessors in the Liberal Party talked about, with some degree of affirmation, the establishment of a portfolio of Solicitor General—many years ago before there was established, by way of example, a Ministry of Financial and Commercial Affairs, where there truly could be an investiture of responsibilities that are those of a Solicitor General. What concerns me and, I am sure, my leader and all the members of this caucus, is the fact that since we have come back here, since the election of October, we have, basically, equity, justice and the law divided five ways. We have on top a Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence), of whom I have said, privately and publicly both in this House and outside the House, he is almost putty-like in the structure of his responsibilities as far as I am concerned.

I really don't know what he does. I must say that I can't fathom it because there hasn't been a question in this House of any depth relating either to the administration of justice or the enforcement of law or any policies concurrent therewith that he has answered. When we talk about policies concurrent with the administration of justice in this province, when we talk about fields that are available to the people in this House and the deputy ministers involved in each portfolio I think, exclusive perhaps of Labour, there is no field that invites a more progressive, thoughtful attitude than justice does. I invite the consideration, Mr. Speaker, of members of this House to this fact.

Mr. Lawlor: What about education?

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps education, but I must say to the hon. member for Lakeshore that I am smothered in dollars there. I really can't cut my way through the jargon of input concept and things of that nature. I must say

I can't fathom it. I hope to get through it by the time the estimates of the Ministry of Colleges and Universities come up so I can make some sensible critique of it. But right now I haven't been able to do so.

When you think about justice in this province I want members to consider this, because we have a great propensity and a great tendency to be very smug about the British common law tradition here. But think of the fact that we are one of the few remaining jurisdictions in the democratic world where evidence illegally obtained is admissible in the courts. It's one of the few left—and isn't that a travesty of justice? Isn't that a tragedy? We talked about it three years ago during the course of the debate on the transference of powers in connection with police weaponry to the Ontario Police Commission. As the then critic of this party toward the then Attorney General, I recall distinctly talking about this very fact. But nothing's ever been done—nothing's been done on the federal level; no pronouncements ever come from the Provincial Secretary for Justice in connection with this.

We talked about the fact, if you'll recall, Mr. Speaker, that a person could be put upon the floor in this very chamber by the police of the Province of Ontario, could be forced willingly or unwillingly, vocally or without vocal evidence, to commit himself and to convict himself. That goes on in this province, and the fact of the matter is it goes on day in and day out. It does happen all the time—evidence illegally obtained in the Province of Ontario is being used continually to convict people in this province.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Of what?

Mr. Bullbrook: Of what? Of any offence. Let me tell you of an offence that I think is abhorrent, and that is the offence of impaired driving. I don't hold at all with the interpretation of the courts in connection of the use of the breathalyser. If the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development wants to have some dialogue in this connection, let me tell him about the decision of Mr. Justice Haines, in this connection, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I bow to the Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the secretary want me to go ahead with this?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, I bow to the Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you. Do you know what Mr. Justice Haines says about that law? He says the police do not require any reasonable or probable cause to require a person to take a breathalyser test. That's what the law of this province says right now. The court of appeal will send this back, there's no doubt about that.

But Mr. Justice Haines says that was the will of the Parliament of Canada. That's what he says. He says a police officer has the absolute right to come up to any citizen at any time and say, "You'll take a breathalyser whether you want it or not." And I defy any member of this House to get up and debate this with me right now, because I know that to be a fact. He says in effect that the onus is on the citizen to show that he had a reasonable excuse for not taking the breathalyser.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Why don't you speak to your friends at Ottawa?

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the type of reply, Mr. Speaker, that is completely unworthy of a parliamentary assistant. "Why don't you speak to your friends at Ottawa?" I have no friends at Ottawa—surely you must know that—none whatever. They recognize in point of fact that I look upon this type of legislation with complete disdain. It's not appropriate. As far as I'm concerned, as one Liberal sitting in the House, when it's a balance between the good of society and the right of the individual, I opt for the right of the individual every time—without reservation.

Mr. Meen: Hear, hear.

Mr. Bullbrook: But that's what happens to laws when they're passed, and that's the type of judicial interpretation we'll get. That's what we want to foist upon the public. Those are the powers of direction that we want to give to one minister, without any temperance as far as the administration of justice is concerned.

The fact of the matter is that when we had the Attorney General of this province vested with that dual responsibility, he recognized that equity in justice and the law had to go together. I hope this basically is what the member for Riverdale was talking about—I believe it was. I say in point of fact that it's a very retrograde step for us to consider this type of thing.

We talked about it before, as I said, when the then Attorney General wished to give to the Ontario Police Commission the powers of police weaponry. It was at that time we

talked about this—the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development nods his head; he recalls it very well. It went on till 3 or 4 in the morning, if I recall—and this was the thing we were concerned about.

We were concerned about the fact that somebody in an elected capacity had to be responsible for the enforcement of law. We in this party didn't agree with conveying to the delegated body, the Ontario Police Commission, the right to control the weaponry of police in the Province of Ontario. It was at that time that the then Attorney General talked about the establishment of the Solicitor General's portfolio. The fact of the matter is to some extent I would say that very evening —and my leader might correct me—I think it was about a quarter to four in the morning when we agreed to the use of the words "subject to the approval of the Attorney General" as somewhat of a Pyrrhic victory for both sides. Really that Pyrrhic victory didn't in any way detract from or denigrate the attitude that we feel that an elected person always has to be responsible for these ultimate decisions of policy.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: It would have to be the Solicitor General.

Mr. Bullbrook: In point of fact we never said that it had to be the Solicitor General. I personally that evening took issue with the fact that we needed a Solicitor General. I continue to do so. There is no need for it at all.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we now have five ministers who are essentially responsible for some ambit of the law and justice in the Province of Ontario. I believe my colleague from Ottawa East has spoken about this.

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is in effect doing a job truthfully that is the job of a Solicitor General. His job is really the job of a Solicitor General. He in effect is taking care of the solicitor's work. He should be in effect, to give it the appellation, its literal meaning, the Solicitor General of the Province of Ontario. That is in effect what he is doing. With the exception of his responsibility in connection with consumer matters that is his responsibility. It is ridiculous really and it belittles our talent and his ability to talk about the Lightning Rods Act.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The member is speaking as a lawyer as though all those rights had to be decided by a lawyer.

Mr. Bullbrook: In point of fact, I am not speaking as a lawyer, I am not speaking as a lawyer at all. Is there anything in this statute that says the Solicitor General has to be a solicitor?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, there isn't, but the member is assuming that he must be.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am not assuming anything of the kind nor have I inferred or alluded to that fact. I am saying in effect that basically, with the exception perhaps of consumer affairs, the function of the existing Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs is that of a Solicitor General.

The fact of the matter is that I would buy the continuation of his responsibility and I don't care what title the government wants to give him. If it wants to give him the title of Solicitor General so be it, but the fact of the matter is that in the Coroners Act, by way of example, there is no way that one can divorce the responsibilities of a minister of the Crown under the Coroners Act from the responsibilities of the Minister of Justice of the Province of Ontario.

You see, the whole purview of the coroners' system is to arrive at, and give public knowledge and view to, the justice of a death unexplained. It has nothing to do with the enforcement of law other than that is the machine one uses to arrive at justice. There is an obvious dichotomy here in this thing.

The Minister of Justice has to be the man responsible for the Coroners Act and the tremendous powers concurrent with the function of a coroner and the responsibility of his jurors. Goodness gracious, we in the Province of Ontario almost lead the democratic world in showing that; we have seen it so many times abused and discussed in this House. The Coroners Act has nothing to do, basically, with the traditional enforcement of law.

The enforcement of law, as the member for Riverdale talked about, is basically the protection of the public peace and the protection of society. It isn't to see that the ends of justice are met and that is exactly what a coroner's jury is all about. Yet the purpose of a coroner's jury is essentially to make an explanation, sufficient to society as a whole, as to why a death was caused and that is justice. That is what justice is all about.

The provincial secretary looks quizzical, and he might join in the debate or take issue with me now, I don't care which. I want to say to him in point of fact that that's my feeling, my direct feeling in connection with this particular statute. I talked before about evidence illegally obtained, I want to just for

a moment invite your consideration also of the thing that bothers me more than this. You can talk about the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, you can talk about the Minister of Correctional Services, the new Solicitor General and the Attorney General and Minister of Justice, but the place that we have been sold short of course is in the Provincial Secretary for Justice—really. There is a man who is supposed to be responsible for the establishment of policy in connection with justice. Not one word in the Throne Speech in connection with justice except something about student lawyers. Nothing at all. What in heaven's name are these so-called super ministers doing, especially in a field that invites a real infusion of energy in connection with this? We talked for a moment about evidence illegally obtained—what about the fact that you have in this country one of the few jurisdictions where police officers can conduct an investigation all the way up to trial in the most slovenly fashion, without any responsibility at all, except to their superior officers, and have a man convict himself out of his own mouth? I want to tell you that were I the Attorney General of Ontario, were I the Provincial Secretary for Justice of Ontario, I'd have many things to say about this, about the conduct of police officers in the investigation of an alleged criminal offence and about the rights of the individuals concurrent therewith. These are the things that I worry about. I worry very much about the fact that we are going to give one minister the power to make decisions in this connection, and not at the same time be responsible for the administration of justice in the Province of Ontario.

Really the administration of justice in the Province of Ontario is a charade. I want to record in Hansard that as late as Monday of this week I was called upon, in my responsibility as representing Sarnia, to evaluate a letter having to do with the conduct of a county court judge in Sarnia and his ability to carry on an equitable and fair trial. I had a letter from a lawyer dealing with this to the Attorney General of Ontario and the response basically is this, that since the formation of the federal judicial council the Ontario government has no constitutional right to deal with federally appointed judges. Now isn't that a shocking consideration?

Under the constitution of this country you are supposed to be responsible for the administration of justice, but that is exactly what the Attorney General feels right now, that they have no responsibility to investigate the conduct of federally appointed judges. Nothing has ever been said during the meeting of the Minister of Justice and the several Attorneys General of the province of Canada in connection with this. Nothing has ever been said in the constitutional conferences as to the delineation of these powers.

I am very concerned about it. I am very concerned that one person should have a power to direct the police and one person should have, in effect, the responsibility to direct provincial judges. I am very worried about the continuation of the whole police commission system. It is archaic. It doesn't respond to contemporary need. Goodness gracious, was it March 11 they appointed some fellow to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission here—Winfield somebody, a businessman—I don't know what his name was, but he's very important. He took Carruthers' place. Carruthers quit because he was fettered in his investigation of local police stations, he said.

But they appointed a new member to the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission, and I remember one of the comments he made in the Toronto Star was that he used to be a Liberal but the Rivard case done him in. He quit being a Liberal because of the Rivard case. That was the famous case, if you recall, where Rivard started to flood the rink on June 3 or something like that. It was Diefenbaker during the course of what was it, the 1963 election, who used to get up and say: "It was on a balmy night like this that Rivard borrowed the hose to flood the rink." And it was really.

In effect we'll say this to the minister, that first of all we're going to vote against the bill because he shouldn't have the power to do so.

The bill lends itself to his own personality, if I may say. Section 22 is great: "The Solicitor General shall preside over, have charge of the ministry."

It sounds like he is hatching an egg here; I believe that's really what he is attempting to do.

Usually ministerial responsibilities aren't couched in phrases such as "presiding over"; the minister might want to explain what he means by that. Because basically there's nothing!

At least the statute creating the Department of Tourism and Trade, or the Department of Industry and Trade as he wants to call it, gave him some direct powers in connection with his responsibilities.

As Solicitor General the minister is called upon to preside over and have charge of the

ministry. Well I just hope that his presiding over his subsequent ministry will be better than the presiding he has done in the past over other ministries.

But that begs the question of the principle of the bill itself. I say to you, through the Speaker, Mr. Minister, that we would like to have an explanation from the minister as to what he intends to do.

Maybe the minister would like to make some notes. I've noticed that the minister hasn't made any notes thus far.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: He has! Well maybe he would like to make—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But not on the member's speech.

Mr. Bullbrook: All right, fine!

Mr. Stokes: He knows how to hurt a guy.

Mr. Bullbrook: Maybe the minister would condescend to answer the following questions for me. Really, if he would care to put these down.

First of all, what are the minister's intentions in connection with police commissions? That's the first question.

Is the minister going to lodge all those up in the vacuum, or is he going to write them down?

What are his responsibilities in connection with the police commissions? Right! What is he going to do in connection with the establishment of police commissions? Is he going to continue to have appointed police commissions? Is he going to continue to have members of the judiciary sit on police commissions?

If the minister is going to have members of the judiciary sit on police commissions, how does he rationalize his function as chief law enforcement officer dealing with members of the judiciary in connection with the enforcement of law?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the minister getting these down?

Mr. Bullbrook: Has the minister got these? Has he got any of these? Does he intend to reply to them?

Tell me now, if he thinks they are sufficiently important? If he doesn't then I'll stop.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: They're important.

Mr. Bullbrook: They're important; well is the minister going to reply?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, not necessarily.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is not going to reply!

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Not necessarily tonight.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well it is interesting, Mr. Speaker, I am really interested to know whether the minister is going to bring to this department any vigour of direction at all in connection with matters of the enforcement of law that we've discussed in this House over the last five years.

I'm really interested, by way of example, to know what amendments the minister is going to make to the Police Act. I'm interested to know whether he is going to respond to the cry of municipalities in the Province of Ontario that compulsory arbitration is not the answer to collective bargaining in the public sector. I want to know that. We're entitled to know that.

These are the minister's responsibilities under this statute. Would he mark that down?

Mr. Stokes: He doesn't believe in the threats of Liberals!

Mr. Bullbrook: We'd like to know if the minister has given any consideration to that.

We'd like to know also—I personally would like to know more than anything else—if the minister could tell me what attitudes of policy and direction in connection with the enforcement of law he is going to bring to the provincial secretary whose responsibility is Justice. Because if he is going to take on this responsibility, one would hope that he would have given it deep consideration and recognize the very significant responsibilities that he is given in this respect.

Because in effect, now he is the police chief of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): God forbid; it's too much to believe!

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister is now the police chief of the Province of Ontario!

From now on it is no longer just a question of whether somebody can get a liquor licence or not; from now on every time a person, a citizen of the Province of Ontario, is stopped on the street and it is said: "Whether you like it or not, whether I have reasonable cause or not, you're going to take a breathalyser test," the minister is responsible! Every time a person stumbles down a

sidewalk in the Province of Ontario and is arrested for vagrancy, the minister is responsible. Every time somebody languishes in jail all night without the opportunity for bail—that happens every night in this Province of Ontario and it can only be categorized as a stinking exposition of what justice is all about—the minister is responsible.

We want to know tonight what the government intends to do about it because, Mr. Speaker, the response we are going to get from that minister is exactly what he is giving me now, a smirk, because he doesn't comprehend the total responsibilities that he has here. He doesn't recognize that from now on Eric Silk is a boy scout compared to him.

The minister has everything within his hands. He is the veritable gauleiter of this province, and we wonder. We wonder.

Mr. Lewis: Ho, ho.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, we shouldn't take that. We shouldn't take that.

Mr. Lewis: He understands his duties to be those of the Lightning Rods Act, and that's it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Those are the reasons why we in this party will not support the bill. We won't support the bill, not because of personal equation. Right?

Mr. Lewis: Not because the minister is an oberfuehrer—

Mr. Bullbrook: It is because of the fact that we don't feel in this party that a person can properly enforce the law—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not very nice.

Mr. Bullbrook: —unless he had, concurrent with that duty, with that right, with that privilege, the duty, the right, the privilege and responsibility of administering the justice, because law cannot be divorced from the justice. It is all part of the same concept.

When you lay an information you are enforcing the law, but you have to make sure that when the person leaves that court, he has been given total equity in justice. That has to be the responsibility of one man as far as we are concerned.

We will never get it from the Provincial Secretary for Justice. First of all, he doesn't have the capacity. We know that now. We can see it. But we thought we might get it from the Attorney General now, as we did get it without reservation from the former Attorney General, the hon. Arthur Wishart. We got it from him totally, as far as I was concerned. We didn't agree with him all the time, but he had an innate and inherent sense of justice which exuded and conveyed itself across here.

I have talked about that night, that 2 o'clock and 3 o'clock in the morning. I said some things that night that I wasn't very happy about. I remember at 8:30 in the morning—he had been in his office at 8—I phoned from my hotel room, because I was just getting up. I said, "I would like to see you, Mr. Attorney General, as soon as I can," because I wanted to apologize to him. I think I said that he wasn't involved with the—oh, it was something about the contemporary aspects of society—that he was a little too old or something like that.

I remembered saying it and I was very embarrassed about saying it afterwards and I apologized to him. Of course, his response was the response that everyone would expect. He said, "Think nothing of it, Jim, because I didn't." That's the type of man he was, but it was the type of man, and you can't pass statutes commensurate with personalities or character. You have got to pass statutes on the basis of the law itself. That's what we here are concerned about really.

The minister is very qualified I would think, or some of his colleagues are qualified, to take care of some of the stautes that they have the responsibility for. I really doubt very much whether anybody has the ability to control the police forces of the Province of Ontario without that concurrent responsibility to see that the end of justice is also served at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped—

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I have one very short word, Mr. Speaker. As has been conveyed, we intend to oppose the bill and to divide the House on the bill, because we feel very strongly about the inappropriateness of this department's having been established for all the reasons that have been given. And perhaps, in a personal way, as an addendum to those reasons or to reinforce them, it strikes me that there is something inherently dangerous about establishing this definition of the Ministry of the Solicitor General. It turns the minister into a public apologist for the police forces of Ontario.

There are no mitigating dimensions of his department to infuse it with the breath and the humanity and the countervailing kinds of powers which a minister must have when he is dealing with matters of police authority. It is the only department of the Solicitor General we have been able to find that is so circumscribed in its definition.

Even a department of the Solicitor General which includes within its bounds the administration of correctional institutions provides some kind of balance, some kind of counterweight, some kind of breadth against which the activities of the police can be measured. But not this department. This department forces upon a minister the attitude of providing an apologia for every police activity. And as I stand here, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what will happen; events will bear it out.

It is one of the reasons—only one—why so many of us on this side sense the inappropriateness of this department. It is one of the reasons, albeit only one, why I am absolutely certain the COGP wasn't able to bring itself to define a department so circumscribed, so narrow, so insular, so essentially authoritarian in its nature, as this department must necessarily be.

I shake to think of what might have happened in the province if this was the department which was already established at the time of the war measures Act in this country. And one of the things which gave to this government—and I will concede it with pleasure every step of the way—a sense of civil liberties which the Liberals in Ottawa will never know, was that in the person of the Attorney General at the time of the war measures Act there was not simply the compassionate man described by my friend from Sarnia, but the reflection of a department which encompassed the administration of justice and the enforcement of law so that there was some appreciation of the civil libertarian aspect of this society.

But not so this ministry; there is simply the power over the police. No one can pretend that the Lightning Rods Act, the Hotel Fire Safety Act or the Emergency Measures Act are in any sense a sufficient compensation or a sufficient balance for the total focus of this department, which is on the enforcement of law and the control of the police.

A lot of us in this House, as the minister must know, are a little anxious about his own precepts of law and order, and the fanatic commitment he may bring to the exercise of law and order in the Province of Ontario. Time will tell. Maybe he will prove us wrong.

Regardless of his administration, this Act is inherently wrong in the strictures it places on the department. It should not be allowed without any other aspects to mitigate it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, the tightness of the position which has been exemplified by all of the speakers on the opposition indicates, I think, that it would be taking up the time of this House to try to persuade them to change their minds.

Mr. Renwick: No, no it would not. The minister can't use that as an excuse in this House.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Their minds are completely closed.

Mr. Stokes: That is his excuse for opting out.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I will take a moment or two tonight so that the public of Ontario might understand—

Mr. Renwick: It is this Legislature the minister is talking to.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Then in the days ahead there will be fleshed out both the concepts and the work of the ministry.

Mr. Cassidy: Flushed out?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: It was interesting to me to note how divided the opposition was when the member for Ottawa East treated the ministry so lightly, as if it had no consequence at all, yet the member for Sarnia took the extreme opposite view that it was probably one of the most serious steps that the government was taking in creating this ministry. Why? That is a good question and I would direct the hon. member for Ottawa East, and all hon. members, to page 24 of the interim report, No. 3, of the COGP. Interestingly enough on that one page, rather disjointedly, there is a philosophy spelled out that the citizens of this province might well turn their eyes to because it was not the cold development of an administrative machinery. It does talk of the—the words used are "society's concept of justice and fair play."

Mr. Lawlor: Nothing about the Solicitor General.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I would have thought—

Mr. Lawlor: Not a word.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —that when this bill

was introduced the members of the opposition would have embraced it completely—

Mr. Lewis: Never.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —because they have pointed out all of the weaknesses. The hon. member for Sarnia has pointed out the weaknesses that have been caused in the past. As a matter of fact, Hansard will record that in two sentences, one after the other, he takes completely contradictory positions. He takes the positions when he talks about the police officer and then the administration of justice.

There is a philosophy which has been accepted on this side. The conflict perhaps has not existed in reality in the past by having two functions, in fact, three functions or three disciplines in one ministry, regardless of the name. Being called the Solicitor General does not add one thing. Whether it is the Solicitor General or the Home Secretary, or whatever it is, it is the powers in jurisdiction that have been given.

Think of an instance where a police officer, a constable in the traditional way, exercises his powers—and I accept completely the member for Riverdale's concept and definition of the evolution even unto this day of the constable; there is nothing in this Act that will detract from that one whit. The police officer who is concerned with an arrest and law enforcement should be completely severed when that man goes on trial in a court of law and is prosecuted. As a matter of fact, I am amazed at the member for Sarnia and the positions he has expounded when he sees the arresting officer in certain circumstances acting as the prosecutor in a court of law.

Someday the member for Sarnia may answer for me what he thinks of that proposition, that the man who arrests is also the prosecutor. I can tell members there are many citizens in this land who have consented to give certain rights to constables who feel very strongly that with them did not go the right to being prosecuted by that constable. This is why I thought that the hon. member for Sarnia would support the bill because this is a basic concept indeed. If there is one member of the opposition—

Mr. Bullbrook: I find it difficult to follow the minister.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: If there is one member of the opposition who will break ranks with the NDP—

Mr. Bullbrook: How many trials does a police officer prosecute?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —it is the member for Lakeshore.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): That is a palpable slander.

Mr. Ferrier: He is a great socialist.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The member for Lakeshore, I thought, was about to launch into a support of the bill when he used the words conflict of interest.

In the function that has heretofore been carried out in the Department of the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice, in the eyes of many citizens, there is and has been a conflict of interest when people under him make arrests and he is also responsible for the prosecution and the judges who listen to the case.

And I thought—

Mr. Foulds: He was schizophrenic and could not handle it.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —really, I honestly thought that the member for Lakeshore had grasped the very significant thing that the COGP—

Mr. Lawlor: Almost a justification for the minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —in its report acknowledges that there should be a division. Now on page 24 they make the division between the Attorney General, correctional services and public protection.

Mr. Bullbrook: Look, I don't give one tittle for COGP.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Absolutely, and it was the hon. member—

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't care for them at all.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —for Riverdale who used the words earlier today I think, about the government not having followed slavishly the recommendations, and the member for Ottawa East picked it up. This is one instance in which that has been carried out. I won't give all the answers to the hon. member for Sarnia—spell out my philosophy in what I am going to do about this and what I am going to do about that. There will be things done and this session will see them done.

Mr. Roy: What are five people going to do?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I may say this to the hon. leader of the NDP—

Mr. Bullbrook: Put it in the Throne Speech. That is the time to say it if the minister is going to do something.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —the times do call for a new concept and certainly I accept the position that I am a law and order man.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: But at the same time I am cognizant that we are living in a day and age when every citizen is striving for a freedom of action and a freedom of expression that the past centuries never thought of.

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And there will be called upon, not only the wisdom of Solomon, but the great sensitivity to balance these two concepts.

Mr. Lewis: There is no balance in the minister's department. That is what it lacks. No balance.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The balance is in the setting up of a ministry charged with, and devoted to—

Mr. Lewis: Law and order, not the citizen. The citizen has no place in the minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —seeing that this balance is kept.

Mr. Renwick: Law and order in its worst sense.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is the embodiment of the imbalance.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member for the NDP knows that is completely wrong. I will not take—

Mr. Lewis: That is not right. The minister is responsible for the police.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —a second seat to him or anybody in his party in the freedom of the individual.

Mr. Lewis: He is already sounding like the public prosecutor. He is already sounding like Mayor Daley.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: The hon. member's comparisons bear no fruit. If all he can do is make invidious comparisons he has a very weak argument.

Mr. Lewis: They are not invidious.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He has a weak argument. And I say to the members of this House and the people that we serve that the great challenge of the Seventies is not only the environment, is not only finding jobs, but the reconciliation between law and order and the balance of the freedom of the citizen.

Mr. Lewis: Of course. So they give the minister the police.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: And those members of the opposition who will be voting against this bill are voting for a separation of a conflict of interest which exists—

Mr. Ferrier: The minister is shouting.

Mr. Renwick: That is not corect. They are voting for the administration of justice.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and which the member for Riverdale recognized a number of years ago. It was very well expounded by the former Attorney General—

Mr. Lewis: We are recognized.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —who had the high regard of all. It was something he believed in completely more than anything else.

Mr. Renwick: The minister has made the conflict of interest permanent.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: When the opposition votes against the bill they are voting against a separation of the conflict of interest—

Mr. Lewis: That is right. We are voting against a department of the police. That is what we are voting against.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: —and the inability of having one minister charged with the very delicate situation of balancing freedom of expression, privacy and all of the other things that we strive for in the Seventies—and law and order.

Mr. Roy: I am concerned about parliament.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The vote is on the motion for second reading of Bill 28.

The House divided on the motion, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Allan	Bounsall
Apps	Bullbrook
Bennett	Burr
Bernier	Cassidy
Brunelle	Deacon
Carruthers	Deans
Downer	Dukszta
Eaton	Ferrier
Evans	Foulds
Ewen	Gaunt
Gilbertson	Germa
Grossman	Givens
Guindon	Good
Havrot	Haggerty
Hodgson	Laughren
(Victoria-Haliburton)	Lawlor
Hodgson	Lewis
(York North)	Martel
Jessiman	Newman
Kennedy	(Windsor-Walkerville)
Kerr	Nixon
Lane	(Brant)
Lawrence	Reid
(Carleton East)	Renwick
Leluk	Smith
Maeck	(Nipissing)
McKeough	Spence
Meen	Stokes
Morrow	Worton—26
Newman	
(Ontario South)	
Nixon	
(Dovercourt)	
Nuttall	
Parrott	
Root	
Rowe	
Scrivener (Mrs.)	
Smith	
(Simcoe East)	
Stewart	
Taylor	
Villeneuve	
Walker	
Welch	
Winkler	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko—42	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 42, the "nays" are 26.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion for second reading carried.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11:05 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 6, 1972

Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, bill to establish, reported 913

Ministry of the Solicitor General, bill to establish, Mr. Yaremko, second reading 921

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 941

No. 25

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 7, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 1972

The House met at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have visitors with us this morning in the east gallery from the Royal York Collegiate Institute, Toronto; and in the west gallery, visitors from the Young Women's Christian Association of Lockport, New York, and students from the Jones Avenue Adult Day Centre, Toronto, as well as from the Holy Spirit Separate School of Scarborough.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. My point of privilege is that it is reported in this morning's Globe and Mail that instructions were issued at the Workmen's Compensation Board that phone calls from me were to be taped. I suggest to you, sir, that it is extremely inappropriate, improper and unparliamentary; and—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Indefensible!

Mr. Shulman: —indefensible! Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Probably illegal!

Mr. Shulman: And illegal! All right—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Reprehensible, too!

Mr. Shulman: —for a department to tape, secretly, calls received from a member of the Legislature.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Ministry of Agriculture and Food): That is what the member does himself.

Mr. Shulman: Furthermore—

Mr. MacDonald: Is the minister defending this?

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): What kind of an outfit has the government got over there?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Agriculture and Food rise and defend this?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the minister better keep quiet or he is going to get himself in deeper and pull the hole right in after him.

Mr. Shulman: It is reported, sir, on the same page, that the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Legge, stated that parliamentary tradition makes the responsible minister the only fair target for attack. The responsible minister at that time, the then Minister of Labour, is now, to my sorrow, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Bales). I suggest to you, sir, it is quite inappropriate for the Minister of Justice to retain his position if in fact he has been a party to or had knowledge of this offence. I ask, through you, sir, to the Prime Minister, that if he is setting up a royal commission to investigate this whole matter one of the things it be asked to investigate is the tape recording of these calls.

I would like to ask why I was the only MPP given this particular privilege?

Mr. Speaker: I haven't had an opportunity to review the press reports, but I will in fact do so and determine whether or not the hon. member has a point of privilege.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I am not certain there is a point of privilege. I suggest that I will investigate the reports and just see what has been reported and what has taken place. I don't know about them.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Of course there is a point of privilege.

Mr. Lewis: With respect, sir, we are always diverting these subjects. You can be very sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Globe and Mail, conscious of the libel law, will have had their lawyers look at the copy that appeared this morning. It makes the categorical

assertion that members of the Legislature, specifically the member for High Park, have had tape recordings made of phone calls to the Workmen's Compensation Board. What we want, sir, is a ruling from you as to the propriety of that action by a government agency, and whether or not the rights of the House have been infringed.

Mr. Speaker: Of course I am sure the hon. member doesn't think it would be possible for me to make an intelligent ruling upon something before I have had an opportunity to at least read the reports?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we are not asking you to rule on the truth of the statement in the Globe and Mail; they face libel laws if it is not true. We are asking you to rule on whether it is within the rights of an agency of this government to tape telephone conversations from members of this Legislature. That is the question that is being put to you; and I suggest to you, sir, that you have an obligation to respond to it immediately.

Mr. Lewis: And you don't need precedents for it.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, I was listening very carefully to the points raised by the hon. member for High Park, and it seemed to me that the points he made, his allegations of breach of privilege, went beyond what the hon. member for York South suggested.

Insofar as the hon. member for York South is concerned, the suggestion made to me as to my ruling upon the propriety of taping conversations, I believe it would be my opinion that this would not be proper.

Mr. Lewis: That whole board is rife with impropriety.

Mr. Speaker: I would like, however, before I complete any ruling that might be called for, to review the newspaper reports, and if necessary I will make a further ruling in connection with the whole matter.

Mr. Lewis: Where is the minister?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

COMMON MARKET THREAT TO ONTARIO TOBACCO PRODUCERS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, to put a question to a minister who is present, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is aware of the additional financial problems which will be faced by the tobacco producers in this province when Britain enters the European Common Market and their tobacco sales are further reduced? Has he any sort of a committee or group examining the effect on our historic markets of entry into the European Common Market by Britain? More specifically, has he undertaken any review of what action might be taken to assist the tobacco farmers, not necessarily the cigarette manufacturers who got some assistance last week in this budget, but to assist the tobacco farmers in maintaining their foreign markets and possibly maintaining a two-price system so they can sell the tobacco to foreign markets at a somewhat assisted price?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, yes we have people investigating the effects of Britain entering the European Common Market. We are concerned.

There has been a recent delegation of the tobacco board, accompanied by the vice-chairman of the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board, which has just had an extensive trip to the United Kingdom and to European countries. They have come back with a commitment by the tobacco advisory council in the United Kingdom of a substantial purchase of 1972 crop production.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is before they got into the Common Market!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that is right.

Now it will be reduced somewhat from last year's commitment because of the amount of tobacco they have purchased over and above their commitment of last year. This was due of course to the substantial increase in production of tobacco in Canada last year. We are hopeful that with deliberations that are now proceeding through the tobacco board itself, there may be some type of a programme worked out whereby there may not have to be substantial cuts in acreage in Ontario-grown tobacco.

We are certainly hopeful that this can be done, and I can assure you that we will be prepared to work with the tobacco board in trying to resolve the situation that promises to generate some problems in the next few years as Britain advances into the Common Market.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister aware that the chairman of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, in commenting on the 1.2-cent-per-pack increase in

tobacco tax, said he wished the increase had been more and, in fact, that the government would use part of the increase to assist the farmers in establishing a two-price export system?

Is the minister aware of that; and would he comment on the possibility of doing that at the provincial level or in co-operation with the government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware that the tobacco board chairman said that. I'm not doubting it—the hon. member suggested he has said that—but I haven't seen the report or the release, nor have I heard his comment in that regard; so I wouldn't want to comment any further on it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have questions?

PUBLIC COMMENT BY WCB CHAIRMAN

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask a question by way of point of order, so that if you judge it to be appropriate it may be subtracted from the question period.

Given your ruling in this Legislature yesterday, and prior to that, about the appropriateness of legislative members commenting on the various matters before the committee examining the Workmen's Compensation Board, do your feelings about the sub judice nature of those hearings extend to the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, who made elaborate public comment yesterday at a meeting of the Empire Club?

Mr. Speaker: Well, I would say that I do not have knowledge that the sub judice rule extends beyond remarks made in this chamber. It would seem to me, however, pending my investigation and some expert advice, that such remarks would not have been proper and should not have been made. I would like an opportunity to look into the matter a little more thoroughly, which I will do at the same time as I'm investigating and considering the previous matter raised.

It seems to me—again, I haven't read the press reports—that while the deliberations of the committee have not been completed, and it was quite possible that further evidence might be given by individuals pertaining to the whole situation, perhaps it was not wise or proper to have made any such remarks. Again, I would like to read the reports.

LABOUR MINISTER'S MEETING WITH WCB COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, within whose policy purview I believe, falls the Department of Labour. Can he tell the House why the Minister of Labour is meeting this morning with the three commissioners of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is it a matter familiar to him that the resignation of the chairman of the board is now under active consideration?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I know nothing of the subject, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: What does a policy minister do, pray tell?

LICENSING OF SECURITY FIRMS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the same policy minister, again relating to a matter for the Department of Labour. Has this minister been involved in the discussions about the various security agencies actively engaged in strike-breaking across the Province of Ontario?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: No, Mr. Speaker. I really think that the fields involved in the last question and in the present question are matters for the ministry itself. Unless there is something deeper than I perceive at the moment, I don't consider it a matter of overriding policy within my field.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if it is emerging, and will emerge as I think is clearly the case, that the government of Ontario is in the impossible position of having to license firms deliberately engaged in strike-breaking because of certain legalities by way of application, and that the whole policy involves the need to plug the loopholes in the law, would the minister undertake to investigate that as a matter of some seriousness? I know it has engaged the attention of some of his colleagues.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Yes Mr. Speaker, at that level I would certainly participate. But, as the hon. member mentioned, I would think it's essentially a matter involving the

civil rights of our citizens, be they labour or involved in any other capacity. I would hope that I would participate if the issue reaches the level described.

Mr. Lewis: Well by way of final supplementary, if I can show to the minister, as I can, that a direct link can be established between the firm which the government has just licensed, and it was announced in this chamber yesterday by the Attorney General, and the firm which the entire cabinet finds abhorrent, Canadian Driver Pool and its principal, who have been involved in strike-breaking activities, would the minister not then recognize that something must be done about the present state of the law?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I really think, Mr. Speaker, in the present state of the law, what is meant or what we assume to be meant by the term "strike-breaking", is really highly legal in its significance and is a matter in which I would bow to the judgement and final decisions of the Provincial Secretary for Justice (Mr. A. F. Lawrence).

STUDY INTO DIFFERENTIAL IN TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Can he tell us the state of the latest study into the differential in transportation costs and freight rates as between northern and southern Ontario?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, the whole question of freight rates, including the freight rate situation in northern Ontario, is a subject of great concern and deep study by my department.

I might mention that under the National Transportation Act, which was passed in 1967, the money ramifications that emerge as a result of this new Act give me great concern as the Minister of Transportation and Communications for this province. It relates not only to northern Ontario, it relates not only to the pulp and paper industry and other industries; but it relates to many industries across this country. There has been a study by a consultant firm in connection with the National Transportation Act on the part of this province and how the Act will affect this province. Part of this whole problem is the subject of the leader of the New Democratic Party's question re freight rates in northern Ontario.

Members will recall this was mentioned in the Throne Speech a year ago, and since then there has been a study going on which has involved many of the industries in northern Ontario. There have been consultations, for example, with the pulp and paper industry and with the mining industry per se to find out what their reactions might be to matters in this regard.

I understand, sir, that it is a very complicated, very intensive study, involving great expertise. As yet no definite policy has evolved.

It is an ongoing study, and one that I personally am concerned about. Apart from northern Ontario, I am more deeply concerned about the Province of Ontario as a unit, because the fact that the National Transportation Act and what may evolve from there, means in effect that industry may move from one province to the other simply by way of freight rates. I think that this is of vital concern to the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River with a supplementary.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Is there any timetable set for the end of this study; and will the material that is gathered by this firm be tabled in this Legislature? Thirdly, does the study peripherally take in the differential between the retail cost of gasoline as between northern and southern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: To answer the last question first, this will obviously be part of the whole study.

Insofar as the report is concerned, I certainly hope that it will be tabled in the Legislature, as any reports will be that I have any connection with. As for the first part, the general part of the question, would the member please ask it again?

Mr. Reid: When can we expect it; we have been waiting for a long time?

Hon. Mr. Carton: May I say this Mr. Speaker, that I personally am rather impatient. I try to get things on the track as quickly as possible, but when you are dealing with such a very complicated thing as the economics of freight rates, as I point out not only between northern and southern Ontario but across this country, it is a very difficult task. I think the hon. member knows that when you are dealing with economists and the expertise in that field it simply is not an easy matter to come to any quick resolution.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, there are three or four pertinent matters that I feel that I must speak on with the federal Minister of Transport, and this is one of them. I am hoping to set up a meeting on three or four different matters in the near future.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South has a supplementary.

Mr. Ferrier: In an effort to reduce freight rates, what weight has the department given in its studies to the taking over by the ONR of the CNR line from North Bay to Toronto and from Cochrane to Hearst, as is now being proposed by the Mayor of Kapuskasing and certain people in that district, and the extension of the ONR from North Bay to Parry Sound? How much study has been given to these proposals and what is the government's reaction at this point to those proposals?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am unaware of the proposal from the Mayor of Kapuskasing and—

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): What about the White Knight?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Martel: What about the White Knight? He went around northern Ontario advocating that all the time he was minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. minister will disregard that and answer the other question.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): The White Knight was here already!

Mr. Ferrier: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister not been approached by the Mayor of Kapuskasing and certain people in northeastern Ontario for a meeting to discuss freight rates and the extension of the ONR to these specific routes that I have mentioned?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the minister is approached by about six or seven delegations every day. If the mayor has approached me and he has a future appointment with me I will be knowledgeable at the time I meet with him. Perhaps the member can inform me as to when this meeting may be because I have some 50 or 60 meetings in the next three or four weeks. If he is aware that the Mayor of Kapuskasing is coming to see me, then I will be knowledgeable at that time.

Mr. Ferrier: As a further supplementary, I understand that this is the whole of northeastern Ontario, all the municipal people. Perhaps the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) might inform the minister on that.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South has a supplementary.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): No, it is not a supplementary; it is a new question.

Mr. Foulds: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: In view of an earlier statement in the series of questions that have been directed to the minister, I would like to ask him: although he has outlined the complexity of the consultations that have taken place with various industries in the province with regard to freight rates, sir, I wonder if the study has included a consultation with the agricultural industry, particularly in northwestern Ontario and particularly in reference to the recent lowering of subsidies on grain seed for northwestern Ontario? If the study has not taken that into account can the minister assure me that it will?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I am not personally aware of this matter, but my policy minister has had some meetings in connection with this. If the member would redirect his question to my policy minister I believe he would be in a position to answer.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur was redirecting a question that he addressed to the minister.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, I can advise that not only in relation to freight rates involving northern Ontario and the pulp and paper industry, but also involving the implications of freight rate changes insofar as agricultural products are concerned, primarily in southern Ontario, manufacturing products of course also are involved. This is a field under very active and concerned study by the policy field that I chair.

I think, and I am really repeating the words of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, there can hardly be an area of the work in which I am involved that can

be more sensitive than trying to understand the significance of changes or manipulations in freight rates insofar as the Province of Ontario is concerned from north to south.

Mr. Foulds: The minister has not answered my specific question about the recent reduction of feed grain subsidies, specifically to northwestern Ontario, as it is affecting the agricultural industry in northwestern Ontario.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: That's a particular question. I thought the member's question was more general. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture can speak to this.

Mr. Foulds: I will redirect it to the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: I think this is getting a little out of control. If there is a supplementary to the original question direct it to the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Martel: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Is the minister not aware that the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) over and over again, while he toured northern Ontario, made the suggestion that the government was—

Mr. Hodgson: Question, question!

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Question.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): He is asking the minister whether or not he is aware. What is the matter with the members opposite?

Mr. Martel: —in the process, or indicated to the populace of northern Ontario that, in fact, the government was in the process of studying the feasibility of taking over the ONR, as my colleague has outlined it, and expanding it from North Bay to Parry Sound; and taking over that section over to Hearst and running from North Bay to Toronto? Is this not government policy, or being studied; or was the former minister deceiving the people as usual?

Mr. Deans: Three questions, now what more could members ask?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, the former Minister is exactly that—the former minister. I am—

Mr. Ferrier: It was government policy.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact he has been kicked upstairs; not just "the former" status.

Hon. Mr. Carton: I am advising the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that this whole subject —and it was instigated by the hon. member at his right with mention of the mayor of Kapuskasing—will be discussed with the delegation when it comes. I would hope, incidentally, that the hon. members interested will attend. They are most welcome to attend that particular delegation meeting.

Mr. Martel: A final supplementary: Then the government was not aware what the White Knight was saying in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I'm not the government.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Ferrier: It is a snow job.

CONVERSATIONS WITH COMMISSIONERS OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BOARD

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour: Can he report to the Legislature on the nature of his conversation this morning with the commissioners of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I wish to inform the House that, at my request, I did meet the members of the board this morning; but I don't think that I should have to give a report of the discussions that went on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Foulds: Members opposite applaud not answering a matter of public importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary—

Mr. MacDonald: What of the accessibility of the government that we have been hearing so much about!

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is it in fact true that the possible resignation of

one or other members of the board is now under active consideration?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, it is not true.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. Lewis: May I ask, by way of further supplementary Mr. Speaker, how long is the minister prepared to allow what is happening to the board in public terms to continue, without stepping in and resolving it one way or another?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, this is being done by the committee right now. The board is appearing before the standing committee on resources development, and we have to hear more, I think, before anything further can be said.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister saying that weekly Wednesday meetings of the natural resources committee are sufficient to deal with matters and allegations which arise on a daily basis, now encompasing tape-recorded conversations from members of the Legislature, from members of the press, obvious dissession and enmity within the board at the senior level itself, hidden tape recorders in the offices of the board, written instructions for the chairman of the board to have reported to him the activities of other members of the board? How long is the minister prepared to have whatever value there is left in the board undermined without stepping in?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am looking into the whole matter myself.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River had a supplementary.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary: In view of the fact that we in this Legislature are under sub judice rule in regard to discussing and asking questions about the Workmen's Compensation Board, is the minister prepared to give instructions to the chairman of the board that he will similarly conduct himself in public and not speak about matters affecting himself and the Workmen's Compensation Board, matters which are presently before the standing committee?

Mr. Speaker: This of course, is a point that had been raised previously this morning. I undertook to look into the matter and express an opinion on it, and I shall look into it.

The hon. member for High Park had a supplementary.

Mr. Shulman: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is: Was the Minister of Labour aware prior to today that the board had been taping conversations with members of this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister think of it, by way of supplementary? How does that strike him?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Can we hear the minister's view on taped conversations with members?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, we have to find out first if this is a fact, and until then I don't want to comment.

Mr. Lewis: Well, if the minister doesn't move, they will destroy anything left that's good in that board.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one final question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: That will be the last supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Oh no, I'm sorry—on a different subject.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a new question?

LICENCE TO FIRM SUPPLYING GUARDS

Mr. Lewis: Yes, a new question; the last question!

Is the Minister of Labour aware of the licensing to which the Attorney General referred yesterday, of Canadian Specialized Security under the sole ownership of one James Kevin McEwan?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, I am informed that our department is working very closely with the AG's department.

Mr. Lewis: Right! Is the minister aware that the application which was withdrawn prior to Mr. McEwan's sole application, contained not only Mr. McEwan's name but also the name of one Nicholas D. Kerr, listed in the latest company returns as vice-president of Canadian Driver Pool?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I wasn't, but I am now.

Mr. Lewis: Right!

Might the minister look at the address which was given as that of the head of the firm in the application by Kerr and McEwan, which was withdrawn, which is listed as apartment 1803, 2240 Weston Rd., which is in the name of one Richard Grange. Are not therefore the Minister of Labour and his colleagues confident—I am sure they are—that the link between these companies and these personalities is clear and that what they have done, what the law allows them to do as it now stands, is to license strike-breaking security firms in this province that, day in and day out, are destroying labour relations in Ontario? How long are they prepared to tolerate it?

Mr. MacDonald: That is abhorrent.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: This will be taken up with the Attorney General's department.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

USE OF NTA IN DETERGENTS

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment: Can the minister explain to the House why the allegedly dangerous substance NTA, nitrilo triacetic acid, used to replace phosphates in detergent, is no longer being used by Procter and Gamble in the United States but continues to be used by the same company in Canada?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Not this morning, Mr. Speaker, I will try and get an answer by Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

SALE OF INFORMATION ON MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the department still engaged in the practice of selling personal information contained in the files of motor vehicle registrations?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, yes. This has been a subject of many discussions in the Legislature since I became a member. I have often wondered, as a member, what the situation should be. The member is referring of course to the R. L. Polk Co. who pay a certain sum of money to the province for this particular list of names.

I am informed, sir, that this is done by every province in this country, except Manitoba. The reason that Manitoba doesn't do it is because they wanted a higher price than perhaps it was thought worth.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Insofar as I am concerned, there were some advantages at one time. The advantages were simply that in addition to that sum of money, they provided statistical analyses of various counties and districts in the province to the department. This was indeed a service that at that time could not be performed by our department.

I will advise the member that we are now getting into computerization; when the computerization is completed and we are able to form our own analyses, my own personal opinion—and this will be gone into by the government—but my own personal opinion is that any advantages will then cease.

Mr. MacDonald: There's a minister who is willing to stick his neck out! Why won't the rest of them follow his example.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that the Province of Alberta has recently discontinued this practice?

Hon. Mr. Carton: I was not aware, sir, if it was recent, but I thank the member for informing me.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister inform the Legislature what sort of revenue is derived from this practice of selling personal information?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand the sum is $35,000 a year.

Mr. MacDonald: Peanuts! No wonder Manitoba is trying to stiffen your back.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Does the Minister not consider that it is an invasion of privacy to sell this personal information?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, I think I have given the member my own personal views on it, and I will leave it at that.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

CANCELLATION OF MASTITIS PROGRAMME

Mr. J. P. Spence: (Kent): I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Is it true that the mastitis programme has been cancelled in the Province of Ontario? If so, why was this programme cancelled?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is yes. The programme has been cancelled as far as our department is concerned. The laboratory service will still be available for those farmers who are participating with their local veterinarians in mastitis control programmes on their own. The reason it was cancelled was because of lack of interest in the programme. I doubt if there has been any programme that we have introduced where there has been as little enthusiasm for the programme as there was for that one among the dairy farmers of Ontario. It was just simply so costly; and with the budgetary restraints which we were required to apply, as all departments have, we simply felt that we couldn't continue the programme because of the apparent lack of interest.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

REFUSAL OF EMPLOYMENT AT ONTARIO PLACE

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Labour: As it relates to the Equal Employment Opportunities Act, would the minister investigate reports that young women employed last summer in the marina area of Ontario Place are now being told that they aren't qualified to work in the marina this year, even though the Ontario government paid for their training last summer at George Brown College, a training that led to their obtaining Masters of Small Craft certification and being licensed to operate the tour and paddle boats at that marina?

Hon Mr. Guindon: I wasn't aware of these facts. Ontario Place comes under my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Tourism, but I will look into it for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

USE OF PECHE ISLAND

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests. Now that the department has had Peche Island in its possession for little over a year, what are the immediate plans for the use of Peche Island?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I can only advise the member that this matter is presently under very active discussion and study within the parks section of my department.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister have part of the SWEEP programme in operation on the island this summer?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I will certainly consider that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, my minister has disappeared.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

LEGISLATION ON PYRAMID SELLING

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs, if I could get his attention: Has the minister shelved legislation having to do with pyramid selling? If so why? If not, when will it be introduced?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is no. Inasmuch as it is government policy, the member will be informed when the matter is to be placed before the House.

Mr. Gaunt: Is it fair to say that the legislation will be introduced before the end of this session?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That might be fair.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

URANIUM DAMAGE IN WHISKEY LAKE

Mr. Shulman: I have a question of the Minister of Northern Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister investigated the sad case of Mr. Leonard Prior whose business on Whiskey Lake was ruined by the pouring of uranium from Rio Algom and Denison Mines? If he has, does he intend to take any action about it? Is there any governmental

programme that can be used to assist Mr. Prior?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In answer to the question, I think he is well aware that the government has stated its case very clearly to this gentleman. He has contacted a number of departments and he has received replies not only from the former Minister of Lands and Forests but other ministers, including the Premier (Mr. Davis).

Mr. Shulman: As a supplementary, if I may: Inasmuch as the government gave him assurance before he bought his property there would be no damage from uranium, and inasmuch as the government has now been proven to be wrong, does the minister not feel any responsibility to this man?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am not that well informed of all of the details, but I think that the matter was clearly reviewed in all the correspondence to this gentleman and he is aware of the government's decision.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

MARKET STUDY ON GO TRANSIT

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has the minister had a market study carried out on the possible improvements in scheduling and possible improvements in operating procedures which could bring about a 15 per cent or more increase in revenue for GO Transit without raising the fares?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, there is always a review taking place with respect to rescheduling and anything that may improve the economy of the system.

With respect to the 15 per cent increase mentioned in the budget speech, I am presently reviewing the fares because, again it is my own personal opinion, that it is 10 to 15 per cent of what amount? In other words, I do not anticipate a straight 15 per cent across the board. Because 15 per cent on, for example a trip from Toronto to Hamilton would be much more difficult for a person of limited means than 15 per cent of a fare, for example, from Toronto to Pickering.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this whole matter of the increase will be coming before the Canadian Transport Commission. We also have to make application to it for this increase and prove our case at that time. I do not anticipate this taking place for some two or three months.

Mr. Deacon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What studies have been made, specifically within the last year; and what changes have been made in the operating procedures and in scheduling as a result of these studies on the operations of GO Transit?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, that is a very detailed question and I'm not in a position to answer it.

Mr. Deacon: There has not been anything done!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

SNOWMOBILE LEGISLATION

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications—

An hon. member: The minister is very popular this morning.

Mr. Burr: —regarding snowmobiling: Is the minister considering any legislation to protect the snowmobiler by having them pass tests for driver's licences and wear helmets that would protect their hearing as well as their sight and their skulls?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this is a very good question and one that will be taken into consideration I am sure, by the select committee that will be constituted. I hope we will have their report in order that we will have some legislation, perhaps before the next snowmobile season.

Mr. Burr: When will this committee be set up?

Hon. Mr. Carton: It is a select committee of this Legislature Mr. Speaker, and I'm not in a position, personally, to say when it will be sitting. I presume that in the course of ordinary events it will be constituted and sitting at the time that this Legislature—

Mr. Renwick: During the summer?

Hon. Mr. Carton: This summer, yes!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent.

LAKE ST. CLAIR FISHERMEN

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Has the minister informed commercial fishermen of Lake St. Clair on the outlook for their industry? When will the ban be lifted in Lake St. Clair on commercial fishing; or will the commercial fishermen forget about the industry altogether?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that question. I too am very much concerned with the commercial fishing industry, not only in Lake St. Clair but in northwestern Ontario—and because of the mercury problem that does exist in those particular areas.

I think the member is very much aware that it is a problem that will not be cleared up overnight. In fact later this afternoon I am flying down to Windsor and Sarnia to look at some of the commercial fishing operations there.

The matter of mercury pollution, of course, in the commercial fishing industry is under very active review and study within the department itself. I would like to be able to give some assurance and some encouragement to the commercial fishing industry, but I'm afraid at this point in time I just can't.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

TREATMENT OF PATIENTS AT NURSING HOME

Mr. Shulman: A question of the minister of Community and Social Services, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister yet had an opportunity to send an investigator to the Ivan Franco Home in High Park Gardens to determine if the patients are being treated properly?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, he brought this to my attention several weeks ago. However there has been a delay because I wanted to discuss this with the director of the home for the aged; he was absent for a couple of weeks. Instructions have now been issued.

There were two things if I recall correctly. The member has given me names and addresses of persons who had left employment and who felt that they had some justifiable causes; this is being looked into. On the other matter, I hope some time, probably next week or the week after, to go myself and to look into it personally. I want to assure the hon. member that I have not forgotten, but there has been a delay.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

ABSENCE OF JUDGE FROM DUTY

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker: Does the Attorney General not feel that it is time, both for the Legislature and in the public interest, that he make a statement about the future of Judge Marshman of London?

Hon. D. A. Bales (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, at this time I cannot make any further statement in reference to that matter. I will make a statement to this House just as soon as circumstances will permit, and I am sure that the members will appreciate my reasons for doing so at that time.

Mr. MacDonald: But we don't!

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the Attorney General explain to me, as a non-legal person, what happens to a gentleman, whose name I believe is May, whose case stands suspended while the Attorney General refuses to designate the status of Judge Marshman? Does May remain incarcerated or is he out on bail? When does it come to trial since, if memory serves me, a week ago today another judge in the Province of Ontario ruled that so long as Judge Marshman was still available, and he apparently was, he must hear May's trial and that it cannot therefore proceed?

Mr. Renwick: Justice delayed is justice denied.

Hon. Mr. Bales: Mr. Justice Fraser's decision in reference to that application was given last week. It referred only to Mr. May. I would say to the member that May at the present time is serving a two-year sentence in reference to another and entirely unrelated charge so he is in jail already. This additional charge will be brought forward before a new judge—

Mr. Lewis: Before a new judge?

Hon. Mr. Bales: —And it will be heard entirely from the beginning.

Mr. Lewis: It will be brought forward before a new judge did the minister say?

Hon. Mr. Bales: That is correct.

Mr. Lewis: I thought that Mr. Justice Fraser's judgement indicated the opposite?

Hon. Mr. Bales: The case was begun before His Honour Judge Marshman—

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Bales: —And there were four people involved in this matter. Two people consented to their cases proceeding before a different provincial judge, and those cases have proceeded. A third person made no comment on proceeding or not. Mr. May did not agree that the charge against him should proceed before the other judge whose name is Carson. If it had proceeded, then the evidence is picked up and carried through. Under these new circumstances the case will begin again before a new judge and be heard from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

INQUIRY INTO JAILING OF EMERYVILLE MAN

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General. Is the minister aware that a Mr. Dennis Clenville of Emeryville was jailed on Easter Monday for not having a $3 dog licence for a dog which he did not own and, in addition to that, that the judge's written order was ignored? Will the minister look into the situation?

Hon. Mr. Bales: Yes, I will look into it. I am glad the member added that last part, because I am sure he wouldn't expect me to know about it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

The guests who have joined us since the opening are students from the Ridgetown District High School of Ridgetown.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, this morning I beg to table the report of the royal commission appointed to inquire into the egg industry in Ontario, the Judge Ross report.

In filing this report this morning with the Clerk, I will also submit a copy to each of the opposition parties. I regret to advise you, sir, that I do not have a copy for everyone. The report is being printed and will be available for any who wish it on Monday. We have, however, a summary of the recommendations of the judge, which we will place on everyone's desk. Would you see that that is done immediately so that the summary may be available for everyone?

I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I might, to pay tribute to Judge Ross for the work which he has done on the inquiry, for the patience which he has displayed, and for what I think is a very useful report respecting the egg industry in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of expenditures for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, of the ministries named, be referred to standing committees as follows:

Ministries of the Environment, Natural Resources, Labour and Transportation and Communication, to the resources development committee;

Ministries of Correctional Services, Justice and Attorney General, and Consumer and Commercial Relations, to the administration of justice committee;

Ministries of Community and Social Services, Colleges and Universities and Education, to the social development committee; and

Chairman of the Management Board of Cabinet, to the estimates committee.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Lewis: Well, before the motion carries, could we have some undertaking from the House leader about simultaneous sittings and scheduling?

It is unprecedented in this House that this number of estimates should be referred to committees, and if we are to get ourselves into the position of meeting simultaneously in the House and in four or five separate committees, clearly everything will grind to a halt—and I can promise the House leader that everything will grind to a halt.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Can we have some undertaking from him that there may be one simultaneous committee sitting, but not more than that? I presume we'll meet on days other than Wednesdays.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to have that undertaking from the leader of the NDP, but let me assure the House at once that we have no intentions of anything grinding to a halt. We intend to do this for the convenience of everyone; indeed, as a matter of fact the request for this information came initially from that party.

Mr. Lewis: About the order of estimates?

Mr. Renwick: That isn't an order of estimates?

Mr. MacDonald: That isn't an order of estimates?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We're endeavouring to co-operate, and I can assure the House that we will continue to do so. The estimates will not necessarily be called in the order in which they appear. They will be called in order to facilitate the sittings of the House and the committees.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the minister's statement, the request which was made by this party—and I made it—was simply for an order of estimates so that we could determine in which order the estimates would be dealt with. In addition, since obviously some estimates are dealt with in the Legislature and others are dealt with in committee, it would be helpful for us to know which estimates were going to be dealt with and where.

But it does seem that if the intention of the government is to have the committees sitting simultaneously with each other and with the Legislature, there will not be sufficient number of members. It will put an undue burden on the opposition members in particular; after all, the estimates revolve around the involvement of opposition members. What we are asking is some guarantee that there won't be two committees and the House all meeting at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In general terms, I think we will follow the course that was followed last year—I think it was handled in much the same way—and I will suggest to the member that the first ministry that will be called will be the Ministry of the Environment. We have no intention of having more than one sit at one time; and again I make the commitment that we will do our best to facilitate everyone concerned.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House leader if the government is considering substitution on committees? What if the estimates for which I am responsible come up to a committee of which I am not a member, for example?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, this brings us back to a point that the government said they were going to take under consideration. But when it was raised, it was then shoved off to the commission that is going to look into the operation of the Legislature. The point is that by a strange reversal of approach a year or so ago, the only committee on which the government permit substitutions is the committee on estimates.

If they are going to send estimates to all of these committees, it seems to me we must have immediate consideration or reconsideration of the restrictions which deny substitution for other committees.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: First, in regard to the question by the member for Port Arthur, we will certainly see that his request is facilitated. Further, I might say that I think we will consider very seriously the substitution aspect of the committee sittings, as I think we did last year. In any event, the members can be sure—

Mr. MacDonald: We didn't do it last year.

Mr. Martel: It was the year before!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: In any event, they can be sure we will bring a solution to the House.

Mr. Deans: Is it the intention of the government to proceed with these estimates on Monday? Secondly, would it be possible for the minister to tell us before the House rises today the approximate order we can anticipate for the estimates beyond Environment and Agriculture?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, I will endeavour to outline the business before we adjourn today.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HEARING AID SALES

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Certification of Dealers and Persons Engaged in the Fitting and Selling of Hearing Aids.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to regulate the hearing aid industry.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 28, An Act to establish the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Bill 31, An Act to establish the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

HISTORICAL PARKS

Hon. Mr. Bernier moves second reading of Bill 34, An Act respecting Historical Parks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I think it might be appropriate if the minister would indicate to the House what he has in mind for this bill, what properties might be purchased in connection with historic sites.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, if I may just make a very brief comment on introduction of second reading. As I indicated on first reading, the purpose of this new Act is to continue the programme of historical parks that has been administered by the historical parks branch of the Department of Tourism and Information.

The legislation outlined in this programme was contained in a Department of Tourism and Information Act and is being repealed in the Government Reorganization Act 1972. In principle, this bill continues the authority for historical parks and makes the provisions of the Provincial Parks Act respecting administration of such parks apply to historical parks.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I notice in perusing the bill that the provision in the Provincial Parks Act which prohibits the sale of alcoholic beverages within the park boundaries is not going to apply to historical parks. I assume by that, that those of us who are interested in history will be able to have a drink at the same time. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes Mr. Speaker, this is correct.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 34, An Act respecting Historical Parks.

MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES ACT

Hon. Mr. Bernier in the absence of hon. Mr. Davis, moves second reading of Bill 30, An Act to establish the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I gather that the minister has no remarks to make. Does he want to proceed?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will just give a couple of brief explanatory remarks.

This bill repeals a number of provisions of the Crown Timber Act, the Mining Act, the Public Lands Act and the Surveys Act and the whole of the Ontario Parks Integration Board Act. The repeal provisions deal with the administration of the Department of Lands and Forests, the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs and the board. The new bill amalgamates the two departments and sets up administrative machinery for the new ministry.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Has the philosophy changed?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Not at all.

Mr. Martel: Not at all?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It will go ahead with more gusto and vigour than ever before.

Mr. Martel: That is the problem.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The conservation authorities will come under the new ministry in an amendment to the Conservation Authorities Act. The historical parks branch will come under the administration of the ministry through a new statute, the Historical Parks Act. The remaining parts of the new ministry will be added through orders in council transferring the administration of the Niagara Parks Act, the St. Lawrence Parks Act and the St. Clair Parkway Commission, 1966, to the new ministry.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments to make on this bill and a few questions. The first one is what happens to the parks integration board? Is this wiped out completely?

Mr. Renwick: This is second reading, let's have a debate on it.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The member has already spoken on second reading.

Mr. Reid: It's going to be one of those mornings, I can see. Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself, for the delight of the member for Riverdale, to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: I just wanted to point out the rules of the House.

Mr. Reid: Well, my friend's party in particular is not too concerned with the rules of the House when its serves its purposes, so let's not be hypocritical this morning. Let's continue with the debate on a rather innocuous bill setting up a rather innocuous ministry. All right? Does the member mind if we proceed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, let's discuss Bill 30.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The member for Rainy River is expressing his views on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Renwick: We don't happen to think it is innocuous.

Mr. Reid: The member will have his chance.

Mr. Renwick: We want to get onto that chance—onto something worthwhile.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Come on it is Friday morning.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on the principle of the bill—

Mr. Renwick: We don't want to listen to this.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River has the floor. Will he please proceed.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for the member for Riverdale's indigestion.

We in this party, Mr. Speaker, will support this bill. We have a few reservations and there are a few things that we would like to bring to the attention of the new Minister of Natural Resources. I have a few questions that I think are pertinent to the principle of the bill. If this bill is going to enact certain legislation or do certain things, then it follows that some of the questions and reservations that we have should be answered before we vote on second reading.

This bill really, Mr. Speaker, returns to the status quo of the early 1900's. At that time, in 1910 and 1915—in that area—there was a Department of Lands, Forests and Mines. In 1919 the two departments were split, forming a Department of Lands and Forests and a Department of Mines. This bill, of course, serves to bring us back full circle to the situation where in effect we have a Department of Lands, Forests and Mines.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I was rather amused to read a press release issuing from the minister's department, headed "Department to Continue in Operation." For your information, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read one short paragraph from that press release. I quote:

> The two departments most completely involved in the formation of the new ministry and their predecessor departments, Lands and Forests and Mines, have had three ministers who subsequently moved up to the office of Premier. They were G. H. Ferguson, W. H. Hearst and Leslie Frost. Sir John A. Macdonald was the commissioner of Crown lands in Upper Canada, roughly equivalent to minister, two decades before he became Canada's first Prime Minister.

And I had to wonder when I read that, Mr. Speaker, if perhaps the present minister, or the minister who will be constituted as Minister of Natural Resources, was perhaps projecting himself forward a little into the future and identifying himself with Sir John A. Macdonald and a few other Premiers. While I wish the minister well, I have my doubts that he will become Premier of the province. However, that remains to be seen.

Mr. Speaker, this bill gives this particular minister a great deal of responsibility and, particularly, a great opportunity to do something in regard to the natural resource policy in the Province of Ontario. There's only one other province, the Province of Quebec, that has anywhere near the abundance of lands, forests, mines and water resources that we in the Province of Ontario have.

But quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the policies in this province have been wanting. As I've said before, we have a wealth of riches but a poverty of policy in regard to these resources. I would hope that the integration

of these two departments will lead to, in the words of the government, "a stronger thrust in the natural resource field."

Particularly Mr. Speaker, The Department of Mines has been, in the past, a very weak department. It has done nothing but react to the wishes of the mining community rather than pursue any initiatives on its own or do any necessary research particularly, as we saw yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in the matter of markets.

It was brought to the attention of this Legislature yesterday that there is going to be a consortium set up, if it is not already set up, to exploit the iron ore resources of the province of upper Michigan while we in northern Ontario, particularly in northwestern Ontario, sit with an abundance of iron ore reserves at Steep Rock and Caland Ore. Caland Ore is possibly phasing out its operation.

We have one of the largest ore bodies at Lake Joe in which Steep Rock and Algoma have an interest. We have an ore body around Nakina, I understand, and yet we hear little in the way of any constructive approach to developing these ore bodies. There is no initiative from the Department of Mines in regard to counteracting this American influence and this American market.

Mr. Martel: While Canadian talent dies.

Mr. Reid: With the corollary, of course, that the small mining towns in northern Ontario are suffering. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this department and this minister have a great opportunity to come up with some policy to deal with all of the province's natural resources of water, land, mines and forests—a policy that has not been evident in the past.

Policies of the Department of Mines have often, when there has been a policy, been in contradiction to the Department of Lands and Forests. We hope that there will be a harmonizing of policy and objectives in this regard.

Although this is second reading, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the minister in his remarks could give me an outline of what he understands by section 10 of the bill dealing with advisory committees. I would like to know just what intent this bill has—the principle of the bill is in regard to the Parks Integration Board and advisory committees—whether this is the advisory committee to the district forester or on Algonquin Park and Quetico and so on and just what tack he seems to have there.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most important policy thrusts of this minister has to be to decide the balance between public forest land for recreation purposes and public recreation land for timbering, logging and commercial purposes. Whether or not the minister is aware, the battle lines have been drawn in regard to the multiple-use concept and the pre-wilderness concept. I don't think we should go overboard on either one but I don't think we can pursue a policy of ad hoc parks being built here or being built there or started here or started there on the initiative of a few people.

I think, for the health of the commercial forest industry particularly and the tourist industry, that the minister has to lay down some guidelines in regard to the balance of that land which will be used for commercial purposes and that which will be used for purely recreational purposes.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we look forward to many initiatives from this department and this party will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, when the proposal was first advanced that the Departments of Lands and Forests and Mines and Northern Affairs were to be amalgamated into one department known as Natural Resources, a number of people in the north, especially the northeast, seemed to react rather unfavourably toward this.

The Chamber of Commerce members in my own community threw up their hands in horror when this was pointed out to them by the manager of one of the mines there. They proceeded to pass a resolution condemning this action and calling upon the Premier to reverse his stand. Then the council of the town of Timmins made the same resolution and took it to the mining municipalities of Ontario and they, in turn adopted the same resolution.

I had the occasion some time during this period to be at a particular banquet and to talk to one of the senior officials of one of the mining companies in my riding. This senior official said to me, "You know, it is a shame that the Mines Department is passing out of existence because we have always been able to get to the deputy minister and to get our points across." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this has been one of the glaring faults in the Department of Mines, that it has been the handmaiden of the industry. In fact, when the industry has said, "Jump," this department has jumped and has ac-

commodated itself to them all along the line.

The mining companies of this province for ages have had a free ride on the other taxpayers by way of favourable tax positions, lower taxes than any other industry in the province, and the rest of us have had to carry them along. When the Mining Act was before the committee for revisions the mining companies more or less said what they wanted and the government went along with that. There was no opposition from the government benches; they even held a vote over for about three-quarters of an hour so they could get enough of their own people in there to make sure the mining companies got what they wanted.

I personally am not opposed to the linking of the two former departments; I think that it's a wise move to bring the whole field of natural resources under one department. However, I do not think the logging companies and the pulp and paper companies have control of the Department of Lands and Forests to the same extent that the mining companies have control of the Mines department.

I believe there is a bankruptcy of policy in the whole mining section. It was highlighted yesterday when the member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Stokes) brought up the question about Canadian companies going to invest money heavily in an iron ore deposit in Marquette, Mich., and to use quite a bit of the iron ore that will be mined there to expand the steel mill in Sault Ste. Marie.

I suggest it is inexcusable for the Department of Mines to go along with this kind of sell-out. Because, as the member for Rainy River has just said and as my colleague from Thunder Bay said yesterday, there are more than ample iron ore bodies in northern and northwestern Ontario to serve the needs of Algoma Steel. Why are we not developing and putting into production those iron ore bodies to provide jobs for our own Canadian residents and to strengthen communities such as Nakina that are now in a great deal of difficulty? I also understand Steep Rock at Atikokan is not selling its full number of iron ore pellets, and so on.

I simply feel this is not good policy. And to suggest that amalgamating the two departments is going to get the policy we want, to me that is wishful thinking.

Too long has this government sold out northern Ontario. Its marriage to the out-and-out free enterprise principle has enabled companies to exploit the north for all its worth and not to return to the citizens of the north the economic benefits that should be theirs. We have consistently subsidized the south, provided wealth and raw materials for the economic base in southern Ontario, and have got back the crumbs from Queen's Park.

This out-and-out free enterprise policy that we have been thrown by this department, by saying to these companies, "Do as you darn well please and we'll back you up," has just meant that the north has been underdeveloped and exploited. I, for one, am fed up with this kind of approach.

We heard earlier how the former Minister of Mines and Northern Affairs, when he was trying to get the leadership of the party, went up to the north and made these wonderful-sounding speeches. "Yes, we'll get involved in the government. We'll put some money in, maybe to secondary manufacturing or even some of the primary processing. We'll develop the railroads up there so that they can be used to provide cheaper freight rates."

This minister, about the first week after he was in that office, was saying that he was going to take a look at it and perhaps have the Ontario Northland running along some of the CP or CN tracks up there to provide services to communities and so on—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I remember the minister saying it

Mr. Ferrier: —now he is shaking his head and he is denying it.

Mr. Martel: The minister said it in North Bay.

Mr. Ferrier: There are a lot of con jobs that this government, through these departments, in the past has tried to impose upon the people of northern Ontario. Some of them have gone for it but a good deal have not, and that is why the government party is not as strong in the north as it is in the other parts of the province, because—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have never been to North Bay. The member is wrong again.

Mr. Deans: Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. Ferrier: —we've seen through the snow jobs that this government has done and we've seen how you have exploited us and you are going to continue to exploit us—

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Certain parts of the north. Speak for your own area.

Mr. Martel: We got two lessons.

Mr. Ferrier: —as long as we go along with these kinds of policies. I for one am fed up with being exploited like this and I cannot see where amalgamating two departments is going to do very much for us. One thing that the now Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has said on more than one occasion, in another attempt to con the people of the north, was: "We're going to put some of the administrative offices of the departments that particularly serve the north in the north." He made that statement over a year ago and I'm waiting for some office up in the north, a major administrative office of—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member doesn't want them. He said Northern Affairs was no good. He said they weren't doing the job of these departments.

Mr. Ferrier: Well there's a difference between Northern Affairs and the administrative offices of these departments.

Mr. Martel: If they are so good why are they shutting down?

Mr. Ferrier: Why are they shutting down these Northern Affairs offices?

Mr. MacDonald: They served their purposes. They were short-term purposes. They were linked to the Tory party in the south—that is all.

Mr. Ferrier: They were another part of the con job of the former minister who is now the Provincial Secretary for Justice. He was making a big play trying to get all the northern votes for the leadership, and these offices were to be—

Mr. Martel: He just about succeeded too.

Mr. Ferrier: —a sort of feather in his cap, to say what he was going to do for the north; that $775 million in these information offices was going to solve all the problems in northern Ontario.

Mr. Martel: Thousand!

Mr. Ferrier: Sure, these offices performed some function in information. I would suggest that if the Premier would see fit to provide a secretary for the members in the north that they could do just as good a job as the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs at less cost to the taxpayers. If this Northern Affairs department which the minister is going to continue to administer under this new setup is of such great value, then why on earth it is not being established in other parts of the province and providing some information there too? The people of the north are not as blind as you seem to think they are. They can see through this con job that we've got there.

I am wondering just what role this department is going to play for the gold mining communities of this province when it is set up. We are told that the EGMA is possibly to run out in June, 1973, and the federal government is now making noises that the provincial government is going to have to have to move in and provide some assistance to shore up these gold mining communities to keep in operation at least until other enterprises are being brought in. One wonders what is going to come out of this department.

If the concept of Northern Affairs is valid, one would hope that this department would be the department that would set a broad, overall policy for the development of the north. For coming to grips with the problems of the north and suggesting policy and strongly seeing that the cabinet and the government would implement this policy.

Now I had a friend who became a Northern Affairs officer. His name is Jim Prince and he left the television field to go into this department.

He felt that by being involved in this operation, the problems of the north would come together in a very precise department and that the problems could be correlated and the government would have an understanding of what they are. Then, on the basis of the recommendations of these people, that policies could be implemented to meet these glaring inequities and problems that we face in northern Ontario.

Mr. Prince worked in this department for about a year and he became increasingly disillusioned because he saw that this department was not doing the job that he had hoped that it would do. He wanted to see things happen in the north and he wanted to see the problems of the north solved. He was told to go out and do a public relations' job for the government or to be an advance man for a minister coming in, or to go and pick up compensation problems; and this kind of thing.

There was no overall policy formulated in that section of the department to really come to grips with. So, in utter frustration he resigned and he went back into the television

field. And you can't blame him because that Department of Northern Affairs has not been used as a strong spokesman for the people of the north and to do things for the north.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are straying far away from the principle of the bill. I think your remarks would be more appropriate when we come to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Leave it for the estimates!

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to this department—all these things are being brought together to administer a section and to establish policy.

Mr. Speaker: This bill is the specific setting-up of the department, and not—

Mr. Ferrier: I was just trying to point out some of the things that should be done.

Mr. Renwick: It's perfectly proper and perfectly in order.

Mr. Ferrier: Another whole section that one wonders if it will be improved with the amalgamation is the whole administration of the Pits and Quarries Act. Are we going to get any difference there? I am told that the Act is only being enforced in the Niagara Escarpment and the other townships which have been designated are in fact not being administered.

Now if this department is going to streamline government and so on, surely we would expect that the Acts it is going to be responsible for will be properly administered and enforced. We would hope that the townships that are supposed to be designated—we are told that there were to be 50—and there were only 18 designated on March 18. One wonders what kind of administration we are going to get from this department?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Sixty have been designated to date.

Mr. Ferrier: Sixty?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The hon. member really did his homework on this one.

Mr. Ferrier: Well I was told that there were to be 32 more designated and there was a letter written by the minister on Jan. 21, I believe, to say that there were to be 50 designated by early 1973. This was over and above the 42 that were designated along the Niagara Escarpment and the 18 townships designated in the March 18 Gazette. So that would mean in my arithmetic that there are 92 that are supposed to be designated by 1973. Where are those? When are they going to be designated? Can you enforce the regulations under that Act that is going to be part of this new department? Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, We're asked to approve the bringing of these departments together. We lost one minister in the north when the former Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs (Mr. Wishart) retired, and we're now expecting this department and this ministry to be the strong man in the government for the north, and to put forward the things of the north and fight for the north.

We've seen where we've been sold down the river on the decision just taken recently about the development of that iron ore body in Marquette, Mich., while the iron ore bodies of the north are not developed. I don't think that we're getting the fight for the north that we should be getting.

It seems as though just because a man comes from the north, it doesn't mean that he's going to take his place in government and fight for the region of the province that he comes from, which should be happening. In many respects I'm disappointed that we're not getting stronger support from this government for our section of the province.

Unless the philosophy of the department changes and there is a whole new outlook I don't see that we're going to get anything more whatsoever for the north.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, frankly I would tend to oppose the bill, and so I'm going to be speaking more from personal feelings than, perhaps, on behalf of my party.

I don't think that this is the proper place to put the conservation authorities. I don't believe that this department is the department in which conservation authorities ought to be placed.

I frankly felt during the last two or three years that the conservation authorities in the Province of Ontario were, perhaps, the only bodies which were operating to protect the environment of this province. And I think that the forces within this department—the forces within the Lands and Forest and Mines and Northern Affairs empires—will work together against the best interests of what has been the traditional conservation views of the conservation authorities.

I'm convinced that the record of this minister and his previous ministry in trying to rehabilitate the Province of Ontario after

its aesthetic beauty has been destroyed by the mining companies is deplorable. I don't see how this minister or his department could possibly change sufficiently in order to satisfy me that they could have within their department the function of conservation, and follow it through in the way in which it has to be followed through if we're going to have anything left in the Province of Ontario of the natural beauty of which we were all so proud.

I frankly don't see either how the Ministry of the Environment is going to be able to operate efficiently without the conservation authorities within it. I think that the conservation authorities provided for the Department of the Environment a vehicle to use to ensure that matters concerning certain areas of the province, certain bodies of water of the province and certain areas requiring bodies of water in this province could be proceeded with in a forthright and in a sufficiently expedient manner.

Just recently in Hamilton we had a situation where the Department of the Environment was faced with a tremendous amount of land fill going on. I wonder how the Department of Natural Resources would act, considering its views—considering the way in which it's dealt with the destruction of the province, considering its inability to come to grips with the sand dunes problem, considering the fact that the minister has consistently been unable to enforce his regulation and laws concerning rehabilitation of quarries, considering his inability over the years to enforce the laws in terms of the rehabilitation of mining operations, considering his inability to come to grips with what everyone in this House recognized as the attempted total destruction of the sand dunes. How could this minister, then, possibly turn around and say that he is capable and has the proper outlook and philosophy to be able to administer conservation authorities and to be able to administer the Act and to provide the kind of direction, guidance and support that the conservation authorities require in order to carry on the functions that they themselves have been struggling against tremendous pressures to carry on.

I say to the minister that in Hamilton recently we had the situation where companies were dumping consistently and continuously into the Hamilton harbour. I wonder, considering the record of this minister and his ministry, whether he would have had the intestinal fortitude to step in and to put a stop to what is obviously the destruction of one of, not only the most necessary bodies of water in that particular location, but also the destruction of what will be, or could become, even more necessary for future generations. I haven't seen any evidence of it. I haven't seen any evidence within this department, the department that he is coming from to this department, and from the people who are in evidence as being those who make policy in the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, or even in the Department of Lands and Forests.

I have seen no evidence of any feeling toward the conservation of this province. I have seen no evidence at all that there is even any thread of philosophical view that there ought to be any conservation in this province. I have seen nothing but delay by this minister over the last number of years in his dealings with the matter of the destruction of the Niagara Peninsula in the quarrying operations—delay after delay. I just don't believe that the conservation of this province should be within this department.

Put it back where it belongs. Put it with the Ministry of the Environment. Put it where it can be put to decent use. Put it where, in fact, it has operated efficiently and effectively. It is the only body of this government that has operated continuously in the best interests of conserving the natural beauty of this particular part of the country. I say to the minister that, if for no other reason than those reasons, I believe that this department is improperly set up. I think that this ministry is in imbalance. I don't believe that it ought to be approved under the circumstances that are put forward within this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the matter of the conservation authorities, raised by the hon. member who just sat down, is certainly an important one. In trying to justify the decision taken by the administration to put the conservation authorities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Natural Resources, one can only surmise that the conservation authorities are seen to have a parallel and collateral use when compared with the old Department of Lands and Forests.

If that is so, then the minister must surely see an avenue to make some substantial change in the first year of the operation of the department as it would be organized under this particular bill and, that is, to restrict the operation of Lands and Forests

where it comes into, not conflict, but, let us say, overlapping jurisdiction with the conservation authorities.

The minister is aware that almost all parts of southern Ontario and some of the developed, urbanized parts of northern Ontario are well served by conservation authorities now. He must surely be aware that the programmes for reforestation, woodlot control, plans for the control of water runoff and similar aspects of erosion control and, I suppose, the development of environment, are served both by Lands and Forests and the conservation authorities. The minister in my view, should make a decision, and make it very soon, as to which one of these branches of his new department in this coming year and in the future will be the one that grows into an area of substantial importance. I do not believe that we can afford either the personnel or the funds to keep parallel operations in their functioning in the southern part of the province.

In the north, I don't believe there is quite the same conflict. The Department of Lands and Forests has always had the paramount position there and probably it always will have, and I think that that is amply justified. My own view in the past has been that the conservation authorities were set up in the north mostly as a vehicle to channel special funds into areas for special development under somewhat special circumstances.

The minister is aware that I believe the Junction Creek Conservation Authority got a massive grant to build what is essentially a sewer running through the rocks underneath Sudbury, where the funds might have been much better spent in special grants to assist that municipality in dealing with the huge problems it has in providing municipal services for a city built on solid rock.

I have examined the Junction Creek conservation projects, the ones in Timmins and other areas and one can't fault them. Certainly people in the community are involved and very anxious to improve the park facilities and so on. I don't have a big argument there other than probably 10 years ago there should have been a better means whereby public funds could be provided to northern urban centres to help them in building the necessary city facilities, sewage treatment plants and that sort of thing.

When we come to the southern part of the province I feel that there is an expensive and unnecessary overlapping of this responsibility. My own view is that all of the southern part of the province should be covered by the jurisdiction of conservation authorities without exception. I don't believe that has been achieved quite yet; there are a few areas that have not seen fit to opt for conservation organization. I regret that and I think the minister should remedy it.

When that has been accomplished, I believe the functions presently extended to the community by the Department of Lands and Forests could be just as well extended by the conservation authorities since they both come under the same ministry.

The Treasurer, in talking about his department, I believe yesterday or the day before, related the difficulty that any government experiences in closing down or shutting off any kind of programme where there are large numbers of personnel and a fairly substantial funding. I don't think this problem would be applicable in this case. Since the two areas are under the same ministry the transference of relevant personnel and grant programmes could be accomplished without any awful dislocation of ongoing programmes or even ongoing employment.

I bring this to the minister's attention most seriously. Obviously it would have to be considered fairly carefully but my experience is that Lands and Forests and conservation authorities do overlap in their jurisdiction. I am not aware of any particular conflicts but I am sure that conflicts in jurisdiction and perhaps approach vary. In my view the approach from the conservation angle is the one that we should opt for under this department and in the southern part of the province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make a few comments with respect to this bill. It was interesting as this discussion was opened up that the minister proudly stated that the philosophy of the department hadn't changed one iota. That has to be very disappointing because if there is a department which needed a philosophical change it was the Department of Mines—along two avenues, not just the ones which have been spoken about by the member for Cochrane South or the member for Rainy River in the area of production and processing, but also in the area of safety.

If there is an area where the philosophy should change it has to be with safety. I searched this bill rather carefully to see if there was something new. I came to the conclusion that after four years of fighting with the minister and his department—and it has been my contention over the four years

that most of the mining inspectors are in the hip pockets of the mining companies—that this should be removed from that section completely, from the Department of Mines. Mine inspection and mine safety should come under the Department of Labour but I see it is going to remain as is.

I make that statement of the minister's staff being in the hip pocket of the mining companies not easily. I just want to bring to his attention—this was brought to his attention about six months ago—I was in his office when it was brought to his attention. I apologize that the new minister takes the brunt of what is going to come, because he's not responsible, but can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, two letters were presented on that occasion to the minister. One was from the former Minister of Mines to the safety chairman of the United Steelworkers in Sudbury, one Mr. Paul Falkowski, and the other letter was addressed to Mr. E. B. Wright, professional engineer of the Department of Mines. I want to drive this little point home. The interesting thing about these letters is that they were identical. One was written first on July 30, 1970, that was the one from Inco, compliments of the safety superintendent of the International Nickel Co., to the Department of Mines. The other was over the signature of the then Minister of Mines to Mr. Paul Falkowski on Sept. 17, 1970, approximately a month and a half later. Can you imagine, the safety superintendent of Inco writing the letters so that the Minister of Mines could endorse them! And that's how safety is treated. I could quote the letters; they're identical. The minister was there, he was very embarrassed. As I say, I feel sorry for him, but that's what goes on.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are you embarrassed?

Mr. Martel: That's what goes on in that department. I can assure you he was embarrassed on that occasion.

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): Would this minister do that?

Mr. Martel: Oh I don't think he would. But it is typical, because I wrote this department again with respect to safety—on this occasion with respect to drinking water—and for three and a half years that department did all its—well I won't use the word.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Go ahead.

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Four-letter?

Mr. Martel: No, it's not four letters. But for three and a half years they denied there was a drinking water problem.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Got action though.

Mr. Martel: They sloughed it off to the minister responsible for pollution at the time. He in turn sloughed it off to the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Health came back and said: "You had better see the Minister of Mines," and so the cycle continued for the three and a half years.

Well, in error, last July someone from the Department of the Environment at that time sent me an entire file. In error. I just want to read you very quickly what this letter said. It was by Gord Hampson. He was the Hon. George Kerr's right-hand man. It says:

> You will recall numerous complaints by Elie W. Martel, MPP, and Mr. Paul Falkowski regarding the quality of drinking water at the Copper Cliff smelter of the International Nickel Company. I have now received the attached report from Dave Caverly, which in fact admits that everything these gentlemen have been saying is true.

Now why did the department deny it for three and a half years?

Mr. Reid: This is not on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Martel: The principle of the bill talks about the safety department. If the member for Rainy River doesn't want to listen to it I suggest he leave.

An hon. member: He needs the education.

Mr. Reid: He has always got an answer.

Mr. Martel: For you we have, because it does not take much to answer you. Now I make the point, why for three and a half years—and that's why I am saying that department, that aspect of your operation, can no longer continue, because I just want to illustrate by one more example—

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The member for Riverdale brought me to order, through you, on the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: But the member for Riverdale wasn't the Speaker.

Mr. Reid: Now I have sat here patiently, because I believe in giving the members the widest latitude, and if the member for Sudbury East wants to go on at great length and make a budget speech, or an estimate speech that is fine, but I think that we all should be treated equally in this chamber and for the benefit, Mr. Speaker, not of

myself, but of the member for Riverdale, I suggest that you call the member to order on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member is relating his comments to something that is in the bill. I have been listening very carefully, and at this point I can't see anything that is badly out of order.

Mr. Martel: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I am simply trying to illustrate where the bill is badly constituted—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: By reading his letter to the former Minister of Mines.

Mr. Martel: Well, it is relative because the latest example before that slight disturbance from Rainy River came into the picture—

Mr. Speaker: The member is out of order.

Mr. Martel: Right. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I apologize.

The most recent example is one on which I have dealt extensively with this minister—and he backs off, he backs off continuously. Regarding SO_2, we had been trying to arrange a meeting at which there would be representation from the minister's staff, the Department of Health, the International Nickel Co., Falconbridge and the two unions involved. All agreed, Mr. Speaker, that they should meet together and develop a system whereby men could be taken out of areas of over-exposure to SO_2. However, when it got to the top brass of Inco and Falconbridge, they decided they couldn't have any part of this because somebody down the line had made a goof.

Well, I wrote the minister and suggested that he had enough authority to tell these people to sit down and meet. His staff agreed, the Department of Health and Dr. Mastromatteo agreed, but the minister will not bring these companies to a discussion with respect to safety and how it will affect the men. And for more than a year he has backed off.

I make the point that this entire section and anything relating to safety should be brought under the Department of Labour and be involved with the Industrial Safety Act, as opposed to the Mining Act as at present. That is the one point I wanted to raise, Mr. Speaker.

The second point I want to make deals with taxation. That is seen in section 8, so the member for Rainy River will know I am right on the bill. During the last set of estimates, the minister and I disagreed on the amount we were deriving from the mining industry in Ontario. Let me set the record straight: On mineral production valued at something like $1.6 billion in Ontario—I am using 1970 figures, because they are the handiest for me—Ontario's share of what was taken in at all levels of government, provincial, federal and municipal, was $30 million. This department has continually protected the interests of the mining barons.

I can well recall during the select committee sittings recently that one of the people who was making a representation, the former federal minister, Hon. Eric Kierans, indicated that the mining industry in Canada pays less than 14 per cent tax. How would the rest of the industrial community like that? Better still, how would the working people like a 14 per cent tax?

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): And it's owned by Americans.

Mr. Martel: And it is American owned. We argued with Mr. Lee and we got some indication that the Department of Mines was going to request more. But I don't see anything in this bill about that—and the minister himself stated as we entered this discussion that the status quo would remain, and he was very proud of it.

What's going to happen is that we will not accrue a cent more in Ontario. The amount we are receiving from the mining industry is so terribly low and this government goes on its merry way. Well, when will the minister change heart, and when will we get our fair share of the largess?

I understand—and my colleague, the member for Nickel Belt, has done some studies with respect to this—I understand if we had the same tax as they have in Saskatchewan we would accrue something like $132 million a year in tax from the natural resource field.

I make the point that again in the minister's bill there is nothing which says that there is going to be anything very progressive in this new department, except a caretaker for the industry. That became evident in the budget the other night when we wrote off $2 million in taxes for the logging industry. We are doing well by those departments and putting them all together, I think, will make it easier for the corporate elite to give us another smack and it won't be in the form of money.

In section 10, the minister talks about advisory committees. I want to raise the

question in section 10. During the debate on Bill 2, we talked about advisory committees and the former minister indicated that he would set up advisory committees with respect to safety legislation and the further discussion of safety legislation. Has that been set up? We are talking about committees and none of those committees that he promised at that time has been constituted, or if any have, we have never been advised of who is on them. That was one of the promises which came out of those four months of hearings.

Is this section of the bill just window dressing or is there some substance to it? My colleague will probably speak about it a little later so I won't infringe on that, but I wonder when the committees are set up how much the department has listened to the advice given by those committees.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments with respect to Northern Affairs, which is part of this bill. I understand they have closed down one office in the great riding of Sudbury East. I also understand they have closed down one—is it in Manitoulin? Is it true they are shutting one down in the minister's home riding, or they have?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We don't look at it on a riding basis.

Mr. Martel: No, I just questioned it. Is that a third one that closed? Two or three?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Two.

Mr. Martel: Two. Mr. Speaker, that aspect has never developed into what its originator wanted it to be. My colleague has outlined it fairly well; it was supposed to be a department to develop the north. There are headlines—we brought in the headlines last year and we brought in the story. Does the minister recall during his estimates? I guess someone was misleading—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member said it, nobody else did.

Mr. Martel: No, I didn't say it! There were the minister's words being quoted; this minister's predecessor—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The policy is set over here not over there.

Mr. Martel: —his predecessor—

Mr. Deans: That is evident by the lack of proper policy being set over there.

Mr. Martel: The department has closed two in less than two years, is that right? There have been two closed in less than two years. Why don't we give some meaning to that group, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister? Why don't we put some meaning in them and get them in the game of helping to develop the north. You see, that would conflict with the free enterprise philosophy, wouldn't it?

The minister is not going to be able to develop the north on a total free enterprise philosophy by which we are at the whims of waiting for some mining company to open up when the conditions are just right. To develop the north properly he is not going to be able to wait until some free enterpriser decides he might want to start a nickel plate company or a copper tubing or a copper wire plant in northern Ontario. They aren't going to do it. We know that they have no intention of doing it.

The minister's free enterprise philosophy dooms the future development of northern Ontario because he can't plan for its development. This free enterpriser whose main interest is the maximization of profit will not go in there because he can make a little more in southern Ontario or in the United States. Why don't we develop northern Ontario, ignoring some of the free enterprise philosophy, using the Northern Affairs offices, through either private, public, or public and private money combined, a consortium of money to develop the north properly and use that department to gather all of the available materials necessary and bring the various bodies together to develop northern Ontario in a very co-ordinated fashion. But that won't happen.

So, Mr. Speaker, when I look at this bill, it holds absolutely no hope for anything different in the development of northern Ontario to that which went on in the past, whether it was under two ministers or three or four different departments. Things will not change. The mining companies will go their merry way, do their merry thing. The pulp and paper industry will do exactly the same thing. This department will come along and provide the pieces—

Mr. Deans: Apologize every once in a while.

Mr. Martel: —and it will not plan the economy. It's strange. Something has always bothered me. Large companies plan five, six, 10 years in advance and governments react.

They react in one situation after another. We've watched it the last two winters with the unemployment. Companies plan but governments don't. That is unfortunate and, as I say, with the type of philosophy this government has, or that other thing over to the right, the same will occur. We can continue this bust-and-boom economy when it is profitable to the industrialist. We will be subjected to that until the day comes when people will put this party into power. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, speaking on behalf of our party, we will oppose the bill. The reason we will oppose the bill is that it has become abundantly and absolutely clear that it is not just the personal bias of the minister which is the problem in this particular ministry, but that it is a fundamental contradiction inherent in the way in which this government has made its division between the areas which are to be covered by the Minister of Natural Resources and the areas which are to be covered by his colleague, the Minister of the Environment.

That contradiction is one which is foremost in the public minds these days. This government seems unable to shift its emphasis and to recognize that that distinction is such that it has to be split between two ministries in order that the matters of policy and priority will be decided at the highest level and will not be left to this minister to accomplish some kind of balancing feat between his version of what is good for the Province of Ontario and the version of many, many other peoples.

Let me give the House two specific examples before I leave the question of the minister's bias on the point. When he spoke yesterday in his ministerial statement with respect to the problem of the shutdown of a plant at Mattawa, which is, of course, a serious problem and a serious economic problem—an instance of the incapacity of the government over the years to have dealt with the whole question of plant shutdowns, in the course of that statement—it was impossible for this minister to make a statement about that problem without gratuitously insulting and attacking the Wildlands League.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Does the member want jobs?

Mr. Renwick: Let me just make it perfectly clear that that was the substance of what he said yesterday, that they were a bunch of woolly-minded people who had no concern or consideration of the fundamental problems which were involved. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it was that very league which forced this government, prior to the election—and God knows, thank God, we have regular elections because it's the only thing which moves this government to take modern attitudes—that very league forced the government in its own circuitous way to reverse its policies with respect to Quetico Park.

Mr. Jessiman: Learn the facts!

Mr. Renwick: I am just saying to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that we had some confusion within our caucus sorting out the extent to which the departmental reconstruction problem was related to the specific bias of this particular minister; because he is so obviously biased in favour of the constant and continuous exploitation of the resources of this province. He cannot conceive for a moment of other than a marginal concern about the ecological protection of the community.

Having said that about the particular minister, we then realized that what is fundamentally wrong is the structure of this department and the structure of the Department of the Environment. Mr. Speaker, these departments exist for practical purposes to administer certain statutes.

If one looks at the long list of statutes which fall under the purview of the Minister of Natural Resources—and there are some 40 or 50 of them—and then one looks at the very few statutes which fall under the purview of the Minister of the Environment, even on a quantitative basis, the imbalance of this government's concern about the ecological protection in its broadest terms of the Province of Ontario, one can see the priorities or the very low priorities, despite the rhetoric of the ministers of the government, which the government gives to the question of environmental protection.

I am not basing our arguments simply on a quantitative addition of the number of statutes administered by the one department as distinct from the other. I want to make some qualitative distinctions in terms of certain specific statutes which are entrusted to this ministry, and certain specific statutes entrusted to the Ministry of the Environment.

Let me say at the outset that until recently—and we don't suggest here that the

ecological concerns are something which are other than a modern phase of public concern about essential matters. We don't think that any one party can claim that it was the first one to recognize the ecological destruction of the province as a matter meriting concern.

But it is true that in a traditional sense this department—that is the former Department of Lands and Forests and the Department of Mines, but particularly the Department of Mines—was engaged in providing the minimum regulation to permit the maximum exploitation of the mineral resources of the province with the minimum return to the public treasury. Now that is the ministry, of course, which this minister particularly had under his aegis until this reconstruction came through.

So far as Lands and Forests was concerned you had this strange dichotomy of the solution by this government—which may have been a worthwhile solution in the past but is no longer appropriate—that the Lands and Forests comprised, first of all, again the exploitation of the woodland resources of the Province of Ontario by private industry with the minimum of regulation and a minimum of concern for the renewing of that particular renewable resource.

It solved the problem of land being available for recreational and other purposes in the Province of Ontario by providing for parks. And if the Department of Lands and Forests could provide parks, then what went on outside the boundaries of the parks so far as the ecological protection of the province was of any concern, or so far as the recreational aspects of the life of the citizen was concerned, that was to be no concern to the Department of Lands and Forests beyond the boundaries of the parks.

It may well have been, Mr. Speaker, that for a period of time that resolution of the inherent contradiction in the policies of this government was a satisfactory one. But what is persisting, Mr. Speaker, is a tendency to think that the concept of the park is the way in which you resolve the whole question of the total ecological protection of the environment. And we are saying to the minister—

Mr. Deans: That's the problem.

Mr. Renwick: —that that is no longer the case. Parks, of course, have an important and continuing role in the setting aside of recreational areas for the use of the public, but the public's interest is much broader than the question of parks.

The public's interest, in my view, extends to, and the environmental protection of this province extends to, and in our view the jurisdiction of the Minister of the Environment should extend to such matters as remain under the administration of this new department. It should extend to the Beach Protection Act, the whole question of public access to the beaches of the Great Lakes, which is inherent in the problems of the Beds of Navigable Waters Act, which has been a matter of concern and prodding of the government by this party without success for a number of years.

The ministry's jurisdiction should encompass the whole of the areas of questions raised in its broadest sense by my colleague, the member for Wentworth, on the Conservation Authorities Act; the whole of the questions related to the Niagara Escarpment Protection Act; the question of the Niagara Parks Act; the question of the Pits and Quarries Control Act; the Provincial Parks Act in its general broad application; and the St. Lawrence Parks and St. Clair Parkway Commission Act.

We would consider that any reasonable—not just logical, but reasonable—intelligent decision about the splitting of responsibilities should clearly provide that those statutes and those kinds of questions—that is, the parks as a continuing aspect of the ecological and recreational protection of the Province of Ontario but, in its broader aspects, the interest of the whole of the society in the nature of the environment in which we're going to live—would lead us to the conclusion that those statutes, give or take argument on one or two of the areas, should be transferred to the Ministry of the Environment. It would then be perfectly clear what the limitations on the responsibilities of this minister are, with respect to the terms and conditions—and God knows the philosophy of this department needs a complete change about that—with respect to the exploitation of the mineral resources which are, of course, nonrenewable, and with respect to the exploitation of the forest resources and the fish resources which are under the aegis of private industry, but subject to effective government control and regulations.

Those are matters which properly fall within the ministry, as we see it, of this particular minister as the Minister, as the name responds to it, of Natural Resources. The exploitation of those resources and the

way in which that is done is of paramount importance to the people of the province.

The whole question of regulation, the whole question of the adequate revenues to be derived from the province from the exploitation of those industries, and the whole question with respect to the terms and conditions under which the exploitation will continue, are proper matters for this minister to be concerned with. They should include giving some real impetus and thrust—if I may use the Treasurer's word—to the question of the development of secondary industries in the Province of Ontario for the processing of our natural resources. As my friends from the north have constantly reiterated, the minister must make certain that that processing of our natural resources on a secondary basis should take place in northern Ontario.

I say that the resource exploitation policies of the government are matters which fall, I think, properly within the purview of this ministry. I think those other matters to which I referred, and which are imbedded within the kind of general and particular statutes to which I referred, should fall in the Ministry of the Environment.

I think, in addition, Mr. Speaker, another contradiction which, obviously, appears when one looks at the list of bills which are concerned, is that then we have the Ontario Energy Board falling within the purview of this minister. If there is one matter which is crucial to the continuing industrial development of the Province of Ontario, it is the question of utility rates; that is, the rates that will be paid for gas, the rates that will be paid for electric power, and the rates which will be paid for other utilities in the Province of Ontario. How this government can continue to split and to provide that the Minister of the Environment will have under his purview the Power Commission Act, the Power Commission Insurance Act, the Power Control Act, the Rural Hydro-Electric Distribution Act and the Rural Power District Loans Act, as if those matters were matters that could be fitted into the Ministry of the Environment, is beyond us to understand.

We are saying that it would be a very proper conjunct to the exploitation problem of the natural resources of the province to also give to this minister the total responsibility for the adequate regulation of the utility industries in the province, and to bring that monolith which is beyond the purview of this Legislature, but is under some kind of co-called public ownership, without any adequate accountability of any kind, back to the responsibility to justify the changes in rates which it unilaterally and arbitrarily imposes before the Ontario Energy Board. It is no longer possible, as the government has learned in matters related to transportation and communications, to simply think that the Department of Highways or the Department of Transport could have done the job.

What is required is for the ministry to understand that this minister should be charged with the direct responsibility and accountability for Ontario Hydro and if necessary to restructure and strengthen the Ontario Energy Board, because the utility rates are one of the items which in the Province of Ontario are rapidly pricing the Ontario economy out of its capacity to compete abroad.

And we have this strange situation that the ultimate determining factor in the cost of gas in the Province of Ontario is being decided in the Province of Alberta, at the wellhead, in the decisions which are being made by the Alberta board and are going to be passed on ultimately into the Province of Ontario without any real expression of concern by this government as to what they will be. And those costs finally will come through to the Ontario Energy Board; Consumers' Gas and Union Gas will appear, and the other gas distribution companies will appear, and they will say. "We are sorry but these are the costs we are saddled with; you will have to give us rate increases," and we will be faced with an increasing escalation of utility rates in the industrial and household use of natural gas.

I am simply saying that we have dealt with Hydro and we have dealt with the gas question, and those two basic utilities, as well as other utilities, should be under the aegis of this minister, along with the question of the proper method for the exploitation of the natural resources of this province, the proper method for the development of those resources, the proper method for the secondary manufacturing and processing of those resources in the Province of Ontario and the proper terms and conditions under which the exploitation will take place; the degree of public participation in that exploitation, and the question, the vexed question, of the proper revenues which we should derive from those companies which have in the past been given a carte blanche to exploit those industries with little if any return to us.

That would be an ample ministry; that would be an important ministry; that would be a ministry which would really have a job

to do. And this minister would not be caught in the impossible bind of having to balance off the priorities and policies that are reflected and inherent in the statement which he made on the town of Mattawa yesterday.

On the other hand, he would be much better off to be rid of, by transfer to his colleague the Minister of the Environment, all of the broad questions related to the ecological protection, in its broadest sense, of the environment of the Province of Ontario. That would then mean that when those policy interests—that is, the interests of the public reflected through government policies with respect to ecological protection—came into contrast with, or clashed with, or contradicted the legitimate policies of this minister, as the minister of the kind of Natural Resources ministry that I have outlined, that it would then be possible, in the purview of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development and under his aegis for the purpose of co-ordination, to thrash out in the initial instances the question of the co-ordination of those conflicts of policies. Then those matters presumably would go forward both for final decision to the policies and priorities board set up under the aegis of the Premier and finally and ultimately would be resolved in front of the whole cabinet.

But that inherent contradiction which is perpetuated in the nature and structure of this ministry and is reflected in the way in which this ministry views the Ministry of the Environment is one which in our judgement this government very shortly is going to have to face up to. I would venture to suggest that during the sittings of this particular Parliament we would find that that very restructuring we have suggested will, in fact, take place.

Mr. Speaker, by way of a minor addendum may I say that I for one, after having heard the evidence which was given before the royal commission inquiring into the escarpment lands last year, am delighted to see that that strange anachronism, the Ontario parks integration board, is finally disappearing. It was only a confusing introduction of a body between Lands and Forests and the Department of Public Works which did much to confuse the whole question as to the direct responsibility for the price which would be paid by the public treasury for the acquisition of land in that escarpment.

I want, Mr. Speaker, however, earnestly to suggest to the minister that the basis of our concern is, as I have stated it, as the members of this party have stated it—apart altogether from the very real and valuable need for a department such as this to have a special regard for northern Ontario—that the distinctions which we have made and the arguments which we have placed before him are ones which merit his consideration. The restructuring of this department and the restructuring of the Ministry of the Environment are essential priorities if the restructuring overall of the reorganization of the government is to be fruitful and meaningful.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: The minister thought he was getting away easily, didn't he?

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to say a few words on this bill, representing the city of Sudbury as I do, which has the greatest deposit of wealth, not only in Ontario and not only in Canada, but probably in the entire world.

There has yet to be found elsewhere a deposit such as we have there, but the philosophy in the past has been such that the people who, by their labours, extract this wealth have really not recovered their fair share of the end result.

This bill probably didn't cause much reaction in the more populous areas of Ontario, but it did receive considerable comment in the northern part, as cited by my colleague from Cochrane South. I am sure the minister in his home riding must have heard some of that reaction.

Not only did the business community reject it, the mining companies and the chambers of commerce rejected it, but the reaction was quite severe from among the people who have to make their living in the mining industry, particularly those coming from that great mining metropolis of Sudbury, people who do have to live most of their lives under the regulations as cited in the Mining Act and under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Mines.

It was the feeling that there has been neglect in enforcement of regulations and that it was diluting the ministry by giving it more responsibilities. If it was impossible for him to control these mining companies in the past, how could he ever possibly do a job on it now. It seems to me also that by putting Lands and Forests in with Mines is like putting a rabbit in a cage with a lion. I think these mining operators are going to eat up the rabbit of the Lands and Forests

Department. I don't know how the minister is going to stop the blood-letting, because these mining companies are rapacious and up until this moment we haven't been able to contain them or to feed their hunger.

Mr. Martel: There will be no control at all.

Mr. Germa: The minister asserted at the beginning of this debate that there was not going to be any change in philosophy from the past. Well, this is a philosophy of rape and exploitation, and the people of northern Ontario are not satisfied with that philosophy. I think the event of last Oct. 21 indicated that the people of northern Ontario are ready for a change. If the minister really wanted to do a job—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Where's Don Jackson?

Mr. Martel: What about Gaston Demers?

Mr. Germa: If the minister really wanted to do a job for northern Ontario and endear himself to us forever, he could reverse the philosophy that we have suffered under in the past. There is a book written by the International Nickel Co., entitled "Romance of Nickel," which documents this case. I think the title of that book should be changed to "Rape of the City of Sudbury," it would indicate more accurately what has happened to the mining communities.

We only have to go a little farther north from my city to see what has happened in the gold belt. Billions of dollars have been extracted from these communities, yet the only thing that moves in most of those communities now is some retired miner, probably living on welfare, who moves around with the sun to keep himself warm. This is the legacy that has been left to the people.

Mr. Ferrier: All he has got is silicosis.

Mr. Germa: That's all he has got to show for his labours, and the community hasn't got much more. This is the kind of future the people of northern Ontario are not willing to tolerate any more. Every time we extract a ton of ore we are closer to the last ton that is in that deposit. It is a non-renewable resource, and I think it should be protected for future generations. There should be set up, under this minister's department, a metals procurement board so that in some fashion we might ameliorate the conflict between the need to preserve our wealth and the greed for profits by the mining operators.

The Lands and Forests department, of course, is also coming under this ministry; not only is my riding the greatest mining community in the world, but formerly it was probably one of the most beautiful areas of the Province of Ontario. Seventy years ago the greatest stand of white pine on the North American continent was standing on the exact spot where today we see the exploitation, the pollution and the bare and arid rocks of that area. Up there right now we have the beginning of another Sahara Desert. This also indicates that the policies of the past have been bankrupt.

The lumber barons of old still live in my riding, and evidence of the wealth they took from the forests is still indicative in their lifestyle today. Mr. Speaker, these kinds of things really have to stop.

I was interested in the debates that went on regarding the preservation of Algonquin Park—

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Does the member for Sudbury East agree with that?

Mr. Germa: I think areas such as this have to be protected. One of the lumber operators did say that the only reason he is cutting hardwood in Algonquin Park is because there is no more hardwood left outside the park. So, you see, even that department has been delinquent in preserving and planning so that we can have a continuing harvest of our natural resources.

This is a beautiful piece of real estate we have here in Ontario, and I think we should do everything we can to preserve it so that it can regenerate the wealth for many centuries to come. But, as the minister said, there is no change in philosophy; therefore we can expect the exploitation to continue. This is mainly why the people of northern Ontario were quite concerned about this department.

The exploitation of the forest industry continues. At a meeting about one week ago of the advisory committee to the district forester, we had some interesting figures put to us: in the Sudbury district he had recovered $300,000 in royalties, yet had spent about $465,000 reforesting the property. You see, Mr. Speaker, each and every time we cut down a tree in the Sudbury district it is costing the taxpayers some money. We would be richer and wealthier if we left them standing if this kind of programme is going to continue.

Clearly when these people are exploiting our natural resources, I think they should have to pay more for this privilege so that it can accrue to the benefit of the people who do the labour. Because a man is worth his keep and if a man has enough courage to go out and exploit these resources, then he has a right to demand a fair standard of living. Certainly the living standards in northern Ontario have not come to the point that I see here in the southern part of the province.

We have been neglected—

An hon. member: And we're still being neglected.

Mr. Germa: —and I think this is the key ministry that could change the whole face of northern Ontario.

I want to talk for a moment about that comic opera, the northern affairs branch. Even the biggest friend this government has in the city of Sudbury—J. R. Meeks of the Sudbury Star—saw fit to put a cartoon in the paper regarding this ridiculous exercise. It shows the northern affairs officer talking to a client; he puts on his overshoes, runs out the back door, down to the public library, gets the answer to the question, comes running in the back door and gives it to the person looking for the information.

What kind of ridiculous situation is this? Why don't they just tell the person, "Go down to the public library and get it yourself"? No, they are trying to make a job for themselves, they are trying to uphold this government, and I think the idea is completely bankrupt.

Mr. Speaker, for these and probably many other reasons I feel quite free in rejecting this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in this debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to the hon. members' comments, I must first express my disappointment in some of the remarks adressed to me on this particular bill. I think many of them really missed the whole principle of the bill and were actually dealing with the operations of the various segments of the department. I am extremely disappointed.

Mr. Deans: I didn't miss the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But I do want to thank those members who have done their homework and contributed some very worthwhile suggestions which I will certainly consider in the weeks and the months ahead.

I somehow feel we are right in the midst of a leadership race in both the Liberal Party and the New Democratic Party. My very good friend from Rainy River, of course, made some remark about the past leaders of the Department of Mines going on to greater heights, but I would have to say to him that in the weeks and months ahead I don't really think he is the messiah that the Liberal Party is looking for at this particular time, time will prove that out, I am sure.

The confusion that lies within the New Democratic Party really puts me in a very awkward position, because there was the opportunity this morning for the northern members, particularly those from the Sudbury basin, to contribute some worthwhole suggestions. But they have contributed nothing, really nothing; they were just critical of past operations. I had hoped that they would come up with some suggestions that I could grab, like the very good suggestions the leader of the Liberal Party suggested. He advanced some which I will consider. I certainly want to thank him.

But I was disappointed by the attitude of those northern members, because here was an opportunity to put the north first.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Don't patronize us.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Then we have confusion again, we have further confusion. We have the northern members and the member—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —for Cochrane South supporting the bill.

Mr. Renwick: That is one of the oldest and cheapest forms of debate that exist.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He is supporting the bill. Then we have a split.

Mr. Renwick: Get with it, get with it or we will ring the bells on the minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have a northern member supporting the bill and the southern members opposing the bill. It looks like a leadership race going again. I just wanted to point out to the House the complete confusion within that group there. They don't know where they are going, really they don't.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: There used to be a Tory member for the Sudbury area; he is not there any longer.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There was a member from Timiskaming, too, who was in the last House; he is not back either.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: The former member for Timiskaming at least contributed to bills like this.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just want to outline to the members the structure of the new department in a very few words.

Mr. Martel: Like the government's mining inspectors.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As members know, the departments of Mines and Northern Affairs and Lands and Forests have now come together, so now we have two deputy ministers, I am pleased to announce to the members today that Don Douglass, who was Deputy Minister of Mines for some 12 years and who was a member of the department for 35 years, will remain as my special adviser in regard to mining problems until his retirement later this fall. The mine assessor and chief of administration branch within the Department of Mines, Mr. Brady Lee, who has been with the department some 44 years and has contributed tremendously to the economic growth and to the welfare of the mining industry across Ontario, will remain.

Mr. Martel: To industry, right, to the mining industry. What about the community?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: To the general economic benefit of the province. He will remain with the department in a special capacity as a special adviser to the deputy minister.

At this time, I want to pay tribute to the civil servants within both departments. I realize that there has been some feeling. When you bring two major departments like this together, certainly there is going to be some feelings. But to those members of the Department of Lands and Forests and the Department of Mines and Northern Affairs, I want to express publicly my appreciation for the tremendous work that they have done on behalf of the province. I know as we go forward under a new ministry, the Ministry of Natural Resources, that while we have had a great past, certainly the future looks much greater for us.

The structure will place the main emphasis on divisions within the department. We have four major divisions; a division of lands; a division of forests; a division of parks and recreation; and a division of mining. Each will be headed by an executive director who will be directly responsible to the deputy minister.

The fears of the mining community can be dispelled because the mining division is intact. The safety inspectors and the land section are being brought together with the Department of Lands and Forests' lands division, which I think is a step forward; really a great step forward.

Mr. Ferrier: The minister still bows and scrapes to the big boys.

Mr. Martel: Who writes the letters?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is no doubt that the movement and the various programmes within the department had to be amalgamated and brought together.

Mr. Martel: Who writes the letters?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is quite correct the Parks Integration Board will be dissolved, and the duties and the functions of that particular advisory board will now be taken by the resource development field. I want to point out that some of the fears which have been expressed with regard to conservation authorities and the Ontario Energy Act and the possibility that we will be operating in isolation are completely unfounded. We have, under the new structure of government, three separate policy fields. The resource development policy field has six ministers who are directly related with problems of common interest. Regardless of what happens within the department, the policy is set at that particular policy field. So there is no fear that one group or one segment will be operating in isolation.

In support of the conservation authorities being brought into the department, I would just like to read into the record the arguments for having that particular section located where it is.

It will, of course, offer the Ministry of Natural Resources the opportunity to directly involve local people in service delivery and consultation on a broad range of resource management activities. There are the land management programmes, which I spoke about just a minute ago, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and the conservation authorities will now come into one department.

Policy and planning for parks and recreation will be within one department. The

co-ordination of land acquisition for parks, woodlots, recreation and wildlife areas will be much easier.

Co-ordination of resource management on authority lands will be easier, with direct access for the branch and the authorities to the resource management expertise, equipment and the manpower force of the new department.

Co-ordination in the watersheds, in which both the Ministry of Natural Resources and the conservation authorities are responsible for water control structures will, of course, be much easier.

So these are some very, very strong arguments, gentlemen, why the conservation authorities were placed within the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Deans: We reject them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There were some very critical comments on the rape of the north and, certainly, I don't want anyone to leave here this afternoon thinking that the new Ministry of Natural Resources is a northern ministry, because we have the needs and of course the problems of all of southern Ontario. We have the Pits and Quarries Act as an example.

Mr. Martel: Too bad the rest of the cabinet didn't realize that from the first.

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): Down, Gomer.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We do have, at the top level—and I personally am from the north, representing that great riding of Kenora. I will have with me, to assist me in my duties in the weeks and the months, and the years ahead, a very knowledgeable northerner. He is one whom I am most pleased to welcome to Queen's Park—I look forward to working with him very, very closely in the period ahead—who is my parliamentary assistant, the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes), who I know will have tremendous input.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just to touch briefly on the mining industry, I want to point out to the members that while they to some extent tried to tear down—

Hon. Mr. Snow: That is their policy.

Mr. Ferrier: Here come the apologies again.

An hon. member: They're destroyers, not builders.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the results of a mining department within this province we, in Ontario, are the leaders in the mining industry in Canada, and never forget it, be it in mining or exploration.

Mr. Martel: We are getting a smaller share.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And never forget that for one person working in the mines, there are six jobs provided somewhere else.

Mr. Ferrier: Right, that is the problem!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is most important, and we're doing it.

Mr. Ferrier: They are all provided someplace else. Why doesn't the minister bring more jobs to the north?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's all right to slough it off.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): How many men have the members opposite hired?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just a brief comment regarding the Northern Affairs section of the department which will remain and, of course, which is providing a tremendous service for those people in northern Ontario—a tremendous service that has brought all of northern Ontario closer to Queen's Park than has ever happened before in history and those fellows know it.

Mr. Martel: What did your man in Sudbury East get, 38 cases a month?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You know that northern Ontario is closer, because of the service that they are providing to the people—6,000 individual, separate communications each month, recorded communications.

Mr. Martel: How many from the great riding of Sudbury East, 34 a month?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Six thousand communications—6,000! Certainly we had to close two offices.

Mr. Martel: Thirty-four—a month?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We did it on an efficiency basis too.

Mr. Ferrier: If it is so good why don't you extend it throughout the rest of the province?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Here again I am confused. I am very confused with the member for Cochrane South because it was that gentleman who came to my office, cap in hand, looking for a northern affairs office to be established at Iroquois Falls. He wrote letters—

Hon. Mr. Snow: He is confused.

Mr. Ferrier: I have never been in your office.

Mr. Carruthers: Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —begging for it, saying what a great job we are doing. Here he stands up today and says they are not doing a job.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I hope the people at Iroquois Falls hear what he has said.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr Bernier: I don't know what to do. I would like to help but the member is so confused he confuses me.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: He was confused when he entered the party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: All they want is government offices. They just want a government office. This government has never put in anything.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member would put everything in Cochrane.

Mr. Martel: Tell us about the one in Sudbury East?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Martel: Tell us about that one! What does the minister think, 28 or 34 cases a month?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Gentleman, I could go on for some considerable length, but in view of the time, I just want to place on the record the goals of the ministry as stated by the COGP:

> To provide from Crown lands and waters and to encourage on private land and waters a continuing combination of resource development, outdoor recreation, and quality environment, both consistent with the social and economic well-being for the people of the Province of Ontario.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

THIRD READING

The following bill was given third reading upon motion:

Bill 30, An Act to establish the ministry of Natural Resources.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, His Honour awaits the House for the royal assent of certain bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the throne.

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bill to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 27, An Act to provide for the Reorganization of the Government of Ontario.

Bill 28, An Act to establish the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

Bill 29, An Act to establish the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Bill 30, An Act to establish the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Bill 31, An Act to establish the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Bill 34, An Act respecting Historical Parks.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, just before you adjourn, the House leader had undertaken to give us a list of the estimates which would follow Agriculture and the Department of the Environment. Is he in a position to do that?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I think with the developments of this morning, that the business of the House next week is almost established, because of the fact that I might have anticipated this morning proceeding with the bills standing in the name of the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart)—that's number 12 on the order paper and number 13 on the order paper—and we also wish to proceed at an early time with order number 14.

Therefore, these will be before us early next week, and as well, the estimates of Environment in commmittee and the estimates of Agriculture in the House are properly programmed. Following that, or somewhere beyond this business, we will be dealing with items 17 to 26 on the order paper, and it would seem to me that that would consume next week's business.

Mr. Gaunt: The minister can't give us any more information?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I see no reason to, and I must be frank, I don't have it anyway.

Mr. Gaunt: That's better.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That's better. We would like to have it soon though.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 7, 1972

Common market threat to Ontario tobacco producers, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. R. F. Nixon 946

Labour minister's meeting with WCB commissioners, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 947

Licensing of security firms, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 947

Study into differential in transportation costs, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid, Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Martel 948

Conversations with commissioners of Workmen's Compensation Board, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid, Mr. Shulman 950

Licence to firm supplying guards, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis 951

Use of NTA in detergents, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Haggerty 952

Sale of information on motor vehicle registrations, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Germa 952

Cancellation of mastitis programme, questions of Mr. Stewart: Mr. Spence 953

Refusal of employment at Ontario Place, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall 953

Use of Peche Island, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. B. Newman 953

Legislation on pyramid selling, questions of Mr. Winkler, Mr. Gaunt 953

Uranium damage in Whiskey Lake, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Shulman 953

Market study on GO Transit, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deacon 954

Snowmobile legislation, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Burr, Mr. Renwick 954

Lake St. Clair fishermen, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Spence 954

Treatment of patients at nursing home, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Shulman 955

Absence of judge from duty, questions of Mr. Bales: Mr. Lewis 955

Inquiry into jailing of Emeryville man, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. B. Newman 956

Tabling report, royal commission on egg industry, Mr. Stewart 956

Motion to refer estimates to certain standing committees, Mr. Winkler 956

Certification of Dealers and Persons Engaged in the Fitting and Selling of Hearing Aids, bill to provide for, Mr. Shulman, first reading 957

Third readings 957

Historical Parks, bill respecting, Mr. Bernier, second reading 958

Ministry of Natural Resources, bill to establish, Mr. Davis, second reading 958

Third reading 977

Royal assent to certain bills, the honourable the Lieutenant Governor 977

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 978

Legislature of Ontario Debates

Monday, April 24, 1972

No. 26

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 10, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, APRIL 10, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Today in the east gallery we have, as visitors with us, students from Nelson High School at Burlington, from Rosseau Lake Boys' School at Rosseau and from Crescent School of Willowdale; and in the west gallery students from Centre Hastings Secondary School of Madoc.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce at this time the introduction of a programme that will be known as the municipal pounds assistance programme. Effective immediately the government of Ontario will provide grants to municipalities with populations of less than 50,000 persons for the purpose of encouraging and assisting in the building of or the renovation of municipal animal pounds.

The objective of this programme is to provide municipal pounds that will meet the minimum standards provided under existing provincial legislation.

The inspectors appointed under the Animals for Research Act have now completed a province-wide survey of the pound facilities that do exist and while in many cases these facilities are adequate, it is clear that steps must be taken to upgrade the facilities in some areas. This involves a capital investment by the municipality.

Under the terms of our municipal pounds assistance programme, the government of Ontario will pay grants of up to 40 per cent of the cost of providing an approved pound structure. The amount of the grant will be determined on a per capita basis, with the per capita grant being calculated on a graduated scale. We will be encouraging municipalities to band together to construct or renovate pounds to serve an area. Municipalities may pool their grant moneys although the total grant may not exceed 40 per cent of the actual cost of providing the facility.

Aside from the fact that this municipal or area pound must meet the minimum standards set forth in the regulations, there are other mandatory provisions.

The pound must be owned by a municipality or jointly owned by several municipalities. It must be located on municipal property or property leased by the municipality for at least 20 years. Municipalities receiving such a grant and building such a pound under the terms of this programme will undertake not to sell or dispose of the pound facility or any interest it has in that facility for 20 years after the grant has been made, without written approval from the minister.

The veterinary services branch of my department is in a position to provide approved plans and technical assistance for those municipalities wishing to upgrade their facilities. In fact, 125 of these plans have already been distributed. The plans are functional and they are practical. We would hope the municipalities would use these facilities not only for impoundment of animals, where animal control bylaws exist, but also as a central base for such services as neutering clinics and anti-rabies vaccination clinics. The moneys for this programme are provided for in the estimates of my department and the programme will remain in force until March 31, 1975.

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to table the report of the Law Reform Commission on development control.

In the early part of 1968, six Ontario municipalities individually submitted to this House private bills for consideration. These bills were similar in substance and each authorized its respective municipality to enact bylaws establishing conditions precedent for the development or redevelopment of land in the municipality. The bills were all given first reading and were then withdrawn on the assurance of the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the commission, which at that time was conducting a comprehensive study of the law of property, would investigate as soon as possible planning and development control legislation with particular regard to the problems raised by the bills.

As a result of the review of this problem, the commission now recommends that a thorough study of the entire process of planning in Ontario should be undertaken and until that study is completed no third level of development control should be introduced.

The commission does, however, make certain recommendations respecting practices which have grown up within the existing legislative framework which could be implemented pending the overall review recommended. These recommendations would permit designated municipalities to be given limited authority in regard to certain matters dealing with development in the context of the present Planning Act and would empower the municipalities to levy for parkland purposes upon defined classes of buildings.

The government has received the report and is considering these recommendations which appear to have merit. However, there are certainly implications which will have to be reviewed and an opportunity given to those directly interested to consider the report in its full detail before bringing forward any implementing legislation.

Copies of the report will be sent to a wide range of individuals, public agencies, and organizations with an invitation for them to study the recommendations and submit their observations and suggestions to the government through the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. McKeough).

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I said on Thursday last, in reply to a question from, I believe, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. R. F. Nixon), that I would probably have some observations to make related to the activities of the natural resources committee and the hearings going on related to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the government has given this matter very careful consideration. The matter was referred to the legislative committee—I believe on the 13th—and of course we know, both directly and indirectly, the hearings that have been conducted by the committee since they started their proceedings.

Mr. Speaker, as I observed on Thursday, the functioning of the committee—and I want to emphasize this; I said then and I am saying again today in no way is this any criticism of the committee—but the functioning of the committee as it related to the hearings last Wednesday left something to be desired. There was some discussion, Mr. Speaker; observations were made, here in the House and elsewhere, about the desirability of a royal commission to deal with this matter.

Mr. Speaker, the government has considered this and considered it very carefully and feels that it is not appropriate in this instance at this time to appoint a royal commission to inquire into the matters being heard by the resources development committee of this Legislature. I say this, Mr. Speaker, making it abundantly clear that if, after the hearings proceed, it then becomes necessary, in the view of the government, to establish a royal commission, that that alternative is still open to us.

It has also been observed, Mr. Speaker, that the way the hearings have gone indicates, shall we say, a failure of the committee structure. Mr. Speaker, I am not that pessimistic, but I recognize the inadequacies. I should point out that the standing committees have, I think very usefully, served the members of this Legislature for many things in the past number of years.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Not for this kind of investigation.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have an opportunity to make his observations or ask a question when I have finished my statement.

I think it is also obvious, Mr. Speaker, the committee, set up as it is to deal with a matter of this kind, perhaps is not appropriate. I think, Mr. Speaker, hindsight being a great thing, that as one looks at this—and recognizing that a commission will be appointed to study this, along with many other things—perhaps a form of inquiry of this kind might best be handled by a select committee of this Legislature. This is something that I would hope that the commission to be appointed would assess.

I think it is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, as I read the reports and from the information I have obtained, that much of what has been said at the committee so far have been statements made, by and large, by a single individual. Others have not had an opportunity to refute or reply to some of the statements. And, as the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Lewis) observed in this House, I believe on Thursday, there have been no allegations against any minister of this government.

So, Mr. Speaker, taking all of this into account, and wishing to see the committee deal with this as best it can, it is my hope that perhaps the resolution that I will be reading to the House and which will be

tabled for discussion tomorrow so that the committee can then move ahead with its deliberations on Wednesday, will enable the members of that committee hopefully—and I think with some degree of optimism—to come to a resolution of the matters presently before the committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, while it is not called for under the rules—this could be done tomorrow afternoon and debated—I think it is important for the hon. members opposite to have some idea as to the kind of resolution that we will be debating tomorrow. I intend to move the resolution that will state: That, for the purpose of its inquiry into the Workmen's Compensation Board only, the standing resources development committee be empowered to engage counsel to assist the chairman and members of the committee in the inquiry, including the questioning of witnesses, and that persons whose interests may be affected by the inquiry, be allowed counsel to advise and assist them, which counsel may question witnesses only through the committee counsel; also, that for the duration of this inquiry the committee be authorized to sit concurrently with the House and have its proceedings recorded and transcribed by the Hansard office.

This, Mr. Speaker, will be discussed by way of resolution tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement concerning the dumping of snow and the possible environmental hazards involved. I am also tabling, for the hon. members, information from a report of the technical task force on snow disposal in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

Ontario in general, and its large municipal centres in particular, are highly mobile and have become dependent on an efficient private and public transportation system for pleasure, business and industry. The development of a programme to handle snow and ice has paralleled the growth of the transportation network. The disposal of the snow has prompted considerable concern over possible adverse effects on the environment.

Preliminary studies have indicated measurable quantities of pollutants in snow, in addition to the salt used to protect life and property, and to maintain the efficiency of the transportation system.

On the basis of this preliminary information the ministry requested all municipalities to review their snow-handling practices and specifically to eliminate direct disposal of snow to lakes and rivers wherever possible.

Direct disposal into a watercourse is probably the most efficient and least costly method. However, direct dumping is the least desirable from the point of view of protecting the aquatic environment, as all the contaminants and debris contained in the snow will be introduced to the watercourse. Serious local degradation of water quality and the disruption of the aquatic community may result.

Land disposal or rapid melting and discharging into the municipal sewer system are alternate methods.

Both of these methods offer similar problems in pollution control. Groundwater and soil contamination, damage to vegetation, residual sand and debris, and aesthetic impairment must all be considered.

It is apparent that there are still insufficient technical data to fully determine the significance of pollutants resulting from snow disposal, compared with the year-round discharge of the same pollutants from rainfall runoff or from industrial and other sources, or which would enable alternative methods of road deicing and snow disposal to be evaluated.

It appears obvious that extensive studies must be carried out before any long-term programme can be developed. The Ministry of the Environment is therefore establishing a task force to prepare a proposal for such a study, including detailed terms of reference with recommendation for the allotment of responsibilities and the co-ordination of research.

The proposed study will have the following objectives: (1) to determine the relative environmental impact of present deicing and snow removal practices, and to obtain adequate data for the full evaluation of alternative practices, and (2) to develop criteria for the selection and operation of land disposal sites, the use of storm drains, the use of sanitary sewers, salt application and the use of snow melting equipment.

The task force will also develop a detailed comprehensive plan for winter operations in the Metropolitan Toronto area which will minimize deleterious environmental effects compatible with the maintenance of safe traffic movement. This plan can also be applied to other municipalities upon completion.

Members of the task force will include representatives from the waste management and water quality branches of my ministry, Metro Toronto, Association of Municipalities and the Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications.

I plan that the first meeting will take place in sufficient time to permit the completion of preliminary studies before the onset of the next winter season.

I believe that this approach will resolve the problem of snow disposal not only in the Metropolitan Toronto area but also on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

WCB COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, further to the statement made by the Premier, regarding the resolution from which we'll be debating tomorrow, are we to assume—the outcome of that resolution being fairly certain—that the Premier has already taken steps to see that adequate counsel and the facilities that are embodied in the resolution will be available this Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been some preparatory work done, in the possibility that this resolution is carried by this House, so that the committee can go ahead and function on Wednesday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, we won't debate it until tomorrow.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the Premier thought at all about the question of who assumes the legal costs for any witnesses named who would wish to engage counsel?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, in that this is really the first time, I think, or certainly in my memory here in the House, that we have done this sort of thing, I think it would be appropriate that if a witness is called before a standing committee and wishes to retain, or retains counsel, that the cost should be borne by the government.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question of the Premier pertaining to the location of the second Toronto airport.

Is he aware that certain studies allegedly conducted by the government of Canada and now made public indicate that none of the four basic criteria for the location of the airport were, in fact, fulfilled by the Pickering site—the implication being that it was the insistence of the Treasurer of Ontario on the fulfilment of the Toronto-centred region plan that persuaded the two governments acting together to opt for the Pickering location? Question: Has he examined these reports, is he aware of them, and to what extent is he prepared, or is the administration in Ontario, prepared to take the responsibility for the location decision?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it is really quite evident what responsibilities this government is prepared to take. I am not aware of the technical reports that I gather have been referred to. If memory serves me correctly, from the story I read just a few minutes ago, the reports referred to, I think, were those of September, 1970. That is in this day and age some substantial period of time ago, but I can't comment upon them or what they contain.

The Treasurer made it clear, Mr. Speaker, and I have restated some aspects of this on occasion, that the province was involved in assisting in the determination that the site be in the eastern part of—not in the eastern part of Metro—but to the east of Metro.

This was done to relate to the Toronto-centred region because the government felt very strongly that to give validity to the Toronto-centred region, a second facility of this kind in the metropolitan area would of necessity have to be to the east or the Toronto-centred region I think would lose its viability and perhaps even its validity.

As to the question, Mr. Speaker, of firstly the need for a second airport, this obviously is a matter of federal determination, and certainly the details related to its needs, specifically as far as site is concerned, were the responsibilities, and properly so, of the federal government as well.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Will the Premier now undertake, however, to make public the papers that at least led Ontario in taking the stand that it did in dealing with the government of Canada on the matter of location? Since papers from Ottawa are evidently being made public, surely the record ought to be complete and Ontario's stand be known?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't give that undertaking today, of course. Really, part of the basic documentation in a general way, I guess, is the basic document of the Toronto-centred region, which made it very clear that this government was supporting a growth development to the east of Metro. This is really the substantial part of the rationale for the position that this govern-

ment has taken and, of course, that document has already been made available and I am sure studied very carefully by the Leader of the Opposition and that would be one of the very basic documents.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: To return to the question: The Premier then refuses to table the documents relating to the airport? Right!

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry. By way of supplementary rather briefly: Did the Premier ever receive a document from the federal government giving the actual justification for a second airport as they saw it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't comment on that. I don't think I ever personally received a document stating the need for a second airport site. I am sure that such documentation has been developed and has been prepared. I think this is very obvious. I don't believe that that kind of documentation was made available to me personally, but I will certainly check on it.

ONTARIO SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker: Can he inform the House as to the policy on the Ontario scholarships? One of the working papers that evidently led the government to opt for an increase in tuition at the post-secondary level, also indicated that it should abandon financial support, at least for Ontario scholarships. I notice that the estimates don't refer to it very specifically, but they indicate that the sums ordinarily appropriated for the Ontario scholars will not be voted this year. Are we going to continue with the programme, or what is the government's position?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think that money was in the budget of the Department of Colleges and Universities, was it not? But it is my understanding that we are not paying any monetory awards in regard to Ontario scholars this year, but they will be receiving certificates.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, then: As a second step in the Treasurer's attempts to save money, he has not only raised the tuition fee—raised the amount that will be payable by individual students—but he has lowered the Province of Ontario student award programme. Now the third step is to abandon the monetary prize associated with the Ontario Scholars that would be paid to all students who get 80 per cent and over. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the thrust, of course, is that the money that is available for student assistance is all in the Province of Ontario's student award fund. The money that could have been used in this area is better served by being placed in that fund and going to those students who need assistance. The students who achieve the marks necessary to be an Ontario Scholar will get the appropriate recognition through a certificate.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, just by way of interest: Was it the minister's intention not to make any statement about this at all but just to go along until somebody noticed that he had withdrawn the support for the Ontario Scholars which had been entered into with such fanfare by the former minister, the now Premier?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time we would be sending out to the school boards the notification of what was to be our programme in this particular area.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary. What is the saving to the province in total by cancelling the monetary equivalent?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is $770,000.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know that it necessarily can be said to be a saving, Mr. Speaker. As I indicated, it is a transfer of the money so that the moneys are in the student of Ontario awards programme and those students who need assistance for further post-secondary education will get it through that programme.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Why is there less money in that fund?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Because they didn't use as much last term.

Mr. Shulman: If the logic of the minister is correct can he explain why there is less money in that fund after he has transferred the funds into it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member will have to ask my colleague, the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Kerr) for that.

Mr. Shulman: I didn't think the Minister of Education would know.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That is higher mathematics.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health, if I can catch his eye.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I don't blame him; he is preoccupied.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Can members blame me?

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): The member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) is prettier than the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Stokes: That is what you call a tête-à-tête.

Mr. Lewis: Or some other medical term.

Interjections by hon. members.

ESTIMATE FOR NURSING HOME CARE REQUIREMENT

Mr. Lewis: If I may ask the Minister of Health, how did the government arrive at its estimate of $31 million for the extended nursing home care requirement in the estimates for this year?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): No wonder the minister shakes his head.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is a quite a question, Mr. Speaker. In determining the $31 million, first of all, we did a survey of the province to determine as closely as possible what percentage of residents in nursing homes today would be covered by the programme. Then we took into consideration the number of residents who were there and were already covered through the Department of Social and Family Services, and came up with the figure of $31 million.

I need not tell the House that it is low. We are finding that a larger percentage of the patients than we had anticipated are going to qualify for nursing home care. I am hopeful that, in addition to this, there will be many more beds made available in the active treatment hospitals by transferring patients who are now occupying beds and who shouldn't be. So it will be in excess of $31 million from the figures I've got today.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, that is, of course, what prompted my question. The misdirection of the estimate is really quite extraordinary on the face of it. Does the minister understand that, as of April 9, 23,000 applications have been accepted which, over the fiscal year, works out to $75.6 million? That is an immediate underestimate in the budget of over $40 million already. Is the minister aware of those figures?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of a little more than that. There are 23,482 who qualify as of today and there are still 1,816 to be reviewed. There's no doubt about it there will be others who are now in hospital who haven't been considered.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I understand it, Dr. Barbara Blake, head of the section administering the programme, is quoted in Saturday's Star as expecting 53,000 applicants, which would bring the programme, even assuming the same percentage level of those accepted, to a cost of something slightly over $100 million in 1972-1973. No one begrudges the expense but how is it possible, two weeks after the budget, to have made a mistake in an estimate of over $70 million, in view of what that means for the deficit which the Treasurer put forward?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't think there will be that much of a deficit, Mr. Speaker. Certainly at the present time there have been 36,461 reviewed. What did the member say 75,000 or 70,000?

Mr. Lewis: Well, of the 36 the minister has accepted 23. He has a couple of thousand more in a grey area. The head of his branch has indicated that she expects up to 53,000 applicants. Applying the same percentages across the board—

Hon. Mr. Potter: I just can't see the 53,000 figure. Perhaps she's right, who knows? I mean, all of us will agree we are starting from scratch here. We had to learn from the experience we've got today; we had to take the number of beds we have available today, estimate the number we thought were going to be required, it is strictly an estimation.

I agree with the member and I am concerned that it's that far out of line. Certainly, there is no way I can explain why we are that far out of line but I must reiterate that this is a service that has to be provided.

Mr. Lewis: The minister might speak to the Treasurer about it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We must continue to see that these people are provided with the type of care they require. I think I should point out, too—and this is where we are going to run into flak, all of us in this House—we find that of those interviewed who are ineligible today, there is in excess of 12,000, close to 13,000. These again are going to be reviewed.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: We must remember a great majority of these people do not require nursing care and they won't be covered under the programme. If we're going to let people insist that we cover everybody whether or not they need nursing care, where are we going to end up?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): A supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Lewis: I am not finished, Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary.

Mr. Paterson: A supplementary: May I ask the minister what percentage of those 23,000 people who have been accepted for this extended nursing care are persons who have already qualified through social services and are in a nursing home?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't got that figure.

Mr. Paterson: Is it correct that for 73 per cent of the people in nursing homes at the present time, their care is being paid for out of the province through social service or the counties?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I would doubt that figure, Mr. Speaker. We found, for instance, that in nursing homes today, we processed a total in excess of 16,000 patients and 78 per cent of the total qualified for nursing care, but many of these are paying their own way. I can't say what per cent; I haven't got that figure today but I can get it for the member. This will make up for a lot of the difference in the other figure.

Mr. Paterson: Sure, that's the key.

Mr. Lewis: Where is it? It is not in the estimates.

Mr. Paterson: That is where the minister saves his money!

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. Paterson: That is where the minister saves his money.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. Lewis: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of the Environment. Now that the minister has met, I believe, with the heads of the American parents of Canadian Gypsum, has he a report he could make to the House?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I will have a full one tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

SALARY DISCREPANCIES AT TORONTO UNIVERSITY

Mr. Lewis: Yes. A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. Has he seen the report compiled by the ad hoc committee on the employment of women at the University of Toronto indicating the very major discrepancies in salaries paid to men and women professors in the University of Toronto?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will realize the Minister of Labour hasn't had a quiet life lately. I must inform him that I haven't read the report as yet.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may, by way of supplementary: Would the minister take this supplementary as a formal complaint filed before the employment standards branch, that the discrepancies, set out and carefully documented, regarding wages as between men and women staff members of the University of Toronto be investigated as a violation of the equal pay for equal work section of the Employment Standards Act. Would he proceed from here to look into it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Labour has the reply to a question previously asked.

REFUSAL OF EMPLOYMENT AT ONTARIO PLACE

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Bounsall) asked the following question, and I quote:

> As it relates to the Equal Employment Opportunities Act, would the minister investigate reports that young women employed last summer in the marina areas of Ontario Place are now being told that they aren't qualified to work in the marina this year, even though the Ontario government paid for their training last summer at George Brown College, a training that led to their obtaining Masters of Small Craft certification and being licensed to operate the tour and paddle boats at that marina?

In reply, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that this matter is now still under investigation by the women's bureau. However, I have made some preliminary inquiries which have revealed the following: The administrative officer for the Ontario Place site has confirmed that women are not being assigned to the canal boat operations this year. This decision was taken on the basis that the late-night operations involved dealing with rowdy customers. Girls are being assigned to other boat work and to other shore-based duties, such as attendants and cash handling. The situation requires further investigation to determine whether these grounds are reasonable for excluding the women from the canal boat operation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of the Environment has the answer to a previous question.

USE OF NTA IN DETERGENTS

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, on Friday the hon. member for Welland South (Mr. Haggerty) asked me the following question:

> Can the minister explain to the House why the allegedly dangerous substance NTA, nitrilo triacetic acid [or trisodium nitrilo triacetate, which is easier]—

Mr. Lewis: It used to roll off the tongue of the former minister (Mr. Kerr).

Hon. Mr. Auld: To continue:

> —in detergents, is no longer being used by Procter and Gamble in the United States but continues to be used by the same company in Canada?

Mr. Speaker, NTA is biodegradable and is removed with good efficiency by secondary sewage treatment. Its current use has resulted in an environmental level that is barely detectable in receiving waters and is not detectable in those water distribution systems which have been examined.

The hon. member will realize that restriction of NTA content in detergents is the responsibility of the federal government. Continuing studies by the federal government will clarify the possible direct toxicological effects of NTA. The existing trace levels and the projected levels for the near future in the aquatic environment do not warrant removal of NTA from detergents. If these studies show that continued use in detergents could in the future produce a hazard, removal from the source, that is from the detergents, accompanied by natural bacteriological degradation of trace levels in the environment, would eliminate NTA.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Holy cow!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

MEDICARE COSTS

Mr. Paterson: Yes, a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: Can the minister inform the House as to what the savings to the nearest million dollars will be to his department with the transference of medical care costs away from his department into the new formula as of April 1? In addition to this, will there be a loss of federal revenues through to his department in this regard, and how will this equalize with the contributions of the federal government through to the health care programme? Will it balance out? Has he determined this?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): Mr. Speaker, I will take that question as notice and get the information of the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, where in the minister's estimates is there an amount of money for any nursing home coverage being paid by Community and Social Services?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: There will be. There is in the estimates, Mr. Speaker, money for those residents in the homes for the aged. My understanding is that those in the nursing homes who are eligible are covered through the ordinary grants.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

STAFF SHORTAGE AT ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

Mr. Shulman: Question of the Minister of Public Protection, Mr. Speaker: What is the minister doing about the complaint by the head of the Ontario Securities Commission, Edward Royce, as reported in the New York Times, that he is so short of manpower he cannot act against late insider filers; in fact, he is aware of hundreds of instances of non-filing of insider trading reports but no action has been taken about it because of lack of manpower.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has the terminology of the new department rather wrongly; however, I will take that question as notice and discuss it with the chairman of the commission.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

U.N. CONFERENCE ON HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. What part will Ontario play in the preparation of Canada's brief for the first United Nations conference on human environment, which will be held in Stockholm, Sweden, and will the province be sending a delegation or presenting a brief to the hearings which will be held in Toronto at the St. Lawrence Hall on April 17?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, we have been in touch quite closely, and quite actively, with the Department of the Environment of Canada in putting together our comments on a great mass of position papers, which I must admit I have not read in their entirety. We will be at the meeting, which I believe is to be held here next week—

Mr. Good: It's April 17.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Tomorrow, at St. Lawrence Hall, although the purpose of that meeting, as I understand it from a letter from the hon. Mr. Davis, is primarily as an opportunity for non-governmental groups to put positions forward. Our activities are ongoing with our counterparts in Ottawa and the provinces, and the Canadian delegation will be led by two federal ministers, accompanied by two provincial ministers, the responsible ministers in British Columbia and Quebec, as part of the official delegation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How did that happen?

Hon. Mr. Auld: All provinces are permitted two representatives at the conference, and we will be represented at the conference. The delegation has not yet been finally selected, but I will certainly remember the hon. member's interest.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

JURISDICTIONAL PROBLEM AT HAMILTON HARBOUR

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. What discussions have taken place between the Province of Ontario and the federal government in order to resolve the jurisdictional problem of the Hamilton Harbour as to who, in fact, has the right to administer the harbour's expansion which is taking place?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or contraction.

Mr. Deans: Or contraction, thank you.

And does the Province of Ontario intend to assume any legal costs in the forthcoming legal battle over who is going to control the dumping into Hamilton Harbour?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member's question technically now should be addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources, since the conservation authorities branch is now under his jurisdiction—

Mr. Renwick: That is the point we made.

Mr. Deans: That is what is worrying me.

Hon. Mr. Auld: However, I can tell him that prior to the changeover, I had been in touch with the hon. Mr. Davis, the federal Minister of the Environment, and that is one of a number of questions which I hope to be discussing with him either this Friday or early in the following week.

Mr. Deans: Is it worth my while directing the question to the Minister of Natural Resources? Would he be able to answer my question?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): I didn't hear the question.

Mr. Deans: I see. Would the minister be able to tell the House what actions have been taken by his department in regard to resolving the jurisdictional problems centred

on the Hamilton Harbour? Is his department prepared to assume the legal costs of any actions that are forced as a result of the ambiguity of the Act that presently exists. And when can we expect an end to the chaos in the city of Hamilton?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the conservation authorities moved into my department as of Friday last, and already this morning I have had a meeting on this particular subject. Certainly I am anxious to have the matter clarified as quickly as possible—I intend to do that—and hopefully I will have a report to make to the hon. members of this House in the not too distant future.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware of some contractual agreements made between the Ontario Water Resources Commission, as it then was, and Dofasco and Stelco, relating to their right to fill in part of the harbour to meet the minimum requirements set by OWRC for the cleanup of the steel industry on Hamilton Bay? Does he know of any such agreement entered into by the steel companies and OWRC as it then was and, if not, would he examine the files to see if such an agreement exists and, if it does, table it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not aware of all the intricate complexities of this particular problem, but I am going into it and, certainly, I will be glad to look into this aspect of it.

Mr. Deans: May I ask one final supplementary question? Has the minister authorized the conservation authority to seek an injunction to stop dumping until such time as the matter is cleared up?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The minister has not.

Mr. Deans. Will he?

Mr. Speaker: Any further supplementaries?

The Minister of Financial and Commercial Affairs has the answer to a question previously asked today, I believe.

STAFF SHORTAGE AT ONTARIO SECURITIES COMMISSION

Hon. Mr. Winkler: A question was asked earlier by the member for High Park and I am happy to inform him that the addition to the staff referred to in the article has been made since April 1. How's that for service?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

MEDICARE COVERAGE FOR PERSONS WITHOUT HOSPITALIZATION COVERAGE

Mr. Paterson: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is there a doctor in the House?

An hon. member: In the balcony.

Mr. Paterson: Might I ask of the minister if those persons who, prior to April 1, had health care coverage but did not have hospitalization, will eventually be billed under the new combined system, or are they just being forgotten?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Oh no! No, they will be billed under the combined system. It is now one programme and it covers both doctor and hospital.

Mr. Paterson: A supplementary: Could the minister explain how this is going to be done since he is using the hospitalization number? Are these people going to be assigned a new number automatically and what is their status today?

Hon. Mr. Potter: They are covered as of today and they will be assigned a new number if they had their hospitalization number before.

Mr. Paterson: They didn't have hospitalization, they had health care.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, they sure will have.

Mr. Paterson: That is what I wanted cleared up.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville with a supplementary, and may I again ask the members to state that they have a supplementary when they rise.

Mr. B. Newman: Is the minister attempting to make some accommodation for those who did the medical services coverage, but did not have hospitalization coverage? That is, those in border towns who happen to have had this coverage by reason of their work in a foreign jurisdiction.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Essex South just asked that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is now one programme. They have all or nothing.

Mr. B. Newman: How does the coverage accommodate those in the U.S. border area—in the city of Windsor and possibly those in Niagara Falls—who may have coverage in one of the health services and not the other health service? They must take both Ontario services?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is right.

Mr. Paterson: Without applying.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF DON JAIL INMATE

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): To the provincial secretary responsible for about one-half of the injustices that take place in Ontario. Two weeks ago, on March 13, I asked a question in this House about the fate and disposition of Karleton Lewis Armstrong.

The minister said at that time he would look into the matter. Has he done so and what action has he taken, as this man continues to remain in solitary confinement at the Don Jail?

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): That one is still being looked into, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what he is complaining about.

Mr. Lawlor: I will ask the minister again two weeks from now.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

FEDERAL PRICE, PROFIT AND WAGE CONTROLS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier. In view of the continuing worry of many people that inflation may continue, is the Premier considering making representation to the government of Canada as to the implementation of price, profit and wage controls, similar to that requested by the Premier of British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we are not contemplating that at this time.

Mr. Lewis: That is a Liberal Party suggestion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury.

HAZARDS OF SPRAYING WITH TCDD

Mr. M. C. Germa (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment, if I could have his ear: Has the minister been in touch with his colleague in Transport and Communications, to point out to him the hazards of continuing the practice of spraying highway rights of way with the chemical TCDD, particularly in northern Ontario? Would the minister consider getting in touch with his counterpart and pointing out the hazards of this practice?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will discuss it with my hon. colleague, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

STUDY SESSIONS HELD BY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister consider the study sessions that were held last Tuesday, I believe, by the North York secondary school teachers an illegal strike, as the term was used in the Globe and Mail and the Star of last week?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter between the teachers who are employed by the North York School Board and the school board itself. There are many names that have been applied to what these teachers have done. I do not really intend to get into the middle of it at this time, except that I think the North York board has handled the matter very responsibly.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Surely, it is the legislation that is handled by his department that prohibits teachers from striking? The minister should take an active interest in the proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, of course the legislation is handled by my department. If the member is asking for the opinion of the Minister of Education, it is that those teachers should have been on the job on that afternoon.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Considering that attitude, what steps is the

minister's department taking to reassure the teachers that the things which they are concerned about—the limitations on spending that his department has imposed, the concern that the teachers have expressed about the cutback in remedial courses, that special services will suffer—what steps has he taken to reassure them that this will not happen?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think as the hon. members of this House know, I have met for many hours with both teachers and trustees from the Metropolitan Toronto area. We have, with their officials, looked over in great detail the budgets that they have presented. We have made certain adjustments for Metropolitan Toronto which I think were right and just.

These have been explained to all and I am perfectly confident that the Metropolitan Toronto school board and its associate boards can live within the ceilings that now apply without hurting the quality of education in this area. There is no question about that in my mind. I think they just have to get down to the job of getting their budgets finished and formalized.

Mr. Foulds: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: The budget speech said—and the minister has just reiterated it—that positively no reduction in the quality of education in Ontario will result from the educational ceilings. Is the minister prepared to state categorically to this House that courses presently offered in remedial reading, English for new Canadians, psychological services, and library services will not be cut? Is the minister prepared to make that statement to this House?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking me now to get into the area of telling the school boards exactly what to do. We have stated on many, many occasions what we are doing; first of all—and I think it needs to be stated—we are not asking that less money be spent on education. We are merely putting some type of ceiling on the escalation of costs.

Once that is done and once the ceiling is established for a board, how it spends that money within its own jurisdiction is up to that board. As I have stated many times they should take the wisdom of many people into account as they formulate that budget—the teachers, the parents, the students, whoever you wish. In doing that it is up to that board to decide where those things will be spent. Certainly, as Minister of Education, I hope that no board will sacrifice some of these very vital programmes when it can cut money out of another area.

The member is asking me to state that there is perhaps no other fat in an educational budget. I just do not buy this argument that every time we suggest there has to be some deceleration to the spiralling of excessive education costs, the only way they can be stopped is in these very important special education areas. This is just not so. I think that within the ceilings that we have established, boards can take other fat out and not let these vital services suffer.

Mr. Foulds: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville had a supplementary.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may, can I ask if the minister can assure us that the extra school programmes in recreation and so forth, now carried on by various boards of education, will not come under the grant ceiling so that boards will not have to include those funds in their overall budget?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot assure the hon. member of that. We have made certain arrangements to assure that the use of schools by the community for other things than educational and school-hour purposes will not suffer because of the ceiling. Those items that come within that category may be moved by a board, if it wishes, to extraordinary expenditures and then the ceilings will not apply. But this may not apply to some of the things the hon. member has referred to, which may be part of the regular school programme. But certainly we have done what we think reinforces the community use of schools, which we do not expect to suffer under this programme.

Mr. MacDonald: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the revision of the ceilings that the minister granted for Metropolitan Toronto restricted to this area or is it going to be extended to other boards across the province? Or must they live within the strait jacket of the ceilings imposed by the minister?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the things that were done in Metropolitan Toronto as a result of my discussions with the board are indeed available to all the boards. One of the things was the one I have just mentioned, the allowing of those costs that are associated with community use of schools to be considered an extraordinary expenditure, when they are broken out, if a board wishes.

The other two adjustments for Metropolitan Toronto apply exclusively to this area and do not apply to any other area. One was to allow that cost of carrying on a two-level system of education to be counted as an extraordinary expenditure. And this, of course, applies only to the Metropolitan Toronto school board system. The other was the special cost associated with running the schools for the deaf and the orthopaedic schools, which again is something that Metropolitan Toronto is running and is unique in this particular area.

I might just indicate that the same kind of provision was made for the Ottawa and London school boards in regard to their school health services, when it was pointed out to us that they were the only boards in this province that ran a very extensive school health service, one which we particularly do not suggest they should be running. But they are running it now. The policy of this government basically is that health services in schools should be provided by the health units; they were asked to try to phase this out over the next few years, so they could allow that special cost to be as an extraordinary cost.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the minister prepared to assure the people of Ottawa that elementary education will not suffer in that area when the per-pupil amount allotted by the department is not essentially changing between 1971 and 1973? Will there be no reduction of quality in elementary education in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, it has not been pointed out to me—and I have had meetings with the Ottawa boards—that the quality of education in elementary schools of Ottawa will suffer under the ceilings. It is not necessarily going to be particularly easy at times to come within the ceilings, but I think it can be done without the quality suffering.

Mr. Foulds: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur has a supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: We have not yet received a statement from the minister that the courses I outlined in my previous supplementary question are tied directly to the quality of education in this province, and that he will take steps to ensure that those special services are not cut by individual boards.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had indicated pretty clearly that it is up to the boards themselves to decide how they would spend their money. Indeed, at this particular point in time, I do not know how—

Mr. Foulds: How can the minister abdicate his authority on this point and yet—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I do not know how they—Well, the hon. member does not seem very interested in hearing the answer, Mr. Speaker. I don't know and he doesn't know. There's a lot of fire going on. A lot of statements are being bandied about; there are newspaper ads and some ads on television and radio suggesting this kind of thing. I think they are rather misleading—and we really do not know. But I stress to the members that it is up to the local boards. We build in incentives, weighing factors and so forth to encourage these special programmes, but we do have to allow some autonomy to the local boards, and that is for them to decide.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. Cassidy: It is evident to us on this side of the House that the minister is speaking some kind of Conservative gobbledegook. Could he, for the benefit—

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member please direct the question and not make such a statement, which is improper.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What kind of gobbledegook is the member expressing?

Mr. Lawlor: That's not the question either.

Mr. Cassidy: Kindly keep those fellows quiet over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order!

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Mr. Renwick: My colleague cannot ask his question.

Mr. Lewis: That was clearly part of the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: Of course it was.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Foulds: They are just giving the member an illustration.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, it has been very difficult for us on this side of the House to listen to the minister's statement and really believe him. I would like him to at least define for this House—

Mr. B. Newman: What is the member's question?

Mr. Cassidy: —what he means by quality of education, since it is some curious elastic kind of thing which cannot be deteriorated under any circumstances, from all he has been telling us.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member I suppose has come perhaps to the crux of this matter, because who really can define quality of education.

Mr. Cassidy: Well, the minister can't!

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am being asked by certain people to say that the quality of education is going to suffer, and I have asked them to prove it. And the only way they can prove it to me is by saying everything we have now is good, and all the money we are spending, and the exact programmes are good; and if you decrease that at all you are interfering with the quality of education. Now there are others of us who don't believe that that is so. We think that there is some fat in the educational system.

Mr. Cassidy: The essentials of what happens in the classroom are being affected by increases in class sizes and reduction of the system.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We think that there can be some fat cut out of the educational budget.

Mr. Lewis: What fat?

Mr. Cassidy: What fat?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is up to the school boards to cut it out.

Mr. Lewis: Well then the minister is willing to impose ceilings which cut essential quality services. That is what has happened; and the minister washes his hands of it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let the hon. member of the opposition stand up and show me some essential service that is going to be cut out and then I will believe him.

Mr. Lewis: Well, speak to the many school boards. We will document it at the first opportunity.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Put up or shut up.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this amendment requires persons under 18 years of age to take an approved driver education course before being issued a driver's licence.

NOISE POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. Burr moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to Control Noise Pollution, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish a means of regulating, controlling and prohibiting excessive noise in the environment.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members, the accomplishment of a 14-year-old, grade 8 student from the town of Belle River, Mark Thibert. Mark won

the Royal Canadian Legion public speaking contest for grade 7 and grade 8 students in the Province of Ontario. His topic was "Our Spaceship Earth" which told of earth's problems of pollution. Mark was sponsored by the Royal Canadian Legion, Branch 399, of Belle River. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all members of this Legislature join with me in congratulating this young man in his successful endeavour and wish him continued success in the future.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

EDIBLE OIL PRODUCTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 17, An Act to amend the Edible Oil Products Act.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a few very brief comments about the bill. We in this party are going to support it.

It's an interesting bill in that it does permit the blending of edible oils with certain dairy products. I presume this will apply to margarine and to butter. I know that in the UK this procedure has been followed and it did result in an increase in the consumption of butter. The experiment, to that extent, was very successful. The University of Guelph in this province has done some considerable experimentation with this type of thing. They have suggested that it's a good idea. The experiments were quite successful and I think from the standpoint of the dairy people, they feel that such a procedure would result in increased consumption of dairy products. I hope it would.

I think in certain states in the US where this has been done, it has not worked out that way. I think they've experienced a lower consumption of dairy products but that's counterbalanced by the situation in the UK. Who's to say? In one instance it seems to have encouraged consumption and in another instance it didn't work out so well. All I can say is that I think it is a step in the right direction and I hope it does result in increased consumption of dairy products.

I think the fact that this bill is before the House today is an indicator of our rapidly changing ideas and concepts. If this bill had been brought before the Legislature even five years ago it would have almost meant the downfall of the government. No farm organization would have countenanced this bill five years ago, Mr. Speaker. It just wouldn't have happened and yet today we have a bill before us.

Presumably this bill will gather unto itself unanimous or almost unanimous support. It is interesting to see the changing tide of public opinion and how it works in the course of a few years. I hope the matter works out to the benefit of the agricultural industry, more particularly to the dairy industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate in the debate?

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is much that we can add to what the member for Huron-Bruce has said with respect to the bill.

It would appear to us to make sense that this degree of flexibility should be introduced into the dairy products business in order to make certain that the widest possible variety of blended products, under proper regulation, would be available having regard to the extended development of that field with respect to food products. I am concerned somewhat to find that in addition to carrying out that very worthwhile extension of the authority, the minister is also extending the provision with respect to exemptions by way of regulation.

I would hope that in the course of his remarks on the bill he, in turn, would comment as to why it is necessary to extend the exempting provision of the regulatory power, to exempt retailers of any edible oil product and prescribing the particular terms and conditions of the exemption.

An hon. member: Well said!

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. member wishing to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Speaker, in replying to the member for Huron-Bruce, I would like to set his mind at rest. This Act does not apply to the blending of butter and margarine. The Act applies simply to those products that are imitation products.

For instance, it is possible to manufacture blended products that are not imitations of, or do not resemble, milk products designated under the Milk Act. However, if a non-designated product contains milk, it is still a dairy product under the Edible Oil Products Act and mixing is thereby prohibited. Accordingly, an available market for certain milk products is lost, as my hon. friend suggests.

This market can be made available to milk producers and processors by, (a) relating

dairy products wholly to such products as are fluid milk products, that is, bottled milks and cream, or milk products—cheese, butter, ice cream and such like—for the purposes of the Milk Act; and (b) by prescribing by regulation the milk products that may be used in the manufacture of blended products.

This bill before us recognizes that milk producers, processors, dealers in edible oil products and consumers, will benefit if controlled blending of milk products with edible oil products is introduced. By clarifying the Act in this respect, blending will be removed from the administrative, decision-making area respecting whether or not the resultant edible oil product is an imitation of or resembles a dairy product. The general purpose of this bill that we have before us now is to bring dairy products under the Edible Oil Products Act into line with milk products under the Milk Act, and to make the prohibition against blending apply only in cases where the blended product imitates or resembles a milk product designated by or under the Milk Act.

What this bill really does is to go beyond that—I shouldn't say go beyond it, but in practical application we have, for instance, skimmed milk powder blended with edible oil products, for the production of puddings that are available—you see them advertised—in food stores today. They were allowed in on a trial basis, a sale basis, and were widely accepted by the public. We simply want to amend the Act, to clarify it, to make it possible that these can be manufactured without somebody challenging the sale of these things, because of the lack of what we think is clarification in the Edible Oil Products Act.

So the Act will permit the blending of skimmed milk powder with edible oil products for these puddings, but it doesn't permit the blending of butter and margarine. That is precluded under the Oleomargarine Act, section 3, where it is stated: "No person shall mix oleomargarine with butter for purposes of sale or for use in any public eating place." It is a different Act entirely.

I think, quite frankly, my hon. friend has touched on a subject that has a good deal of merit and we should pursue it. As a matter of fact, I have already suggested to some of our milk people that it might be wise to consider amending that section of the Oleomargarine Act to do what my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce has suggested.

I think that partially answers the question raised by the member for Riverdale. I would like to go on further to say that with regard to the exemption clause, the Act presently confers power to exempt manufacturers and wholesalers; but it does not exempt retailers. We simply said we had better put retailers in with the manufacturers and the wholesalers. There is not much point in having a product manufactured if you are not going to let the retailer sell it. So now it simply means that he can go ahead and sell the product; he is not denied the right to sell it. That is the type of exemption. We add one further clause and, that is, we can provide inspection and regulation of premises where the product is mixed and blended.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, before the Minister of Agriculture proceeds, would it be inconvenient if we went ahead with the Nursing Home Act instead of the Dog Tax Act?

Mr. Renwick: It will only take a minute.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) wanted to say something about that. He was involved in it and he is just on his way.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, that being the case. In fact, I would like him to be here. I don't think there is any real problem with the bill and I would like to get it going so that the necessary legislative machinery can get rolling throughout the municipalities.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He asked, if it wouldn't put the minister out unnecessarily. He should be back in a moment.

Mr. Gaunt: Has the minister got the Nursing Home Act?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): It is ready to go.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Okay, go ahead.

DOG TAX AND LIVE STOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill 18, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act.

Mr. Renwick: We agree with the principle of the bill and will support it.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I have a word or two to say about Bill 18. First of all, not being an agricultural critic nor even remotely related to the animal kingdom in this way, I want to mention—probably this will not go on to committee of the whole House—the change from the word tax to the word licensing that was felt requisite in bringing this bill into being.

Secondly, there is the business of the dog tags set forth in section 4. In the previous legislation there was set forth the grounds, and to whom the duty devolved of affixing the tags, and all that sort of thing which have been eliminated from this present bill. They were given out either by the clerk or the asssessor of a municipality and now this has been taken out of the statute. I wonder if it was an oversight or whether it was deliberate on the part of the government.

The third point I have to make has to do with section 5; where as it has been pretty well eliminated—subsections 2 and 3 were knocked out by way of this bill—section 1 was retained. It had been my intention, had the bill not come on so relatively quickly, to get in touch with Kate Millet and other people of that stripe in order to question and bring to the attention of certain movements in the modern world of the profound, crucial, discrimination being levied against female dogs in the legislation, which has been retained by the minister whereas, as I say, he gets rid of everything else. I think that is the most reprehensible piece of business—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It is a violation of the Human Rights Code; discrimination on the basis of sex.

Mr. Lawlor: —and I am sure the minister will have adequate justification for his position on that particular matter.

The only other matter which I wish to mention is the business of the definition of dogs running at large. It seems to be a very broad and indefinite definition, to say the least. It is not eliminated from the legislation; subsections 1 and 7 are altered but subsection 2 is retained. Has the minister given that goodly consideration? Perhaps he could bring in the future, if not in this legislation, a closer scrutiny as to what that definition should hold? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the second reading of the bill to amend the Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, I would like to commend the minister for bringing in the amendments to the bill in view of the fact that there have been several distressing happenings across our province in the past year when, on a matter of principle, people have gone to jail for not having a dog licence or obtaining their annual dog tags.

It is interesting to note and I think significant that the bill is no longer a taxing but a licensing bill which I think is a step in the right direction with the regulatory purposes or the control of dogs should be for that purpose and not as a means of raising revenue. The bill itself really makes permissive what was mandatory before. It is now possible for municipalities to continue, if they so wish, to pass bylaws under section 5 to raise revenue in those areas where there must be payments made for the destruction, I presume, of sheep and other animals in the rural areas.

Those townships or rural municipalities that still want to use the licensing of dogs as a revenue-producing instrument will be entitled to do so. However, in the cities—in my own city as well as others—we find that the annual business of dragging people into court because they haven't bought a dog licence is something that the municipal leaders find anything but desirable. Many people feel that they should not, in fact, have to pay a licence fee for dogs when no such licence is imposed on the feline population of the province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or on budgies.

Mr. Good: Or on budgie birds flying around in the open, this is true. So we have here a step forward in that dog licensing is permissive.

Last December I wrote a letter to the minister explaining my objections to the old Act and giving him documentation of the gentleman Frederick Strauss in Waterloo, who went to jail rather than pay for a dog licence, when he said his neighbours' cats were running all over his property. The same thing happened in the Windsor area just recently, in April, where a gentleman who didn't even own the dog, but was considered to be the harbourer of the dog, decided to spend some time in jail on a matter of principle rather than buy a licence for the dog.

The new bill will permit municipalities to issue a tag for each dog, the number of which will be recorded by the municipal clerk. The fee for this is a very nominal fee of 25 cents and it was my thought that this

would be a once-in-a-lifetime registration of the animal.

I would direct the minister's attention to the principle involved in the second clause of section 4, where it says "this tag must be worn by the animal until a new tag is provided the following year." I just don't agree with the philosophy or the principle involved in that section 4. I would think it's unnecessary that the municipality send a new tag to each dog owner annually. I don't think that is right, but it says here "until the owner is furnished with a tag for the following year."

I think perhaps the simplicity of the system is going to be lost if there has to be a new tag provided each year for the dog. We are getting away from the taxing process and we want to go to a licensing process, similar perhaps to what most municipalities do with bicycles. They provide once-in-a-lifetime licensing for bicycles. So, unless the owner loses the licence it would remain the same for the life of the animal.

This is what I think would be much simpler to operate. I'll leave that thought with the minister.

I would commend him once again and thank him for the letter he wrote back to me on Jan. 11, stating that "the proposal seems to have a good deal of merit and we're giving it very thorough consideration."

We will support this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. member wish to speak on this bill? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support indicated by my friends opposite. The point raised by the member for Waterloo has some merit, I would suggest and we will take a look at that particular section. I must confess that when the bill was being drafted, discussed and planned, I was of the impression that the tag could be left with the dog as a licence in perpetuity. But I do note the term is there —"shall keep the tag securely fixed on the dog at all times during the year and until he is furnished with the tag for the following year." That's the point the member is concerned about.

I'm wondering if, perhaps, it could not be left to the municipality to so draft their bylaw to either provide a permanent type of licence and tag, or if they want, draft a bylaw that would require the licence being renewed each year. I think there is some merit in that. We will take a look at that.

There is one further thing I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, when we come back to the committee stage, another matter has been drawn to our attention that I would like to deal with at that time. With regard to my friend from Lakeshore's comments this seems to be, I shouldn't say a perennial comment of his, but I recognize and appreciate the matter. There seems to be some difference of opinion among those who are charged with the responsibility of administering this Act in municipalities as to the inherent costs, or I should say liabilities, of having female dogs running at large in comparison with male dogs, and they seem to govern their licensing fees or structure accordingly.

I really don't think there is anything more that I have to add to the comments that have already been made, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand from the minister he wishes this to go to committee of the whole House?

Agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The third order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

DOG TAX AND LIVE STOCK AND POULTRY PROTECTION ACT

House in committee on Bill 18, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 18, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act. Is there any comment?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Has the minister got one for section 4?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Section 4? Yes. In section 4 I would so amend the bill by striking out all the words beginning in the third line with the word "during" and ending at the comma in the second line thereafter following "year" and replace it with these words, "until it is renewed or replaced." The section would then read: "On payment of the licence fee for a dog, the owner shall be

furnished with a dog tag and shall keep the tag securely fixed on the dog at all times until it is renewed or replaced, but the tag may be removed while the dog is being lawfully used for hunting deer in the bush."

I would qualify that statement this way, Mr. Chairman, that it is up to the municipality to so draft their bylaw accordingly. If they want to do that it is up to them. The second amendment I would like to offer—

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I am sorry.

Mr. Lawlor: Just on the one point, Mr. Chairman, is it the proper time—

Mr. Chairman: This is on the minister's amendment?

Mr. Lawlor: On his amendment, yes. Could he explain to me—it's in the Act and in the amendment, too—what is the business about the dog tag being removed while hunting? Why is that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: When dogs are hunting in the bush with the collars around their necks, they are liable to get caught on a limb or a bit of a tree or a stump or something that would catch them and hold them there, and they would never be found. It is for the safety of the dog that the collar is removed. Owners of dogs can get around that by tatooing them in the ear or in the lip. They do that occasionally, so that the dog is identifiable. But the safety of the dog is what's involved.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any other comment on the minister's amendment?

Shall the amendment carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Are there any other comments, questions, or amendments to be offered?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, I have one other amendment, Mr. Chairman, and that is that section 6 be amended by adding thereto the following subsection :

Said section 7 is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

(3) Every owner of a dog who allows it to run at large contrary to a bylaw made under this section is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine of not more than $50.

Then in section 7 that:

Section 7 be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

This Act, except subsection 2 of section 6, comes into force on the 1st day of January, 1973; subsection 2 of section 6 comes into force on the day this Act receives royal assent.

As amended, as I say, in the explanatory note, the bill imposes a penalty on the owner of a dog running at large contrary to a bylaw passed under section 7 of the Act.

I think this has been drawn to our attention by a judgement that was handed down in Windsor, I believe, that indicated that the dog was being penalized and not the owner. They threw the case out of court and said, "You have got to put the fine against the owner of the dog, not against the dog." We think that this clarifies the matter and brings it in line with the same section of the Act that applies to The Dog Tax Act in unorganized territories. We have moved that section into the other area where it now applies.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: On that amendment, section 8, it never ceases to bemuse me how it is possible for judges to so construe statutes so as to reach that effect. I would be most grateful if the minister or his department would let me have a copy of that judgement for future reference because section 8, I think, is abundantly clear that a $50 fine, exclusive of costs, falls upon every person who contravenes the bylaw.

Why is it felt—I can only take the minister's word for it at this stage—that this new section is necessary? It seems to me to be adequately covered under the existing legislation.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other comments, questions or amendments, or comments or questions to the proposed amendment by the minister?

Shall the amendment as outlined by the minister carry?

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any further amendments, questions, or comments concerning Bill 18?

Shall the bill be reported as amended?

Bill 18 reported.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee of the whole House report one bill as amended and ask permission for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NURSING HOMES ACT

Hon. Mr. Potter moves second reading of Bill 24, an Act to amend the Nursing Homes Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle enunciated in this bill at outset, I would like to assure the minister that our party is going to support this legislation. We have some reservations in some of the sections and the principles enunciated.

There is a great deal of power in this bill. I think it certainly is the hope of all of us in this House that these powers that possibly may have been misconstrued in the past few weeks by the nursing home operators, especially the smaller operators, will not come to realization. Certainly the minister has indicated an amelioration of the situation since he first made his very definite pronouncements in relation to this matter

I think those of us who represent constituencies with small communities and the smaller nursing homes, view this bill with many aspects in mind. Certainly, we are concerned with the care that is going to be given out, first of all to the residents of those homes. This must be the foremost consideration. But in addition to that, the fact that these people are still going to live in their small town communities and not forced to be removed to larger institutions away from their immediate family and immediate friends, is something worth attempting to protect.

The other principle too, in relation to these smaller homes, is that in many cases these are the main industry in some of these small communities. They are large employers of people and require local services and require local goods. It would be a shame to see such stringent regulations being enforced that might preclude the closing of many of these smaller homes. It is with these thoughts in mind that, of course, they are somewhat hesitant in accepting until we get the full explanation to the fine details of the regulations as to what is going to happen and a few months' operation by the nursing homes under this bill as to what the financial structure is really going to be. And whether the department is going to have to take a second look at the financing arrangements made by the province for the health care coverage of the residents.

As I indicated there are several principles enunciated in the bill. In sections 2 and 3, Mr. Speaker, a director is now being appointed to administer the Act and issue the licences. I believe this is a change from when the minister previously had this particular power.

I realize the very onerous duties of the minister, but I had hoped that there would always be an appeal through the minister over the decisions of the director—and the minister does nod assent to this. I always think there should be an appeal to an arbitrary rule by the civil service in relation to these matters. Circumstances do arise in situations where possibly a second look has to be taken at a particular situation.

Section 4 delves into another area. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will be aware that I have introduced a private member's bill into the Legislature on this very topic indicating that possibly we should restrict the issuance of licences to Canadian citizens or Canadian-controlled corporations, and possibly this is worthy of some support.

The minister has indicated that he has a great number of applications on his desk from persons or organizations who wish to construct nursing homes in our province. At least, this was the case several weeks ago before the monetary terms were spelled out; I do not know whether any of these application forms have been withdrawn since that time.

It has been indicated to me that certain financing companies have taken a second look at the nursing home business and have withdrawn the availability of capital in many cases. I am sure it's of concern not only to the nursing home operators, the prospective operators and to the department itself, that this is just not meeting with the enthusiasm there was when we entered into this a few months ago.

It would almost seem, from one or two instances which have been drawn to my attention, that the value of a nursing home licence is now quite substantial. Prior to the enactment of recent legislation, a nursing home licence was certainly desirable and really carried no extra monetary benefit. But now, with the freeze that has been imposed for approximately the past year on new construction of nursing homes, it would

indicate some of these smaller homes, should they decide to close, might have a very valuable piece of paper that they might like to sell to organizations. In a way I am sorry to see this.

I know of one instance in my own community where a nursing home was closed for approximately two years because it couldn't meet the fire regulations of the department after many warnings. Another one or two applications to build large homes had come in for this community, but they were refused, I believe, until one of the companies purchased the assets of the defunct nursing home to the tune of $125,000. The licence was then granted to build a new home, and the old home was turned into a rest home. This appears to be the picture, and I hope that story is not entirely correct and that this system will not develop in the months to come.

Under sections 11 and 12, Mr. Speaker, there are some new and very strong powers, in that the director named by the minister may occupy and operate the nursing home that is not meeting the specifications of the Act and the department in relation to the safety and welfare of the residents.

Certainly, the safety and welfare of the residents must be our prime concern, and although I have some hesitancy in condoning this very strong power, I think the safety and welfare of the residents must take precedence over this. I am pleased to see that included in this section is the clause that this procedure will only last for a period of up to six months or thereabouts, here again depending possibly on an appeal through to the minister. Certainly I can support that particular principle.

Under section 13, there is the principle that every nursing home shall have an extended care unit. I think this is where a lot of the flak arose a few weeks ago in connection with the minister's statement that either you comply or you are basically out of business. I think the minister did receive a lot of good press coverage and editorials in relation to this. Either these people are going to provide these services on the province's terms or change their occupation. It seemed like a pretty tough statement at the time but I believe the situation has mellowed and things are working out much better.

I would like to know if possible how the Queen's selfcare unit at Belleville fits into this pattern. I guess it is really not a nursing home; it is a branch of a hospital but it could add a little confusion to this situation. It is a principle that was enunciated in this Legislature by the former member for Parkdale, Mr. Trotter, several years ago, that we should look into these selfcare units and utilize these facilities. Possibly in the weeks and months to come we will have an opportunity to question the minister in relation to this operation and how it is working.

A few weeks ago I had occasion to meet with one section of the nursing home industry in the province. One of the suggestions or queries that was put to me, Mr. Speaker, was on the fixed percentages of beds as initially announced by the minister. I believe, if I am correct, the province has control of 75 per cent of the beds in these nursing homes and 60 per cent were to be for ward care. At the meeting it was brought to my attention that they might like a little shifting, in semi-private and private care, from the percentage ratios that were originally suggested. I do not know whether there has been any accommodation in this. Possibly the minister will clarify this for the House and the industry itself.

One of the clauses in this section says, "The director may, by order, authorize the reduction of the said facilities, services or bed capacity." I trust this would not only be done if such a case was necessary after we proceed along with the implementation of this Act, but that it will be done both on actuarial grounds for the benefit of the nursing home operators themselves, as well as the health care of the residents of that home.

Under section 16, Mr. Speaker, there is another principle which was drawn to my attention in relation to the keeping of records. It was hinted that the nursing homes might in some instances have to keep records of their patients for a period of up to 20 years. I do not know whether this has ever been really spelled out. I assume it would be in the regulations, but that seems to be a very lengthy period of time. I know, as a businessman, that by law we should keep our records for at least a seven-year period, but a 20-year period seems like a very arbitrary period. I would hope that the minister would inform the House, in relation to this particular matter, the reasons for keeping records for extended periods of time and whether or not this 20-year figure is accurate.

Section 19 deals with the regulations, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose it is the section that has created the most interest and anxiety within the industry itself. I believe the industry may have been a little premature in the

suppositions that passed out to its membership a few weeks ago on the anticipated regulations, with which I certainly could not agree wholeheartedly as they seem to be rather vigorously put. But I suppose one cannot comment too much on the regulations until they are published.

I would hope that there would be a grandfather clause in there which would tend to protect the existing homes that have met all the qualifications of the Nursing Home Act as it applied up to the date of the new Act. If these homes were good enough as far as their physical standards at that time, the day after they should be equally as good, with possibly suggested improvements.

Of course, the emphasis now is on the nursing care; a further step which does not require physical alterations to the nursing homes, but is one of the major considerations in the costing factor.

I believe the minister has indicated that the upper limits on the charges allowable to the residents have been ameliorated, and I think this is good.

This past weekend I happened to have a new nursing home—Country Village Nursing Home—opened at Woodsley. And it had a very fine advertisement in the weekly papers: A two-colour advertisement spelled out very carefully all the rates for the various types of care. I think this is a thing that the average citizen wants to know and needs to know so there isn't confusion in the minds of the people who are potential residents of these homes.

I know it has been suggested to me that there is a great deal of interest in this particular bill by the families of persons who are residents, or who are going to be residents of these homes, as to whether or not these people can qualify.

Certainly there is a great onus on the medical profession to give a determination in this matter, and I hope the public in general doesn't push the ethical position of the medical profession too hard, including we in this Legislature. Sometimes we try to exert influence where possibly it should not be exerted. I hope we don't come under too much pressure from the public in this regard.

Some cynics have suggested that a lot of families of these residents of the nursing homes wish to get them covered merely to inherit the estate. I am sorry to hear comments like this. I know there must be some small element of truth in this regard, we are all human, but I think those of us in responsible positions cannot condone this. We know it will go on; but we can approach this whole matter with the clarity and the real purpose of this particular care.

Under subsection (t) in this section there will be no charges for certain amenities in the nursing homes. As was suggested, in the prior format of the Nursing Home Association some of these appeared to be somewhat arbitrary on facilities, and possibly the minister can explain any change in that particular situation.

The final subsection (v) of this section allows the director to exempt designated nursing homes from specific provisions of this Act or the regulations.

I think this is one of the key clauses in this Act, in that I, and I know many of the members, have visited nursing homes in our own ridings and elsewhere. Many of these homes attempt to and do provide something extra. Possibly they have, over the years and months, built in a very high cost factor with extra service and extra benefits that their clientele was willing to pay for.

There seems to be some indication of an amelioration here in this section, through the words of the minister that these people can be accommodated—for example, those persons who have been placed in these homes under the directions of trust companies—and the very specific recommendations for their care can be adhered to, and there can be some flexibility in the decisions of the director and the ministry in this regard. I think with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my comments with the indication that we'll support this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Parkdale.

Mr. J. Dukszta (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, any proper health care system should in fact include care for children, for mental health, some aspects of preventive medicine, dental care, community support systems, and above all, nursing and chronic care, and for this reason I shall support this bill. But I have serious critical points to make which may nullify some of the approval that I bestow at the moment, and will probably show that I am somewhat ambivalent about voting for the bill, though I approve in principle the extending of care to the people for a number of reasons.

One of them is that there is a tremendous human need at the moment to cover the people who are chronically ill. They have been somewhat forgotten for a long time.

The second point—and I imagine this is in the mind of the minister—is that if you're going to calculate and devise a health system for the future, extension of care to the nursing homes will lower the cost in the long run, though it cannot be probably done fully and efficiently until the whole system is overhauled. For that point of view, again, that's one of the good points about extending care to the nursing homes.

Now, it is a very piecemeal approach of this particular bill, which does not take into account—though I hope the minister will in fact keep this in mind and extend this further—that maybe a more effective way of dealing with the chronic care is not only through the nursing homes the way the bill now provides for, but also to extend it to more extensive home care.

There is already some element of home care in this province, but not enough of it has been introduced. For example, I mean more intensive use of visiting nurses, more intensive use of physicians coming to deal with the patients at home. If necessary, one could pay the family to provide the bare nursing responsibility that the family could provide.

It has, I think, been shown in a number of places that if the family is supported they are more willing to keep the older member of the family, and extend both the protection and the nursing necessary. This has an added benefit, of course, of having the elderly person back in the social matrix from which he came from.

The regimen at the present is that the government is paying $9 and the individual pays $3.50, so the total payment is $12.50. I understand that many of the nursing home operators claim that their costs cannot, in fact, be met by this allowance. The true cost, according to nursing home operators, if $14.50, which is at least $2 more.

An interesting side comment, I think, on the whole system can be gleaned from the remark of G. S. Chatfield—who is a programme co-ordinator for extended health care—which he made on Feb. 23, 1972. He said:

> As the nursing home segment of this programme is almost totally private ownership, a great challenge is thus presented for private enterprise and for government to work together to develop a mutually satisfactory programme in this important health care segment of our social structure.

This to me is very significant, that perhaps even people who are co-ordinating and working within the programme are going to have serious thoughts, as I have, about whether it is feasible in the long run to have a total segment run entirely on a private basis.

If I may, let me return for a moment to the cost of nursing care in other provinces. I could choose from a number of them, but I will choose specifically Alberta, not necessarily because it is a Conservative province but because that particular system—implemented by the Social Credit government—is interesting, complete, comprehensive and much cheaper than the one in Ontario.

If I am correct, as the latest figures show the patient pays $3 per day in Alberta, the government pays $4 and an extra $2 is provided for future capital costs, bringing the total cost to $9, which is still infinitely cheaper than it is here.

I haven't really worked out in my mind why it should be so much cheaper there than it is here. A number of reasons have been given, and the previous Minister of Health (Mr. Wells) has offered as one possible explanation that labour costs in Alberta are cheaper than here. I don't really accept this, nor do I accept that the nursing care given there is so much less than the standard given here.

I suspect the decision made in Ontario to introduce this particular system, and to support to such an extent the private segment of the health industry, has been an ideological one. It amuses me in a way that I, being a socialist, am so much more pragmatic than the Conservative minister who introduces this and who is, I suspect, strictly ideological about supporting the private segment of the health industry. I am not sure, though, whether it is particularly the minister who introduced it or if the prevalent ideology of the government is such that there was no other possible way of doing it.

I would like to make a couple of remarks on the $3.50 which each resident has to pay. I do buy the principle that if someone is on an old age pension he has to pay something toward the cost of the nursing home, because if he were living at home he would have to spend most of that money on his upkeep and his shelter.

What I don't like about this is that $3.50 operates in many senses like a deterrent fee. If we use as an example what happened when OHSIP was originally introduced, the 10 per cent of the fee which the patient had to pay operated very effectively in preventing probably 10 to 15 per cent of the population, the poorer people, from actually going to a physician and requesting his services. What it

is perfectly reasonable to pay if one is a middle-class individual—let's say, $1 per visit —becomes almost impossible to pay for people who are much poorer. In that sense, it is an attempt to control the inflow of the potential users of the extended care system by setting up a deterrent fee as high as this.

I assume that if an old age pensioner is using this system and he gets what will be soon $137.50 per month, most of this money will be used up to pay for his stay in the extended care system. It leaves him literally I think with $1 dollar a day for expenses.

This concerns me and this I would formulate in the form of a question: I would request the people who are designing it that they make a suggestion and request that it should be changed. A dollar a day for a pensioner, for a newspaper or whatever he wants to spend it on, is simply inadequate. It reflects a certain attitude in the treatment of the individual which sees him more like an object—an elderly person who maybe is ready for the compost heap—more than as an individual who still has many years to go and to whom we should, in fact, extend both our sympathy and privileges as much as if he were at full capacity.

I don't consider $1 a day really adequate. If I may again return to Alberta, for example. The pensioners who need nursing care in what they call the senior citizen lodges, which have a nursing component, can have as much as $45-$55 pocket money per month, which really brings it to $2 per day and it becomes more reasonable.

Another attractive feature of the Alberta homes is that they are very small. They have usually about 50 beds each and have now been increased to 65. If we accept all the nursing homes which are applying here to be included under the system, some of our nursing homes are gigantic in size and are very dehumanizing. I am not sure whether, for example, Lambert Lodge comes under this or not but it is an enormous place; it has something like 700 beds. Again I would advise anyone devising the system that one should stress smaller homes and if necessary build smaller homes, because they provide a much more human approach than the others.

I realize that for people who cannot afford to pay this $3.50 from their own pockets, the Department of Social and Family Services will pay for them. Maybe something will be altered in the future, but at the moment it is a dreadful duplication of administration and is probably another element which brings the cost up; the fact that the Department of Health has to apply to the Department of Social and Family Services for this extra money for a sizable percentage of the population in the nursing homes. The sooner the administration is under one roof the better. I say this with some element of hope since these two departments are now combined under one heading and maybe this can be worked out in more detail.

I have a number of points about the money provided. I am actually not quite clear now, in spite of all the questions that have been raised, on exactly the amount of money that has been provided. I understood it was $54 million. I've read in the Star—maybe one should never believe the amounts in the newspapers—that it was $51 million, but will the Act in fact provide care for all those who need it? In spite of what I call the deterrent fee and in spite of the points system which I think may bias those in the grey area, as I think the minister called it—I am phrasing this, Mr. Speaker, in terms of questions to the minister.

I would like some reassurance—and he can reply to this in his closing speech on the Act—on whether the Act will in fact cover all those who need it. How many people will, in fact, be covered? That is the major question.

I will come soon to the point where I think there has been a gross underestimate of the cost made by the government on this Act. The minister spoke of the pilot assessment which he made of the needs for the province. One of the difficulties of the particular pilot assessment has been that his department field-tested 3,500 residents now in the long-term facilities. Based on this and combined with the Ontario Council of Health rate as to the advisable amount of beds per 1,000 population, they've arrived at a certain figure.

I believe strongly that this is an inadequate figure. What has not been taken into account is the list of people who are waiting at the moment for beds in nursing homes. One of the reasons why they have not been able to get into nursing homes is the inadequacy of available facilities, and a second reason is that you have to pay for them from your own pocket. And if you haven't got it, then it is best that you stay in hospital—in either a medical hospital or a psychiatric hospital.

I can assure you, Mr Speaker, that a number of people now in general hospitals who, in fact, have not been able to be placed and occupy very expensive, active beds, will now apply to enter the extended-care system. They will throw out of tilt all the figures

which I think the minister has calculated at the moment. I suspect the need is much, much larger.

The number which I understand has been expressed by the Ontario Council of Health is that there is a need for 3.5 extended-care beds per 1,000 population. Now on my own calculations, I would say that there will probably be at least 30,000 by April 1. By the remarks that the minister has made today it sounded maybe much, much more. If we, in fact, expect something like 50,000 applications the costs will begin to go sky-high.

I do believe that we have to pay. That is not what I am objecting to. I think the government must provide the money if necessary to build extra nursing homes. There is no question in my mind that we must provide this type of care. Where does it fit into the whole context of the provision of health care in Ontario? Why has such a gross mistake been made in miscalculating the amount of people who need the care and the amount of money that will be needed to cover this type of care?

Now the cost per patient-day of the programme is $9, while the cost per patient-year is $3,285. The absolute minimum cost of the programme in the first full year will be something like $75 million—if we accept my extrapolated figures of who will need the care and how many people will apply. The calculations might not be quite as high as 50,000 applications. But if we stick, let's say, to the 38,000 people who have made applications, of which 11,000 have not received approval and will not be admitted to the system, it still leaves a number of people who have already been admitted. So that the cost, if you extrapolate from this, from the $75 million, plus the remarks I've been making on the potential pool of the patients in general hospitals and homes that have not been covered before, the costs between 1972 to 1975 may be over the sum of $100 million. This will have to be found somewhere.

Part of the difficulty in dealing with this large problem is that Ontario, unlike many other provinces, does not have a full system of graduated health facilities. We seem to go straight from the acute-treatment bed in a large, very expensive medical hospital, to a nursing-care home. We lack auxiliary, convalescent and rehabilitation beds which are really necessary to reduce the active-treatment rate of 5.9 beds for 1,000 of population.

Now I understand this is going to be reduced in the future, if my sources are correct, but it will be very difficult to reduce this rate of active beds for each 1,000 of population unless we make a major effort to build rehabilitative services and plan for future community support systems in the health field. It is this relationship, I think, between the active treatment beds and the cheaper convalescent beds which has a direct bearing on soaring health costs.

If I may explain, the more you concentrate on the active treatment beds in hospitals and the less you concentrate on the cheaper convalescent beds, the more expensive will health costs be in the long run. The active treatment bed in a general hospital may cost as much as $109, while a convalescent or rehabilitation bed can cost, maybe, $25 to $30, but usually the range is about $20. The nursing home bed, as calculated here, is $12.50. So the more we push out from the general hospital the people who have no need to be there to the rehabilitation and convalescent beds, the cheaper in the long run the system will be.

Another point to make on the subject is that in Ontario the average 1970 figure of stay for the patient in active treatment hospitals, was 10 days. They stay longer in the active treatment hospitals in Ontario than in any other jurisdiction, province or even, I think, country. We have one of the longest stays in the active treatment beds. I want to stress again how much correlation there is between the stay in the active treatment bed and soaring health costs to repeat that point ad nauseam, the jurisdiction could solve the the question by building nursing homes and building rehabilitation beds which, in fact, in the long run will reduce the costs and improve the health care of the jurisdiction. Just to bring Albertan experience into it again, the cost of a convalescent bed in Alberta is between $14 and $20 per day.

Another problem which occurs in terms of our looking at the active treatment bed in its relation to the nursing bed, is that there has been no considerable mobility between a patient in the active treatment hospital and in a nursing home. Part of it has been obviously due to the fact that no doctor will discharge a patient to a nursing home, if there is still need for nursing care and the patient has no money and he is already in hospital. I wouldn't do it myself. You simply just keep them in an active treatment bed even if it is extremely costly to do so.

So I have a number of those general remarks of criticism about the bill, though I am supporting it. I have not yet finished, because there are a number of other criticisms. But I am supporting the bill because I could never really explain, I think, to any

of my older constituents that I would vote against the bill on those conceptual criticisms. I do want to extend again a warning that the way we have devised the system here in Ontario can only send our costs up and is another addition to the very piecemeal non-system of health care which exists in Ontario.

Basically, the whole concept of approaching nursing homes in this particular fashion by the private sector without co-ordinating them in a totality of health care is ineffectual and will, if anything, produce more of a breakdown of the health system than there is at the moment. I don't want to sound like a Cassandra. The breakdown is not going to occur immediately, but the strain of it will show itself in a constantly increasing cost and a dissatisfaction when people feel the difficulty of obtaining any type of medical or health care.

There are two other criticisms of the bill which I would like to discuss at the moment. I see nowhere within the bill or the regulations or the statement of the minister any concern in respect of all the nursing homes or almost all nursing homes in the province are now privately owned. The large chains, American and maybe Canadian, are moving into the field and they may not move quite as rapidly if they know the exact rate we are paying but they are nevertheless moving in because the profits are to be made; profit can be made in this.

Part of the differential between the Albertan scale and our own Ontario scale is probably that there are profits to be made. It bothers me that such a large segment of health care is so strongly in private hands and so strongly profit-orientated. There are many other ways of looking at it; under no circumstances, am I suggesting that the minister should go ahead and nationalize the nursing homes. I am suggesting to the minister that we should look for other ways of both financing and managing the nursing homes so that they can be nonprofit corporations under the Charitable Institutions Act, and do not have to be entirely reliant on the private sector.

The second point on this is that there has been very little control. I disagree, I think, with the statement made by the previous speaker. I think there has been very little control set up both in the quality of care and general control over the nursing homes. There is control set up on who gets a licence. I think on page 9 it very nicely specifies that an inspector can go—sorry, I should say on page 9 of my copy, that is, section 15, subsection 2, and section 16, subsections 1 and 2—the inspectors can be appointed and can go into the home any time.

I am not sure that this is a particularly effective way of doing it actually. I would say it is probably one of the most ineffective ways of doing it when you have sporadic visits by an inspector. Admittedly, within the context of the Act, the nursing home can or cannot be licensed; what bothers me is that there will be little control set up except, from what I gather from the Act, by sporadic visits by the inspector.

If I may use an example from the minister's own jurisdiction, within the context of the Ontario hospital system. The boarding homes which are set up under the auspices of the Ontario hospital system have very strict control by the staff in the hospital; the books are audited, and the quality and the education of the staff is under fair control. There is constant vigil; almost daily contact between the staff and the boarding homes. In that sense I think we are able to have some control over the quality of care and to know what happens to the patients.

The same system could be in effect here. As far as I am concerned it is much better—and I worked in this system—in terms of providing care for the people who need nursing care, whether it is psychological or physical, than the present system the minister proposes under the extended care Act. I would say that there would be very little control set up and this will be a serious thing. We will probably find considerable complaints coming up later on it.

The last point I would like to make is the choice of control we can exert and the type of control we can exert. The nursing home review board which is to be set up under the provisions of the Act is obviously an essential board so that people can apply for a review if something goes seriously wrong. There is only one board and to return to my previous point there is not enough daily or weekly or monthly control over the nursing homes in terms of the control of the quality of care. No nursing home review board just meeting irregularly, can in fact have enough time or space to deal with all possible things that go wrong in this very large department. There are a number of other ways of doing it. Any type of appointed board tends to have little contact with the people who work and even less with the people who actually use the nursing homes; it gets detached from the problem at hand.

Very typically, I would say, most of the boards of the general hospitals in this province at the moment are appointed from somewhere or other. Their composition does not reflect what goes on in the hospital; above all, it doesn't reflect most of the workers and seems to have very little connection with the patients generally.

There has been no provision in the Act made for any type of community control. I am not suggesting that we should have complete community control over each nursing home, but it would be much more efficient and effective to have the nursing homes controlled by the municipality or by the particular region. In fact, if the government goes ahead with its own regionalization plan, this would provide a natural vehicle for control of all health facilities in the area. If I am correct, there is only one area where this is under way, but it is an extremely good instrument for providing control over care and professions for one particular geographical catchment area.

I would push this particular point: to move the control of the nursing homes, as soon as possible, toward regional boards. I am not happy that regional boards should be entirely government-appointed; they must, in fact, have a large community input. I am not particularly concerned now, because we are nowhere near this stage of community control over our hospital facilities, as to how it should be done, although by particular choice is that the people who use this nursing home must have some ability to say something meaningfully about the decision-making in the nursing home as well as the people who work in it. It has to be done in terms of a tripartite arrangement between the regional board, which represents the government; the people who work in the nursing home; and also the people who use it, which may be either the community or the people right in the nursing home.

I have come to the end of my remarks but there were at least five questions that were pushed in between the remarks I was making; I hope the minister will answer some of those concerns I have about the bill.

To summarize, I am voting, and so is my party, for the bill in principle because we believe that for a long time it has been essential to cover financially the most needy people in our province, the people who are in need of long-term care. I am not concerned with the fact that the money expended on it will rise astronomically, because it is an essential part of our provision of social services for the population of Ontario. But I am concerned that there was a gross miscalculation in terms of the need; I am also concerned that this piecemeal approach to the development of comprehensive health care in Ontario in fact will not solve our major problem in health care, which is that the department and the minister—I hope not—and his advisers have been preoccupied both with the medical approach to health care and with the private segment. They have not been prepared to move fully into a more ideologically free and more technocratically correct solution of the health care problems of Ontario, which would be to look from a societal, community-orientated point of view and not to concentrate entirely on the whims and the privileges and pomp and circumstance of the professions.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I think it was about a year ago when the former Minister of Health rose in this House and told us about this plan, which I am sure was received with open arms by all of us as one of the most progressive steps that has been taken in some time. There was extreme silence for many months about the whole procedure. It was amazing to me that not until the last minute—it was really not until this minister took over, and we begin to hear about how this plan was to be put into effect.

It also is very surprising to me to find that this minister, who is one whom I know is very keen to preserve initiative of individuals and freedom of individuals, is the one who said, "Sign up or be put out of business." Probably the motivation is his concern that, when this plan comes into effect, everyone is being looked after. But it certainly seemed to be out of keeping with the way this minister has operated in the past and his desire to do things in a way that people are not blackmailed, which is the feeling which was certainly given to those who are affected by his order.

I could not quite understand how an operation, which was meeting the requirements for care and facilities and was licensed properly as having met those needs and had operated well for years, would suddenly be faced with the position that it had to decide whether to operate at a loss under the government's plan, agree to that, or be put out of business. It just did not seem to be in keeping. I would appreciate the

minister explaining to us here today, as he goes into the principle of the bill, how the impression we have gained is not correct, because I am sure it could not be correct. I am sure that the minister has provided for variations in conditions, so that those who have been in the business for years, have been taking excellent care of their patients and have been living up to all of the qualifications of a nursing home, are going to be able to continue in business and serve their community. I am sure he needs the beds.

One of the points that I cannot quite rationalize in my mind is how this excellent new idea of self-care in Belleville under the hospital would be costing $25 a day when they are looking after themselves and yet, under the regulations here, nursing home care will cost just half that amount. That seems to me an amazing situation. One pays a motel, being turned over for self-care—and I would think that is what it means, self-care—$25 a day which seems to me an outlandish fee when, for someone in a nursing home we can provide nursing care with a certain number of hours—an hour and a half or whatever is the minimum, and two hours and a half maximum—for $12.50 a day. This is another thing in the principle of imposing a fee that I cannot quite understand in the minister's plans.

Another thing that concerns me is in the regulations. This bill, I understand, imposes regulations that will prescribe how many ward beds will be provided in every home. Many homes have been designed for almost complete private or semi-private care. It is going to require major physical additions or changes in the homes to meet any substantial ward care requirement that the minister is proposing here. Will the government cover this in making changes, so that the people who are operating these homes, can meet the requirements? I would hope that that is in his plans and that he will take that into consideration.

The previous speaker has mentioned the fine results that have come by having statements of hospitals examined carefully and that the supervision of the hospital commission in the past has done a great deal to keep operating costs as well as patient care under good control, or reasonable control, in the light of everything in the past. I am not too sure that has been the case. I am wondering if we are not doing the wrong thing when we work on the basis of what is the return on capital, or what the cost is per day on these things. If we try to set a standard, is that the best way?

I am inclined to feel that we should be moving ahead in making public comparative costs of care and evaluating or rating their patient care in almost the same way that would be done in the tourist industry. If you go to Europe you will find that you can buy a book which sets out the standard of accommodation you can expect to find somewhere. Would it not be wise, in the case of nursing home care, to have an evaluation of the quality of care and the costs made public, so that those who are operating good homes and finding ways of providing the care at low cost are well known? They may find ways of making a good return on their investment at a fee that is well below that of others who, because of their lack of expertise and lack of good staff, require a much greater expenditure of funds.

I would hope that the minister will investigate carefully the methods of keeping some sort of competitive atmosphere between homes, so that there is an incentive to find improved ways of looking after patients and, even at lower costs, not having a standardized atmosphere, one that is beset by regulations and has the same approach right across the province where we in effect put everybody into Procrustean beds. We are all different, each community is different, and I hope that the minister's system for providing this very important new service will allow for variations, will allow for those with initiative and enterprise to be rewarded in accordance with the efforts and skills which they apply to their jobs.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have just a few observations I would like to share with the minister, supporting my colleague from Parkdale in our intention to vote for the principle of the bill. There are others of my caucus colleagues who will be intervening in the debate on other matters.

It is true that the minister's attitude can be seen to be peculiar, in Conservative terms. He has entered this field with fiats handed down on all sides, with a very peremptory and arbitrary attitude, unlike some of his colleagues who have treated the whole field of medical care rather tenderly and have forever been of faint heart to transgress upon the medical Establishment and the existing institutional arrangements.

Not so the Minister of Health (Mr. Potter), the heroic man from eastern Ontario. He has moved in rather toughly and said that the programme is required; the nursing homes will simply have to accept it; these are the percentage arrangements which we will impose on them, require by law, and they will have to live with it.

It is not a stance entirely in the free enterprise manner. The member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) has returned just in time to quiver with apprehension at the centralist tendencies of the Minister of Health. A good thing he is not in charge of small business, or one would not know what might happen. But the minister has applied this centralism to the area of nursing home care, and in a sense, it makes considerable common sense. And we are not inclined to disagree with the minister in some of the strictures he has handed down.

We think that inevitably, when you make this kind of proposal, you have to allow yourself a little more flexibility than appears on the surface.

That may be an unwarranted judgement, but one has the sense—my colleague from Wentworth (Mr. Deans) put a specific case very clearly on the record—one has the sense that for certain nursing homes in the province this may be a very difficult process of adaptation. One has a sense that in the assessment of eligibility there may have to be much greater flexibility.

One has a sense that in the arbitrary pronouncement of 25 per cent of the beds in one area and 75 per cent in the other, there may be some artificial distinctions being applied which will have to be evaluated. That is inherent in having taken the step.

I assume that the minister, in his own very forthright fashion, with the earthy language that he uses on occasion, can cope with those flexibilities.

Let me take that to one of the central points which my colleague from Parkdale made, which is the dependence on and preoccupation with the private sector as the vehicle. There is, of course, nothing wrong—and no one on this side of the House has suggested that there is anything wrong—with agencies in the private sector providing services to government on essentially a non-profit basis. In, in fact, the pattern here is to be one of private profit, there is inherent in the arrangements which the minister has made certain financial problems and certain quality of care problems which will be difficult for the government to administer.

The question of standards will be very difficult for the government to administer, I suggest. That is why I think my colleague from Parkdale made the other observation which we in this party support and intend to make a theme for the next three or four years. That is the sense of the need of overall community orientation of health delivery in the Province of Ontario. To have relied so consistently on the established institutions, on the present medical monolith, on the existing private nursing homes, is to reinforce a pattern of health care in Ontario which is ultimately self-defeating.

I think that is also what was meant in the reflection of "piecemeal" until one deals with the imbalance of active treatment, until one takes an overall look at the disproportionate emphasis on active treatment compared to convalescent and chronic care, having dealt purely with the nursing home phenomena—however desperate that may be—we are still in a situation in Ontario where the whole health system is distorted and where, however noble this one effort may be, we haven't begun to fashion what the Ontario Committee on the Healing Arts would have wished to fashion and what, I presume, the Council of Health also supports.

The kinds of exclusions into which the minister is trapped under this bill really raise some questions, and I don't know how he is going to resolve them all. I presume that when he said in question period that he would feel pressure, he meant that for the 10,000 or 12,000, or 15,000 people who are not considered eligible—and maybe greater numbers than that—there would be considerable pressure applied to all of us to provide for them an eligibility; to take another look at the points system to see whether they don't fall into the so-called "grey" area; to make sure that they are brought before all the regional appeal boards involved in nursing home assessment.

I think he's right. I think the members of the Legislature are going to be under intense pressure to take a look at those who were excluded. The apparent injustice—I think it was dealt with again in the Toronto Star on Saturday—of a patient in a nursing home who is between 85 and 103 years of age being judged ineligible, despite senility, despite arthritic problems, despite the need for partial medical care, if not 90 minutes of nursing care a day; all of these things will make it appear as though there is an injustice here. There will be tremendous pressures on all of us to see whether or not the eligibility

requirement can be changed, or the system upgraded.

I will tell the minister something—if this isn't a presumptous judgement—there is going to be an enormous, an inexplicable bitterness in the nursing homes themselves because on this basis of distinction on a points system between the 75 per cent who are provided with coverage and the 25 per cent who aren't, he is setting up a ready-made incomprehension and antagonism. This will occur not only among patients but among relatives who come to visit and wonder how it is that a 100-year-old mother who is clearly having difficulty making a go of it day by day cannot be eligible for the subsidy which is involved.

What I am really saying, I suppose, is that inevitably these kinds of point applications will create enormous stresses. There has to be something in the application of the law, there has to be something in the administration of the department which mitigates that. I'm not sure what it will be until the principle of entire nursing home care is brought in within the medical care plan and we don't create artificial distinctions on a point basis.

I want to make only one further point and elaborate a little on comments at question period and comments provided by my colleague from Parkdale.

The reason I make the reference to the eligibility requirements, and the reason I raise the question of the acrimony which can flow from a nursing home situation when people appear to be discriminated against for reasons which, I bet, none of us in the Legislature could judge—perhaps the Minister of Health can judge; but many of us won't be able to judge it—is because I am confused as to the advanced planning, as to the principles which were applied to this legislation, as to the amount of thought which was given.

I read in one of the weekend papers, I think it was the Star, that the assessment is made initially on the basis of computers. Well, maybe that's true. But if it's true, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the minister that that's a lousy way to determine eligibility—by way of computer.

It may be that the numbers are so great and the plan was initiated on such an 11th-hour-basis.

Note for Hansard: Let it be said that the minister's head jogged up and down ever so slightly, indicating concurrence.

Maybe it was such an 11th-hour introduction that the only way he can do it is by computer. But let it be pointed out that of the 30,0000-odd applications made, only 6,000 have been verified by medical doctors.

Let it also be pointed out that the medical doctors who filled the forms for eligibility in the first place frequently did so, apparently, without full knowledge of what was required. Without full knowledge of the way in which the forms would be assessed and in much the same haste that medical doctors fill out Workmen's Compensation Board reports. All of us known as members of the Legislature that you have to go back to the doctor 10 times to make it clear to him what it is the agency is asking for, so that the person who is entitled gets his or her full entitlement.

Now, to have relied on a computer-processing operation was, perhaps, irresistible; but it is a very poor way of determining eligibility. I appreciate that it would take a very large work force to examine every application individually, but I would be inclined to think that every application which is rejected, whether in the grey area or not—that is, whether less than nine points or eight points or more than eight or nine points—that every application which is rejected should have serious scrutiny by some part of the minister's administration. I would be willing to bet that 10 or 20 per cent of them will have been rejected purely because the application forms were not appropriately filled out.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise the question of the whole manner of advanced planning is because of the extraordinary, the truly extraordinary, underestimate of financial cost. It is almost beyond belief.

Two weeks ago the provincial Treasurer in this Legislature introduced his budget. The estimates which followed upon the budget within 24 hours set out a total of $31 million for this fiscal year for nursing homes. The provincial Treasurer trumpeted with some pride that this year's deficit would be slightly under last year's deficit. Yet the mistake in estimating costs within this one programme alone will make this year's budgetary deficit in Ontario far greater than last year's.

Now let me take a look at the figures with the minister and flesh them out just a little more fully. As of April 9—I'm using thousands rather than hundreds in my figures, so that the calculation doesn't get to complex. As of April 9, the branch had received 38,000 applications for coverage. Of these, 23,000 had been accepted; 11,000 did not qualify because the branch doesn't reject applications—which is an important point—it deems them ineligible, which means that their eligibility can be raised again. The other 4,000 had been re-

ferred back to the applicant for further information. And thus, of the 34,000 that were dealt with, 68 per cent had been accepted. The cost per patient-day of the programme is $9; per patient-year the cost is $3,285. Thus the absolute minimum cost of the programme in the first full year will be 3,285 times 23,000, which is $75.6 million, which is already $44 million over, or better than twice the amount budgeted in the estimates and presaged in the provincial Treasurer's report.

Now if we distribute the 4,000 applications referred back between those accepted and those that were rejected, if we apply the 68 per cent figure to them, we get an additional 2,720 patient years, an additional $8.9 million of cost, and the total cost then rises to $84.5 million for this fiscal year.

Of the total 38,000, 12,000 or better will be rejected at this 68 per cent ratio, but many of these fall into what the Minister of Health has himself called the grey area, and they will come back for reassessment by the department and they will go to the various appeal boards. Let us assume that just 10 per cent of all the appeals are successful. An additional 1,200 people would then qualify for assistance at a cost of $4 million and the total cost then rises to $88.5 million in this fiscal year.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that in a very serious interview with the Toronto Daily Star, Dr. Barbara Blake, head of the section administering the programme, said that she expects 53,000 applications. I would say that that seems to be quite a legitimate figure. Thirty-eight thousand have come in already. The private sector, as it were, has hardly been heard from, 53,000 seems a modest figure. And if you apply some kind of rough rule of thumb to the other 15,000—let us say not 68 per cent accepted, let's say only 30 per cent accepted, because they come from the private sector—there will still be an initial 4,500 eligible applicants at a cost of $14.8 million, and the total cost then rises in the first fiscal year to $103.3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think any of those figures are unwarranted extrapolations—and again the minister nods his more or less concurrence. I think those figures are fairly legitimate efforts to show what the plan is likely to entail. So instead of a budgeted cost of $31 million, we have a probable cost of $103.3 million.

All right, Mr. Speaker, fair enough. Nobody in this party is going to quibble with the extension of financial aid to cover nursing home care, but let it be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that if such an extraordinary error could have been made on the assessment of the financial costs, then what kind of errors have been made in the determination of eligibility? What kind of errors have been made in the formulae which have been applied to applicants? What kind of errors have been made in the assumption that the nursing homes will meet certain administrative standards and be able to provide the programme? What kind of errors have been made in the assessment of those nursing homes which have provided audited accounts to the government saying they can't hack it on $12.50 a day and the government has arbitrarily said, "you will not get a penny more"?

The confidence in the analysis of the whole bill is necessarily shattered to some extent by the extraordinary error in financial judgement, and I would say that we in this caucus would be inclined to err in favour of the applicants. We in this caucus would be inclined to err in favour of those who feel that for some reason they have been discriminated against on the basis of eligibility. We made the point, Mr. Speaker—the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) made the point fully in the budget reply—that there was more than enough money available from the amount which was to be rebated to the corporate sector for tax credits on machinery and equipment to cover the cost of a programme like this.

If the minister says to me there is money hidden in the community and social services estimate, I would ask him to stand and provide the figures, because we have looked pretty carefully at those estimates and compared them with the public accounts of the last two or three years. It applies only to the homes of the aged programme and I don't really see where the hidden costs are, if there are any.

And even if there were, let me say with respect, a few million dollars in another departmental estimate, it will never bridge the gap between $30 million and $100 million.

I hope, therefore, that in supporting this bill in principle the minister will be able to provide to the House, in his reply, some assurance that a rather better method of assessment and judgement applies to the human aspects of the programme; rather better, for example, than those assessments and judgements which applied to the financial implications of the programme.

Having made those points, Mr. Speaker, I combine with my colleagues to support the bill in principle and look forward to the Health estimates, when perhaps we can move

away from these specific legislative programmes as such and into a general view of the health delivery system that will allow us, overall, to reduce these astronomic costs rather than maintaining them however necessary, through programmes like this. In fact if we shift from acute treatment systems to community health services, we don't have to designate only 75 per cent coverage; we could then include all of those who have reached a certain age and should clearly benefit from the society to which they have contributed and not be deemed ineligible purely because they have only seven points rather than eight.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate?

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): I don't know how extensive the minister is going to be in his reply. I understand that private member's hour begins in just a few moments, and assuming that he has some additional information to give the members of the House then he obviously is not going to have time to complete his remarks now.

So in the one or two minutes that might be available just now, I would like to say that what the leader of the NDP has said about financing must certainly be of great concern to all of us here.

Obviously it would so be to the Minister of Health, unless there is some relatively pat answer; but I can't help but feel that discrepancies in the figures as they have been presented mean that it is going to be impossible for the minister to finance his programme with anything other than a supplementary or a change in the estimates as put before us; or with the payment of warrants for at least a period of the year.

It seems to me there are so many areas where further information is going to be needed that the minister should, and I hope is, considering referring this bill to the standing committee. After all, the bill itself comes into effect on April 1 just passed, so there doesn't seem to be any urgency in its passage, since the minister has the approval of his cabinet colleagues to make use of the undoubted and large majority supporting the government to implement the plan, even though there are some flaws in it.

It seems to me those people in the community, not only the people being served in the nursing homes but those people operating the nursing homes as a business, have the right to put their questions through the members of the Legislature to the standing committee. The minister would be well advised, Mr. Speaker, if he would not attempt to hurry the bill through the legislative process, but use it as a vehicle not only to, I suppose educate himself and his own advisers in what is relatively, for us, a new field—and obviously a very expensive one—but use it in a broader way as a vehicle to educate the community in the cost responsibilities as they will be now and as they probably will escalate, not only in this coming year but in the immediate future. It could also be used to give those people in the nursing home business, who have I suppose complained to every member of the Legislature—although as far as I'm concerned not in great numbers, but with legitimate complaints—to give them an oportunity to hear the minister and his advisers explain the rationale behind the decisions taken in this bill.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, that it would give the minister an excellent opportunity to rationalize the problems that seem to be appearing—and monstrous problems they are—in the financing of even the first year of this operation.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would urge the minister to give careful consideration to putting this before the standing committee. He would be most unwise to give the impression to this House, his own supporters included, that he is attempting to use the majority simply to push through what has been arrived at, let's say in the hurry of the fulfillment of a political promise, even though that promise was enunciated almost a year ago now.

The Minister of Health is not that kind of a person; I'm sure he would want to give every person in the community—the legislators, the community of older people needing nursing home care and those people in the business—every opportunity to find out the reasons for decisions taken by the minister. I hope he will not put the lid on the possibility of having this bill go to the standing committee without giving it that careful consideration.

Mr. Deans moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 6, by Mr. Eaton.

Resolution: That in the opinion of this House the right to vote on farm marketing plans and take office as a director on a farm marketing board should be limited to those producers who have sold a minimum of $1,000 worth of the produce to be regulated under the marketing plan in a period of the 12 months previous to a vote regarding the regulating of the product or to an election of directors to the board, and show proof of same.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in moving this resolution, seconded by the member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve).

As some of the members may recall when I made my speech seconding the Speech from the Throne, I spoke of a need to ensure that those voting on marketing plans have a reasonable portion of their income at stake. This resolution suggests that very thing, that a producer must have marketed at least $1,000 worth of product in the previous 12 months to vote on a plan that is to regulate that product; that he must show proof of the same; and also that to sit on a marketing plan board he must have the same qualifications.

I would like to put before the House some of the facts as to the need for this type of action. Perhaps it came most clearly to the attention of the public at the time of the proposed vote on the egg marketing plan last year, with the sudden creation of instant voters by the passing out of a few hens to individuals who had little or nothing at stake in the proposed plan.

Some questioned that this could actually be done, but one committee man involved in the egg marketing programme certainly proved it. I would like to quote from the Farm and Country magazine:

A Protest That Shows Elections Can Be Rigged

Who speaks for the farmers? This question has to be answered sooner or later. At the recent Lennox and Addington egg meeting Bath farmer Roland Stalker was returned comfortably as a committee man to the provincial board.

During that meeting he announced that his election was helped by instant voters who had bought hens for $1 each. In all probability, Mr. Stalker would have been re-elected without the extra help, but he took this unusual step to protest the current electoral procedures.

Over and over again commercial family farmers have complained that too many people without a stake in the industry influence policy. The situation reached serious proportions 15 years ago when forces opposed to agency marketing rounded up innocent bystanders with one, two and three peach trees in their backyard. They were told their freedoms would vanish should producers be so foolish as to vote in favour of fresh peach marketing.

Fortunately, that plan carried and some other plans carried despite this sort of action, but I think what Mr. Stalker showed was that a problem existed and was made unfortunate use of. Sometimes it probably didn't have any effect on the change of directors or the voting, but this type of vote has been used unscrupulously to remove directors from boards and place people on boards who have little at stake, and usually very little to offer to that particular industry.

In one particular case the producers who did have something at stake righted this situation the following year by turning out in force, and also perhaps bringing some instant voters of their own with them, and replacing a director. But I question whether the end justifies the means and point out that it would not have been necessary had the rights of producers been previously considered.

I would point to another case that I have personal knowledge of, where a man had not produced in the previous year and indicated that he was not going to produce in the next year, yet he stood for election as a director of a board, and was elected to that board.

One can go over many of the marketing boards in this province and find numerous examples of directors who have little at stake in the marketing of the product, but who are available. These people are usually elected by those who do not have a reasonable financial interest at stake in the industry, but rather have very little at stake and are also available to go out to meetings.

Let us look for a moment at some of the examples of how those producers who sell a reasonable portion of a crop can be outvoted by those with little at risk in the industry. I would like to refer to some statistics from the Ontario Apple Producers Marketing Board in which they indicate they have a list of 2,392 growers reporting apple trees. Of that, 846 have less than 30 trees—less than 30 trees—and another 597

have less than 150 trees. So over 1,400—1,443 to be exact—out of that 2,392 growers, have less than 150 trees. A very small portion of their income is at stake, yet they have more than the majority vote of the producers involved.

We can go on and look at the pork producers in the province. There are a total of some 31,214 registered in Ontario. Eleven thousand, seven hundred and twenty, or 37 per cent of that total, produce over 90 per cent of the total pigs in Ontario. The converse of this is that 19,494, or 62.4 per cent of the producers, market only 9.4 per cent of the product. In other words, these producers who produce less than 10 per cent of the total production have, without a doubt, voting control of the product.

Let us examine it a little bit further. Fifteen thousand of these 19,000 producers shipped less than 25 hogs. In fact, the average that they shipped was nine. If we figure this at approximately $50 per head, it gives us an average of $450 income from their hog enterprises. In my opinion it is not a very legitimate amount to warrant control of the hog industry to these people. The marketing policy applicable to those who depend on the pork industry for a reasonable portion of their income shouldn't be controlled by that group of producers.

Let us also look at eggs. I would like to point out here both the voting power of the producers in relation to production and also the committee man representation in relation to those two items.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Look at the voting power in the House here! Those fellows opposite had only 49 per cent of the vote, yet they have all the say.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Glad to see you back, Eddie, you have been away for a few weeks.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: He's losing his tan. Have you been to Cuba?

An hon. member: The Liberals don't have much in Florida either.

Mr. Eaton: I would just like to examine a couple of zones in the egg marketing plan—zone 1 in particular, in the counties of Essex, Kent, and Lambton.

Essex county has 134 producers with some 270,000 hens, and Kent county has 167 producers with some 359,000 hens. Lambton county, in turn, is part of that zone and has 268 producers, but they have one million, two hundred and some odd thousand hens.

In other words, the production of approximately one half the amount of eggs in Kent and Essex has more voting power than all of Lambton county; and this is further exemplified by the committee men representation which gives Kent, with one quarter the production of Lambton an equal number of committee men—eight—and Kent and Essex combined almost twice the committee men, 14 to eight.

This is even further exemplified in zone 2 where Elgin, Oxford and Middlesex counties are together. Middlesex produces 1.4 million hens. I would just make a comment there that we have more hens in Middlesex county than any other county in Ontario. Yet in comparison to Elgin county, where there are 274,000 hens, and in Oxford, where there are 46,000, they are outnumbered in a committee vote by 13 to 11. So the representation certainly doesn't compare favourably with what the individuals have at stake in the industry.

This lack of proper representation may have led to some of the problems we find in the egg industry. I would just like to note some of the recommendations made by the report of the royal commission appointed to inquire into the egg industry in Ontario.

First of all, there is the implementation of a marketing plan for eggs without a producer vote. Under any other conditions than those which prevail in the industry at the present time, I would take quite an exception to a plan being brought in without a vote.

It is my firm opinion that those producers who have a reasonable stake in the industry should have an opportunity to express their views. However because of my contact with egg producers, I certainly feel that had those with a reasonable stake in the industry had the vote last year, a plan would have been brought about much sooner. I know that concerned egg producers, representing approximately 85 per cent of the production in Ontario, asked that a plan be brought in without a vote.

In my opinion, the resolution which I have presented gives this type of producer a proper and just say. I do note that the report would exempt producers of 500 hens or less from the plan; and I assume this also would exempt them from voting and holding directorships on the egg marketing board.

This brings me from the point of a need for action on the resolution to the desire of the producers to have some guidelines laid down. The egg producers did ask previously that this exemption be brought in and at that time were turned down by the Farm Products Marketing Board. I feel this resolution can give the Farm Products Marketing Board the guidance necessary to bring these changes about.

I would also bring to your attention desires of other producer groups. The Apple Marketing Commission has suggested that those who have contributed less than $25 per year in fees be exempted. This would represent approximately $600 worth of produce, so you can see that the basic part of their income is not tied to what they are producing under this plan.

The Pork Producers Marketing Board passed a resolution at their annual meeting asking for definition of who should be eligible to vote, taking into consideration the fact that the producers have been in production a reasonable period of time. The pork committee in Middlesex county passed a resolution, and I quote from it:

> Whereas for the best interest of the pork industry and the pork producers of Ontario, it is realized that 50 per cent of the producers market 25 hogs or less per year, therefore, be it resolved that to be eligible to be a councilman to the Ontario Pork Producers Marketing Board, he shall market a minimum of 100 hogs a year or maintain a herd of 25 sows or more.

This would result, at average prices, in a return of somewhere around $5,000 per year. In my opinion that may be a bit high. However it brings out the fact that although there is agreement on the need, there is some difference of opinion as to the level at which this voting right should be established. This is exemplified in the fact that the general opinion of the Ontario Commodity Council seems to be that each marketing plan should have fixed in its plan the qualifications for voting on that particular commodity.

I certainly can't take too much exception to this. I respect the opinions of the gentlemen who take part in the deliberations of the commodity council. They are all quite involved in marketing. I have had many discussions with them and I know they gave it considerable consideration. However, I do feel I can take some exception and I think that if we are considering income the level should be the same, probably, for all commodities. For instance, we base the payment for our grants in Ontario on an income of $3,000 worth of farm products and do not base the payment on different levels depending on which product you are producing. I think perhaps we should pay some attention to this in making this decision.

This is the reason I have moved this resolution with the one level for all commodities in mind. I believe it is an attempt to prevent the abuse of voting privileges on marketing plans. It is to give the decision to those who are affected and to establish, with that right to vote, a degree of responsibility. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to support the resolution in principle. I think the resolution is worthy of support.

One can get into all sorts of arguments about levels and where the cutoff should be, and I really don't want to get into that this afternoon, because one can argue back and forth all day and really not resolve the problem.

The thing I want to support is the fact there should be some cutoff at which people who have a legitimate stake in the industry and who would come under the terms of any particular marketing plan should be allowed a vote. Those who really don't have anything at stake, and who really have only a passing interest in an industry, should not really be involved or should not be allowed to vote on a particular marketing plan. They are affecting the decisions of people who make their bread and butter and their living from the sale of that product, and really they are in a completely different class.

I think the example used of the egg marketing plan and what happened last July is a very legitimate example of what can happen when everybody can vote on a particular marketing plan. Both those who oppose and those who support have very strong feelings and arguments to back up their position; and both tend, in their exuberance, to attract people to one side or another. In so doing, and I suppose it is a human tendency, they are not above doing things which perhaps are not in the best interests of the industry.

I think that is what happened last July, or just prior to July. We moved up to an egg vote, and within the last week there was a tremendous number of registrations, most of whom were not legitimate egg producers. So I think the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) very wisely said no, we would not have a vote at that point; because it was obvious the vote would have been lost.

Those who registered late were opposed to the plan, and I will show in a minute that most of them, as a matter of fact all of them with the exception of one, were not producers. They were given one or two or three or four hens at the last minute in order to qualify under the plan.

Even at that some of them who registered who had no hens at all, but were able to get registered because they had a particular friend in the industry who said: "Look, if you vote a certain way we will see that you get registered." I certainly do not think that type of thing is good for the industry. It is certainly not good for the people who have a real stake in the industry and who have to make their living from it.

For instance, I have a rundown of some of the people who were registered last July. This is in eastern Ontario. These people were registered the last week before registration closed, and I am just going to give the House a few examples of the people who were registered at that time. I do not want to indicate the names, I will just indicate the circumstances concerning the registration.

For instance, here is a gentleman who was registered. He said he had no hens, never had and never would have any, and yet he was registered. Another one worked in a factory and had a few hens for his own use. Another example: No one at home, fallen down henhouse; yet he was registered and could have voted on the plan. Another gentleman here has not had hens in three or four years and did not intend to have, but he signed the registration as a favour to the person who was taking it around.

Here is another one: He was a Gulf fuel dealer, he had no hens, he had never been in the business; and yet he was registered. Another gentleman had 24 hens; no more in the past, no more in the future; he was signed up. Another gentleman here had 24 laying hens; has not had more for a long time; no more in the future. In other words, he just had a few hens for his own use. Retired gentleman; 16 hens, obviously just for his own use; no real stake in the industry. One here had 62 cross-bred banties for meat and eggs, and he was signed up.

So whoever took that petition around was certainly going to great lengths to sign up people.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Did Colonel Saunders have a vote?

Mr. Gaunt: Maybe he would have had they taken the petition around to him.

Another gentleman: 25 hens, no real facilities; just had them for his own use. Here is another gentleman: No hens; he had two banties; eight years since he had had hens. Another one: 11 hens, three to four years of age; too tough to stew; they—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): They'd be good for Sunday dinner, eh?

Mr. Gaunt: —kept laying and he just kept them around the farm; he was registered as well.

So it goes, on and on. I think the point is made that these people should not have been registered; and had they gone ahead with the vote, certainly I think it goes without saying that the vote would have been turned down. And the people who would have been mainly responsible for turning it down were these people whom I just cited—the very small operators, the people who just had a few hens for their own use and really had no interest in the industry; they had no real financial interest in the egg business, yet they were on the list.

The member for Middlesex South mentioned the egg report that Judge Ross brought out. The interesting statistics, as far as I am concerned, related to the people who have less than 2,000 hens. There are 18,916 of those people, as opposed to 955 people who have more than 2,000 hens. So we can see the weight of a vote; we can see the preponderance of those under the 2,000-flock limit having a great deal more to say than the people who have very large operations.

Mind you, I am not suggesting for a moment that smaller producers not be given a vote. I think they should be given a vote provided they are making their living, or a good part of their living, out of producing eggs. But when we get into this business of 10 or 12 hens, obviously the fellow really has no interest in the industry and should not be given a vote on a particular plan.

I think Judge Ross recommends that those with less than 500 laying hens be excluded from any vote. Here again one can argue. I think there is a certain amount of validity here. Once you get over the limit of 500 you have got to become mechanized to a certain extent; you have got to invest some dollars in equipment and facilities. After that point I think people should be allowed a vote.

I notice the resolution ties it to a dollar value. There is validity in that, simply because it could be applied across the board and not to any one particular industry. Having regard to the egg business, $1,000 a year would

mean the person would only have to have something in the neighbourhood of 200 hens in order to get in and be able to vote. Maybe that is a little low; but as I said at the outset I do not want to get into that kind of argument, because it can go on all day.

Any limit you set is bound to be arbitrary; there has to be some cutoff point. My view is that the dollar value criteria is good. I think it is wise to attach it to a dollar value and to make it applicable to every vote rather than saying 500 hens in the case of an egg vote, 50 hogs in the case of a hog vote, and so on. If you put it on a dollar basis then it is much more practical.

Mr. Stokes: Maybe we should vote on this! Is the minister with us today?

Mr. Gaunt: As for the matter of people sitting on the board as directors, I think it is a reasonable position to suggest that those people who sit on any given marketing board once again have a real and current interest in the industry.

I can think of one marketing board, the Ontario Cream Producers Marketing Board, where there was some discussion two or three years ago about that board and the fact it was really made up of men who were retired —men who were undoubtedly knowledgeable in the area of cream production but were not active producers at that particular time.

There were many people—certainly I had some representations—who felt this just shouldn't be so. As it turns out, that is no longer the case.

I think it certainly points up the fact that a group of people which has good contact within the industry and which has acknowledged expertise and knowledge is liable to get itself elected to the board and maintain itself in office over an extended period of time. To a certain extent that really isn't fair to active producers, because even though these people are very familiar and very knowledgeable, it's always a possibility that time can pass them by, that circumstances can confront them with which they are really not familiar and with which they really can't cope. If the people on the board are in the industry up to their necks, so to speak, then they'll make the decisions that are in the best interests of the producers. I am not saying these other people don't, but at least they have more chance to err—I think that is the way to put it.

So in summary then, I just want to say we support the general principle of the resolution and the general tenor of the resolution which has been expressed. The mechanics of it one can argue about all day, but I think there should be some provision under the marketing legislation of this province to exclude the very small, "hobby" producers in any given segment of the agricultural industry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, when I first read this resolution on the order paper the suspicion which government policy has tended to engender on this side of the House, led me to suspect that in this instance the hon. member was being a forerunner for the government on whatever it has in mind with regard to the egg plan following the Ross report. Having listened to the hon. member I think my suspicions may have some validity, but I must confess that, obviously, he is a little tortured in defining exactly what should happen. He confesses to us that he had always supported the proposition there should be a vote of producers before the government establishes a marketing plan.

It seems to me that to establish a producer-control led marketing plan without a vote is something of a contradiction that must be evident even to this government. But then he wondered whether or not, because of the situation in the egg industry, there was any other alternative but to move forward without the vote, unless we got some clarification of who has eligibility to vote.

What you have in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member's rushing in where the government has failed to lead all down through the years, namely on some basic definition of what is a farmer, what is a producer. Admittedly there are in the farm community many crosscurrents with regard to it. But it is so basic, in terms for example of attempting to formulate a policy on income that might meet the needs of people who are genuinely farmers; or again it is so basic in terms of establishing marketing plans because it establishes the eligibility of those who are going to vote, that it would seem to me the government should have grasped this nettle years ago.

It is rather interesting that we should have this spectacle, if I may put it in rather harsh terms, of a backbencher in the government party, a newcomer in the House, coming in and in effect placing this squarely on the

table and saying something must be done about it.

I have already indicated that what it raises really is the question of what is a farmer, what is the definition of a farmer? I discover in talking to some of my farm friends that there is a great deal of thought being given to this at the present time. Some of the thought seems to be running along the lines that a farmer might be defined as a person who has either $3,000 gross income, or 50 per cent of his total income, from farming. The argument is that if he hasn't got $3,000 gross income he isn't really a farmer; and if he has a problem—and surely he has a problem—it's a social problem rather than an agricultural problem. Fine; I think that's fair enough.

An alternative to that definition of a farmer—$3,000 gross income or half of his income coming from agriculture—is that a man should be designated as a farmer if he has $10,000 gross income from farming irrespective of what proportion that may be of his total income. At least with $10,000 gross income he has a stake in the industry and he is entitled to be able to voice his views.

Be that as it may, some time—either in agricultural circles or in government circles—we will get some consensus on this definition of a farmer. But precisely because we've got such crosscurrents in the agricultural community at the moment—between agricultural organizations, to say nothing of all the various commodity groups and their various characteristics—I don't think we're going to get a consensus if the government isn't willing to give some leadership. If it isn't willing, at least, to move in, as this resolution in fact invites it to do.

A second aspect, having defined a "farmer", one has to go a step further and define a producer of any given commodity. I would agree that becomes very necessary. Not only necessary, I think it should become part and parcel of the marketing plans so that from this point forward, we aren't operating in the dark; we don't know, exactly, the ground rules that we've got to abide by.

However, one thing really puzzles me—I suppose my approach is something like that of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce—but one comes to grips with the figure of $1,000 which was specifically stated in the resolution itself.

Who knows whether $1,000 is the appropriate figure? In some commodities it may be too low. For example, $1,000, in the marketing of hogs or in the marketing of beef or even in the marketing of poultry is pretty low for an annual gross income.

In some instances it may be too high. Are we going to chase out of the industry everybody who happens to be in it as part of an agricultural mix? I grant you the mixed farming of yesteryear is tending to go by the board in favour of greater specialization. But do we really want to force that on farmers to an even greater degree than economic conditions already have. The line has to be drawn somewhere; but where is the line going to be drawn?

The hon. member cited examples of eggs and a few other cases where a very large percentage of the producers were actually marketing a very small percentage of the product. He suggested that many of these people don't have a stake.

You know, if one goes to the Ross report itself, which has just now become available to us, one can take the figures which he has provided and they illustrate the problem that we've got to grapple with.

He points out, for example, that producers with 527 hens and under—that's roughly the under-500 group which he has said could be exempted—he points out that in 1961 they numbered 50,989. In 1971 there were only 18,080. In short, we had a drop from 50,000 down to 18,000.

Clearly they are being weeded out by the economic forces in the marketplace The fascinating thing, Mr. Speaker, is this: There are 18,080 producers with under 527 hens; and in the four large categories, there are 502, 334, 195 and 760 producers for a total of 1,791 producers. What in effect he is saying is that we should set up a marketing plan, without a vote, in which 18,080 producers are going to be excluded altogether, and 1,791 producers are going to be included.

Well, obviously, at first blush this is a pretty extraordinary kind of thing!

Now the hon. member for Middlesex South drew the line rather arbitrarily at one point; but pursuing these figures for a moment, I will show you just how difficult it is to come to a decision as to where you are going to fix it.

For example, in the largest flocks—the category of 4,973 and over or 5,000 and over hens—there are only 760, only 760, of the 1,791 producers that the Ross report suggested should be involved in the plan. Yet those 760, roughly 40 per cent of the producers, produced 86 per cent of the eggs! And that is the only one of the rather anomalous situations you get into.

There is another quotation, on page 13 of the report. Let me quote one sentence:

> Contracts and direct ownership of facilities by feed manufacturers and hatcheries, totalled at least 42 per cent of the hens in flocks over 1,000 hens in 1971.

In other words, a very significant proportion of the people who are going to be eligible to vote in this plan aren't really operating as independent farmers. It is contract farming, it is vertical integration; that thing which the minister periodically becomes very wrathy about and says has to be eliminated if we are going, ultimately to protect the family farm.

When the hon. member for Middlesex South speaks of eliminating all of the small producers and granting the right to vote, and therefore control of the marketing, to those who are the large producers, he is really describing a situation that is characteristic of all of the commodity groups, indeed of most industry today. Normally one has heard from the government side of he House—it is part and parcel of Tory mythology—that they are the protectors of the little man. Yet now they come forward with a proposition in which all the little men, 18,090 of them, are going to be wiped out of the picture and only 1,760.—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, they are going to be excluded from the plan! They are going to be excluded from any control of the marketing arrangement, and only 1,790 are going to be included.

In short, while I commend the hon. member for bringing in a resolution which seeks an answer on an issue which this government has evaded for a long time, both in his resolution or in speaking to it, he has not resolved the basic problems. He has really done no more than the government, which has evaded the problem all down through the years.

Now one final point on the question of election of directors to the board which is encompassed in the resolution too: I would agree. I checked as late as today with some knowledgable people in the agricultural industry and it was their impression that we are moving pretty quickly to that. In some of the instances the hon. member cited people who weren't really producers continuing to control and sit on marketing boards, but I think that is an exception.

And I would agree it should become an exception; not only an exception, it should be ruled out altogether! Surely some guidance, again from the provincial level, in terms of what should be put into the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Act, would be a legitimate proposition on this, as well as on the thorny and complex earlier issue of defining a farmer and who is going to be eligible to vote.

In short, Mr. Speaker, to wrap it up—I am going over my allotted time—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): The member can have mine, too!

Mr. MacDonald: —the principle of what the hon. member is seeking to do here is a good one. It is something that should have been done a long time ago; but he hasn't really come up with an effective answer. He has rushed in where the government has failed to lead; in fact we are still back where we have always been all down through the years!

Mr. Deans: Somewhat like fools rushing in where governments fear to tread!

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): I take great pleasure in supporting this bill, but I certainly cannot agree with the member for York South when he blames the government for the problems of marketing in general.

I believe the $1,000 does appear to be a small amount of money to allow people the privilege of voting. But on the other hand, there is a transition, as has been pointed out, where many of these smaller operators are dropping out because it is not profitable.

But we do have such a thing as marginal farmers, who possibly are in different fields of agriculture, some part-time. Nevertheless these people derive a livelihood from it; they are not on welfare, they have no academic standing nor qualifications, at 45 or 50 years of age, that will fit them to go out and acquire a job in industry. Yet they are the people that have their taxes paid when they come due in the fall.

I feel—they should not be ignored completely—but at time goes on, sooner or later they are going to be separated from the successful operators who have a heavy investment and equipment and such like. Nevertheless, these people will see for themselves that it is not a paying proposition for them to carry on. But as of now I do not

think we should in any way leave the impression that the small people are completely put out of the picture altogether.

It is hard to say where the amount should be or the number allocated; but I do know of four operators in eastern Ontario who have gone into bankruptcy for sizeable amounts of money in the last three weeks. These people have had success in years gone by. They modernized because of labour problems and labour shortage and got in just a little bit too deep at the wrong time. I would say as a result hens were much cheaper a year ago in eastern Ontario than you could buy them in Middlesex South. You could buy as many laying hens as you wanted at 25 cents apiece. Now that situation is a disaster, as anyone knows.

I do feel this is a step in the right direction. I agree it may not have the answers to everything, but at least it is a start. We found out last year it was an utter impossibility to allow a vote when you found out that over 50 per cent of the producers produced less than five per cent of the eggs.

Unfortunately, we have people in a democratic system of government who agree and disagree. Therefore they are allowed to think as they like. However the time has come when we have to have restrictions to help the farmer and the producer of any commodity, because these people need guidance. The government can be helpful, but we have to have systems which will be helpful in themselves.

I feel very strongly that something has to be done—and done very, very soon—because the egg industry, as you know, is in a critical and disastrous situation. As far as orderly marketing in concerned, I think the Milk Marketing Board has proven beyond doubt—and I have differed with it quite often in its decisions—but as far as our particular area is concerned, where over 90 per cent of the producers are industrial milk producers, it has put them on their feet. Dairy cattle are selling at a price unheard of before. Commercial cattle, young calves for raising, are selling as high as 80-85 cents a pound.

They never had better returns financially. The fact the milk industry has control under its quota system. Supply and demand have to come into any picture in order to produce at a satisfactory profit.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, I would recommend all sides of the House to give this bill serious consideration. I'm sure the mover, as well as myself, feels we're quite open to have free discussion and views on the matter, but something has to be done in the very near future to help this industry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I'll join briefly in discussing the resolution we have before us today. It is something that has been under consideration for some time in some areas.

I have had discussions on this with some people in the farming areas, where perhaps farmers should be licensed in order to have any right to vote on marketing legislation. Perhaps that is something that will have to be looked at in the future.

Some people say a farmer is a man outstanding in his field, and of course they have to be in order to compete nowadays, with the price for which they sell their goods.

The limit here of $1,000, as was mentioned before, is probably a little difficult to comprehend in some areas. It would probably depend to some extent on the type of articles the farmer was producing. The member for Huron-Bruce mentioned that probably about 200 hens would qualify him for $1,000 worth, where Judge Ross says he thinks 500; so there's a difference of opinion with the report and the member's resolution.

In a number of other areas too, if a farmer was voting on a corn vote or anything, he may only have to produce 10 acres. It is very small, and I would imagine that in some areas on this type of thing you would have to have larger amounts, depending on the commodity you were voting on.

With regard to the farm tax rebate, there was never anything specified when the government brought that in. I believe it was 11 acres or more that made him eligible for the tax rebate. However if he had under 11 acres and he had $2,000 that would also make him eligible. Well a good many small farms could have 25 acres and not have $2,000 of income, and they are still receiving the tax rebate. So there is a large area there concerning what is a farmer and what is not.

I think under the Municipal Assessment Act a farmer's sons and daughters and so forth could vote. As long as it was assessed as a farm then all his children could vote. Perhaps on only 50 acres he might have five or six voting in municipal elections, where at the same time a person could be living in a large home with that many children and none of them could vote because they were not on a farm. So there is great discrepancy going on.

However we can see this, our society has changed so much from its farming base of the past. So many people went out of farming. With modernization we don't seem to need so many. I think one farmer produces food for about 45 people now because of modernization, and the large tractors and machinery and everything else that he has available for him; so this has quite an influence on these things.

I think with a member of the government bringing in this resolution at this time, it has been mentioned that this could mean something will be taking effect, that legislation will be coming in before too long on this.

I would hope with the report of the royal commission on eggs, and so forth, that perhaps the government will be taking steps to improve the situation in the agricultural areas; and of course marketing is one of the most important parts of that.

We always have been great at producing our farm commodities. There is never any shortage of them; and farmers are great to work and get out and produce. But we are not always sure whether we are going to sell it and how much we are going to get for it. Now we seem to be going into another era where we are looking at the sales and the income we are going to get from produce. Because of the high cost of operations, we must have some guarantee as to what we are going to obtain for the work and the investment we have.

So I think this is probably a step in the right direction and join with my colleagues in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone need debate much longer the intent of the resolution that is before us. I doubt if there is any person in this House who would feel more strongly about the need to permit voting to take place in the setting up of any organization than I would. Yet I recognize that over the years there has always been a problem of determining guidelines—who will be eligible; the eligibility in almost every single area in the farm community.

One thing that has always bothered me though, and it still does, and it was referred to rather extensively by my colleague from York South, is the problem raised when you set those guidelines centring the power in the corporate boardroom, rather than leaving the power in the hands of the smaller operator, but nevertheless, the family farm. I suggest that in setting limits perhaps the dollar evaluation is not the best way of resolving it, when one might consider that any given time, due to unforeseen circumstances, a person who had quite legitimately been involved—in this instance in egg production—might find that in that given year, the year in which the vote is to be taken, he is temporarily not as active as he might have been previously.

I think those things have to be taken into consideration in determining the eligibility of any person to participate in a vote. There are farmers who, for reasons of health and other reasons—in fact reasons of expansion—in any given year find themselves not producing at the level they normally would; and thereby it is conceivable, though perhaps not as likely as the opposite, that these farmers may find themselves denied the opportunity to participate in the vote as a result of setting some kind of dollar level for income from that commodity.

So I would suggest that while we all recognize the need—and there is no one in this House who would deny the need to establish firm and fair guidelines as to eligibility—that the government, in considering this resolution, consider all of the implications of it, recognize that much of the farming—particularly in the egg industry although in others too—is starting to centre on the corporate farm as opposed to the family farm, and that we in Ontario do want to preserve the family farm. We want to do what can be done and must be done to ensure that those people who have devoted so much time to the development of a farm are able to participate and to maintain their interest.

I think that in looking at the resolution the minister has to consider it.

I hope he considers it; I know he is here. He has to consider there are a great many other problems other than just simply the amount of income derived in the year in which the vote is about to be taken, and those other problems have to be considered alongside that particular one.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 10, 1972

Municipal pounds assistance programme, statement by Mr. Stewart ... 983

Tabling report, law reform commission on municipal land and development control, Mr. Bales ... 983

Workmen's Compensation Board inquiry, statement by Mr. Davis ... 984

Environmental hazards involving snow dumping, statement by Mr. Auld ... 985

WCB committee hearings, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis ... 986

Location of new airport, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis ... 986

Ontario scholarships, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shulman 987

Estimate for nursing home care requirement, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Paterson ... 988

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis ... 989

Salary discrepancies at Toronto university, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis ... 989

Refusal of employment at Ontario Place, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall ... 990

Use of NTA in detergents, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Haggerty ... 990

Medicare costs, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Paterson, Mr. Lewis ... 990

Staff shortage at Ontario Securities Commission, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman 991

U.N. conference on human environment, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Good, Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 991

Jurisdictional problem at Hamilton Harbour, questions of Mr. Auld and Mr. Bernier: Mr. Deans, Mr. R. F. Nixon ... 991

Staff shortage at Ontario securities commission, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Shulman 992

Medicare coverage for persons without hospitalization coverage, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Paterson, Mr. B. Newman ... 992

Solitary confinement of Don Jail inmate, question of Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Mr. Lawlor ... 993

Federal price, profit and wage controls, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Ruston ... 993

Hazards of spraying with TCDD, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Germa ... 993

Study sessions held by high school teachers, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Foulds, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Cassidy ... 993

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 996

Noise Pollution, bill to control, Mr. Burr, first reading ... 996

Edible Oil Products Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading ... 997

Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading ... 998

Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act, bill to amend, reported ... 1000

Nursing Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, on second reading ... 1002

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Deans, agreed to ... 1015

On notice of motion No. 6: Mr. Eaton, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Villeneuve, Mr. Ruston, Mr. Deans ... 1015

Recess, 6 o'clock ... 1023

No. 27

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Monday, April 10, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 11th order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 24, the Nursing Homes Act, 1972.

NURSING HOMES ACT

(*continued*)

Mr. Speaker: Is there any other hon. member who wishes to speak? The hon. member for Wentworth.

An hon. member: There are several.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): I am sure this will go on all night.

Mr. Speaker: I thought at 6 o'clock or 5 o'clock we were running out.

Mr. Deans: Not at all; we were just beginning.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): We might even hear from somebody on the Conservative side.

Mr. Deans: I raised with the minister during the Throne Speech debate some problems which I had brought to my attention by nursing home operators in the Hamilton area, particularly those in my own riding. Parochial as I am, I am going to restate the position that they put to me so that it can be considered by the minister in the context of the debate on this piece of legislation.

Nursing home operators in my riding have said to me—and the majority, not all the homes in the area that I represent, are small; 15 or 20 or perhaps 25 beds—they have made the case and I think made it well that it would be impossible for them to operate on the grant and fee structure that the minister has proposed. One operator produced for me an audited statement showing his expenditures and projected expenditures for the year 1972.

I want to raise them with the minister and they are as follows. It is a letter from his auditor and it says:

Dear Sir:

A review of your financial records appears to indicate the following costs for the financial period ending 1971 and your anticipated costs for the next 12 months.

In the year ending Aug. 31, 1971, wages were $6.80 on a per patient basis. Food cost $1.06; drugs 37 cents; overhead $2.82, for a total of $11.05 per patient for the year 1971.

For the four months ending Dec. 31, 1971, wages went up 10 cents to $6.90 per patient; food was $1.36 [it had gone up 30 cents]; drugs 35 cents; overhead $3.22, for a total of $11.83.

Projected for the year ending Dec. 31, 1972, wages were $8.78, food $1.60, drugs 35 cents, overhead $3.46, for a total of $14.19.

They point out—and this is all based on per patient per day—that as a result of the new legislation they are going to have to hire additional help and this accounts for the increase in the wages; that the other factors involved in making up the per patient cost on a daily basis take into account only the normal increases from year to year, and that the figures that I have stated to you include the salary to the proprietor and to his spouse, both of whom work in the building, in the amount of $1.63 per patient day during the entire programme, including the projected period for 1972.

I don't think it is unreasonable to think that they are going to face an extremely difficult time in maintaining the standard of operation that they have. They have been in the business for a period of time. The business that they are operating is an accepted business in the community. The people who live there—from my own experience in visiting and from what I can gather from speaking to the general neighbourhood—are happy, they are well taken care of, not lavishly looked after but looked after in an adequate way.

The feeling of these operators—and they tend to think that they are expressing the view of a number of other owners and operators of nursing homes of similar and comparable size in the area—is that they are going to be unable to maintain the standard of service that they have been maintaining on the $12.50. They say it this way—and the

minister shakes his head. They put it in this way—and the minister shakes his head "no"—that they would have to maintain each bed occupied all of the time to realize that particular figure; that each of the 75 per cent—which, if there were 20 beds, would be 15—and each of the additional beds for which they are allowed to charge in excess of the basic amount, would have to be occupied at all times just to arrive at those figures.

They are convinced by their statements, and by the statements of their auditor, that it isn't possible to maintain that kind of an operation, to have the additional staff on duty that they are going to require, and to provide the service that they have been accustomed to providing, and the service that they believe ought to be provided, on the allotment that the government has made.

In the area of nursing homes it surely must be recognized that a good number of people who finally end up in nursing homes come there by way of a general hospital; that a good number of them end up in hospital for one reason or another; they are taken care of for whatever ails them and eventually they are told that there is no longer any accommodation for them or no need for them to be there. They do require a certain amount of nursing home care. They are too old to look after themselves. They don't have the money to take care of themselves and therefore they make use of the nursing home facilities.

The kind of saving that we as the public are realizing by having good and adequate nursing homes available for these people is fantastic. When you consider the cost on a per patient per bed basis on a daily basis in a nursing home, over and against what it would cost us to keep some of these people in some of the general hospitals in the Province of Ontario, the saving there is phenomenal. I believe that we are being niggardly, to say the least, in our approach to this whole matter.

We should be attempting to make sure that there is sufficient revenue flowing into those homes in order that they not only can maintain the level of service that they are accustomed to maintaining but that they can improve it, that they can in fact provide a better service, that they might be able to provide more nursing than is required and not simply the bare necessity, that they might be able to provide better accommodation and not just the bare necessity. We have got to take into consideration that if those homes are going to meet what I suspect will be an ever-increasing need, we are going to have to be sure that there is sufficient in the way of profit to those individuals operating the homes, or on the other hand a programme put forward by the government for development of homes in order to ensure that when the need is there it can be met.

I've found it, and I'm sure that most members of this House have found it, extremely difficult to find adequate nursing home accommodation. How many people have come to the members of the House and asked if they could somehow or other use some influence? What influence they think I've got, God knows, but nevertheless, they ask—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, don't underestimate yourself.

Mr. Deans: They ask us to use the influence that we have to find some accommodation for their parents or grandparents, or, in some instances, for themselves, when doctors have finally decided they can no longer remain in a general hospital. Under this kind of programme with this rather minimal amount of money being made available, it's going to be virtually impossible to see smaller—and I happen to opt for smaller—nursing homes survive and flourish in Ontario.

We're not going to see people going into the nursing home business. We're not going to see nursing homes develop in the more intimate 20- to 30-bed size, because there simply will not be sufficient revenue going into the homes in order to enable the people to take on the capital investment that they must take on in order to develop. I think that is safe to say this. I don't think that many people would risk, or would have, the kind of capital necessary to build from scratch. They've got to go into the marketplace and borrow the money. For the money that is being allowed here, and the suggestions of $12.50 per day, it is virtually impossible under these audited statements—and I suggest to the minister he may be able to produce others—to expect nursing home operators to maintain the kind of service that we've been accustomed to.

I happen to think that it's good that we've finally moved to cover nursing care. I think we didn't go nearly far enough, as we always tend to say in this House, that, in fact, we're drawing the line too thinly, and that we're being perhaps a little too stringent in the application of who, in fact, requires nursing care, as was evidenced by the 103-year-old lady or man or whatever it was, as I listened to the debate some days ago. But it seems evident to me that, if what these people are saying and what their auditor is saying on

their behalf, is true and, if the rate of return is as they said, running at something like seven per cent, I seem to recall—approximately nine per cent—if their rate of return is running at that level, they're not going to be able to put back into the business the kind of money that has to be put in order to meet the ever-expanding needs of the older and more infirm people in this society.

All I suggested to the minister, as I did some time ago during that previous debate, is that he should take a look at the level of $15 a day, $14 perhaps or $14.50 or $15. I don't think we're being particularly generous in talking in those terms. We may want to set some other kinds of standards that will ensure that the money that is going into the homes will be providing an adequate level of care. But I do believe that we have to be sure that the homes that presently are operating will continue to operate; that their expansion and programmes of development for the coming years will be able to be fulfilled; and that they'll be, in fact, able to provide a service which this government has never provided and which, I suspect in the cuts that are inevitably taking place in the various departments, they will be unable to provide in total. I believe we have to be sure that those people will be able to meet the need and that those people will receive sufficient in return to carry on their business in a way in which they can guarantee a return on their original investment and a reasonable wage and provide a decent level of service for every single person who wants to avail himself or who must avail himself of the service that is provided.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things I'd like to say to the minister. He's begun to answer some of them in a rather unsatisfactory way, I might say by tossing or rather by giving me across the floor of the House a copy of the draft regulations which are proposed under the Nursing Homes Act, 1972. I'm sorry to have to say that to the minister. I did ask him, had I or the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) sought these regulations two weeks ago whether we could have had them, and he said, no, they weren't really ready at that time, and it wouldn't have been possible to have them because they were still in draft form and they were still working on them at that time.

Unfortunately what happened here—and I don't particularly blame the minister—is an example of the kind of problems that I am beginning to appreciate in legislation in this House. I am new to this House—I am more familiar with legislation up in the federal House than here, because that is where I lived and worked for some years, although not as a sitting member. I must say I still find my mind a bit boggled at the speed with which legislation goes through and the way in which it goes through.

What we have in the bill before us tonight, Bill 24, is a skeleton bill, as are so many bills that have come before this House. A great deal of what is proposed under the Nursing Homes Act is in fact in the regulations and is not before the House except in very general terms. Should one read section 19 in detail, one could see that the powers that are being given to the minister, and the kinds of goals of the regulations which are set forth in the legislation, are considerably improved over the Nursing Homes Act that was in force before.

However, the House is not privy to the details, the way in which this will be implemented, or else it is only privy on the evening of the debate on second reading of the bill when the minister is kind enough to allow me and anybody else in this caucus to have a look at the regulations.

I would like to make two or three points arising out of that. The first is a plea—not just to this minister on future legislation, which I am sure he will have coming before us, but also to all ministers in the government both present and absent—to try to ensure that draft regulations proposed under skeleton legislation are tabled in the House or are made available to the House at the time the legislation is being debated. That is a very simple step.

I don't think that people on this side of the House would insist that the draft regulations be available in their final form. In other words, we would understand the desire of the minister to retain some flexibility. We would understand the desire of the minister possibly to continue consultations on certain aspects of the regulations.

We appreciate, in fact, that it's very useful for a minister to retain flexibility in drafting the regulations rather than being frozen in to a specific set of requirements at the time that the legislation is passed. There are many things that he may hear even during the debate or from the industry, from patients in this particular case, or from other people involved in the regulations which could influence the final form.

But I think it is a very reasonable request that members on this side of the House should know what is in the government's mind. It is very clear in many cases that what is in the government's mind is not really in the legislation.

If the minister of the bill involved—I am speaking generally right now—if the minister of the bill involved chooses not to make a statement on second reading, then from my cursory acquaintance with the legislation that has been passed in recent years, in many cases the opposition has literally nothing to put its teeth into. It is faced with skeleton legislation which has desirable objects but for which the details are not filled in at all. The details are filled in by regulations, and there is no satisfactory means by which this House reviews regulations after a bill is passed.

Again this is my understanding, but I am told that the regulations committee is only beginning the work of constructive review of regulations. In fact, when its members come to consider the documents that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Potter) will lay before them in a few weeks, as I understand it, the present situation is that their only authority is to consider the legality of these regulations and not their content. That is a very important distinction, because I am sure the minister will admit that these regulations represent an enormous change from the regulations which governed nursing homes prior to the 1972 Act, which we have before us tonight.

In fact, they represent an incredible change. To put it even higher they have taken away half of my speech, because a lot of it was based on the inadequacies of the last set of regulations which, from a very quick glance, seem to be attacked, if not solved, under the new regulations.

I hope that the minister at least will agree to the request of the Leader of the Opposition that his bill not be rammed through the Legislature tonight but that it be sent out for consideration by the standing committee on social development in order that it can give it the kind of careful consideration in committee that it should have and in order, specifically, that it can look at the ideas that the minister and his department are putting forward in the regulations and see whether in fact it thinks those are good ideas.

The minister may object and say the regulations are not before us tonight. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the regulations are only before us during readings of this bill, because they are before us at no other time. Since the regulations do exist, then it is up to the government and the opposition to seize on that opportunity and to debate them as they stand now, while recognizing that the minister will undoubtedly have some changes to make.

We can live with the changes. We would at least like to be able to debate the main structure.

Mr. Speaker: I should point out that we are in second reading which is the debating of the principle of this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: That is correct.

Mr. Speaker: The regulations are not before us tonight and they are not for debate here tonight.

Mr. Cassidy: That is the point, Mr. Speaker. I am suggesting to you that though the regulations cannot be debated, there are principles involved in these regulations. There are principles which are important enough to debate on second reading. I can hardly bring myself to debate principles of a set of regulations which I only received 10 minutes ago. This is true of the member for Parkdale or of any other member of this House. It is obviously laughable to expect a member of the Legislature to debate the regulations when they are not before us. But there are principles here because that is the way in which the government legislates.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but it is the principle of the bill that is under discussion at this—

Mr. Cassidy: I quite agree.

Mr. Speaker: —order of the House.

Mr. Cassidy: Members of my party have already stated that in general principle we support the bill. I am sure, though, it is not in the tradition of the House for a member of the opposition to get up to state that in general principle we support the bill and simply sit down, because there is a number of very serious problems which are raised by the bill and which the minister, I hope, will seek to answer during the course of this debate, or during the course of the committee hearings on the bill, but which have not been answered satisfactorily up to now.

To some extent, Mr. Speaker, those are going to be questions that verge on detail. I don't think you would expect us to try your patience talking about the elevator regulations in the new Nursing Homes Act. But

there are many, many questions in this thing that have far more relevance and have far more questions of principle than that.

To take a few, there are questions of staffing; there are questions of new requirements for nursing home operators when they decide to alter their existing premises; there are questions in here of dietary requirements; there are questions here of the programme of activities which is for the first time to be laid down by the department rather than left at the discretion of nursing home operators with a bit of nudging from the local medical officer of health.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You might find out that those are the topics which are most appropriately discussed in another forum, either in the standing committee or in the committee of whole House. Tonight it is just the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps the Speaker could suggest what other forum is available for these things.

Mr. Speaker: Other members find it possible to speak on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: All right. In that case, I will return to the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: I am glad the member is learning. It takes time.

Mr. Cassidy: I hope that the member opposite learns as well. Speaking through the Speaker—

An hon. member: Typical. Listening to the member.

Mr. Deans: The member for Ontario South (Mr. W. Newman) is not in his seat. He can't speak.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He is supposed to be silent.

Mr. Cassidy: The problem with regulations put forward by the government is that these are the guts of the bill, or of a large part of the bill as put forward by the government, and these are not officially before the House and they should be. I am asking the minister who, I know, has come into his job with a very good reputation, to make sure that in future and now the regulations will be available for consideration by the House so that they don't escape our control as they would do otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, in my riding there is a nursing home called MacLaren House which, I may say at the beginning, although run purely for profit and not with any social or Christian purpose, is, however, within the letter of the existing nursing home regulations. Whether it would meet the new regulations is a very moot point. I hope those regulations will be promulgated quickly and will have the desirable effect.

The kinds of problems, Mr. Speaker, we've had there, though, I think can be elucidated in order to illustrate some of the problems which the minister is stirring up for himself and for his department with the new legislation.

Let me begin with the question—a very simple one—of inspection. In the Ottawa area right now there is one nursing home inspector for about 1,500 nursing home beds.

I don't know what standard the minister is proposing in terms of the number of inspectors for the 20,000 nursing home beds across the province. But the experience in Ottawa is that the provincial inspectors are distant, are remote. That they pay visits only very seldom. That when they pay those visits they tend to pay them in a way which is well-announced in advance so that everybody is on his best behaviour and nothing that is wrong is seen.

Moreover, of course, I think the minister has been sufficiently aware to make changes in the legislation, of the fact that the existing Act is very inadequate for cracking down on substandard operations.

But I think that one of the important things that may be forgotten in the decision of the minister, as I understand it, to take away from local health units the direct day-to-day responsibility for supervision or inspection of nursing homes, is that the centralized inspection service is going to be of necessity very distant. If it is as frequent I would be surprised. It isn't very frequent in our area. I can't say what the experience is in other parts of the province.

Nursing home operators have suggested to me that under the present system they have some second chance, should they feel the local MOH is being tough on them. That is, they can go to the department, if the MOH is being unduly restrictive in his application of regulations. That recourse ends once the inspectorship is centralized, and my understanding is that that is the intention. That is, the inspectorate will be centralized rather than being delegated to the local health units. This problem would arise for patients and patients' relatives as well, who now have two

channels of appeal and who in future would only have one.

The second problem is one that is not touched on at all in the legislation and I think that we will try to bring something forward in the committee stage. That is, with the centralization of control of nursing home operations—I hope the minister takes this one very carefully—you have a further removal from the community of nursing home operations. Specifically, right now nursing homes have some local involvement through inspection locally; maybe through some voluntary work of the community.

In future, they will be inspected centrally. The administrators will have to be very responsive to the department because of the fact that the regulations have been greatly tightened up. But there is no provision in the Act for community input into the operation of nursing homes, none at all. In fact there is no recognition of the very innovative kind of step the minister has taken in bringing a group of profit-making agencies into the semi-public sector.

I can't think of any other group of institutions in the province which will be in an exactly comparable position. The closest parallel might be the children's aid societies, but they are private in the non-profit sector and run effectively as agencies of provincial policy in the field of children's services.

Here we have private agencies in the profit sector, in the main, who will be running basically as provincial agencies. And I suggest to the minister that there is a very real need to make more concrete the kind of choice he has taken. The member for Parkdale has already talked on what we would like to see in terms of the integration of health services in the community; the integration of nursing homes with hospitals with home care, and so on.

I'd like to talk specifically about this particular Act and suggest to the minister that it would be very helpful if there were citizens' advisory councils, nursing home councils; some kind of advisory bodies which represented the community and which had the right to consult with the operators of nursing homes, with medical people in the community, with hospitals in the community and with the patients; and the right to visit the nursing homes in order to see how they were operating.

Isn't that two purposes? One purpose would be to try to encourage community relationships with the nursing homes; to try to encourage volunteers to go in; to let the community know the needs of the nursing homes; to turn a nursing home—which in my area is a building just sticking up out of a sidewalk with no relationship to its community at all—into an institution that people in the community feel is theirs. That just doesn't happen in our cities.

The second point would be to provide a channel at the local level for patients and for relatives of patients or friends of patients who feel that they have been ill-treated and maltreated, and who find that the system being set up by the minister just plain doesn't respond when they try to cry help. I have heard some pretty poignant talk about the problems which nursing home patients can suffer essentially because so many of them are old. They feel weak. They feel defenceless. They feel that if they dare to raise their voice about the conditions in which they are living they may get kicked out.

People in nursing homes are constantly open to that kind of unfair threat. How often that kind of threat is uttered one doesn't know. I know that it has been uttered at MacLaren House, the nursing home which is just around the corner and within the heart of my riding of Ottawa Centre. Perhaps I can give an example which would illustrate this particular need for a citizens' committee which would provide a more direct, informal and private kind of channel for grievances as well as for other things than the minister's inspectorial staff.

Last December an elderly patient in MacLaren House was manhandled by a couple of untrained staff members. The lady normally sponged herself and did not require a full bath. The staff, however, insisted that she have a bath although she was clean and certainly had never had any problems with cleanliness. They took her threadbare clothes off and they threw them in the laundromat. A number of pieces of her clothing either did not come back from the laundry—that is, they were lost—or else they were so damaged that they were useless when they came back to her because they were simply too threadbare to stand up in a washing machine.

The lady herself was badly bruised by these attendants who were untrained and I think had been recently hired, but she feared retaliation by the administration and did not dare to speak up. In fact, she didn't know to whom to speak up. How could you expect a lady of 75 or 80 to have the sophistication to reach into a phone book and to find out the phone number for the nursing homes inspector in the regional health unit, or the phone number for the nursing homes inspector down in Toronto, a long-distance call

away. For that matter, how could she even make such a phone call when she was in a nursing home and under surveillance from a rather suspicious staff?

The lady was badly bruised. Once she sought medical care and complained to the doctor. The doctor told her, "I have heard about that and I don't want to hear anything more about it," or words to that effect. In other words, he had been warned by the administration and had been told to ignore the lady. The bruises were very real and I can cite witnesses if necessary that they existed. The lady was told that she should either shut up or get out.

Now, I very sincerely hope that that kind of very sad case history will not occur again under the new regulations that the minister has put forward. In fact, I congratulate him on the new regulations that he has put forward because they respond to a number of the abuses of which I became aware because of the situation in this specific nursing home.

For example, he has dietary requirements in the regulations. They did not exist before and there was no power by which inspectors could compel adequate dietary administration. There is the story of another nursing home in Ottawa where the diet was not up to scratch and when they were told, the administrator said, "I am sorry. We can't do anything about it. The diets are made up in Winnipeg." The MOH's staff had no power to do anything about that. They will have under these new regulations and I am very pleased with that.

I suggest to the minister that there should be some form of citizens' committees which could deal with this kind of problem and could talk on a friendly basis with the administrator or the operator. It would have to be a friendly basis, because I don't think that under the system the minister has set up these committees should have the power to actually administrate and make decisions—they should be advisory. This would be a first step toward involving citizens, in a much deeper way, in the control of health facilities. But right now, within the system the minister has set up, I am suggesting that this is a desirable and feasible kind of change and it's an amendment which can be very easily made within the legislation he has proposed.

Again, in order to respect, if you will, the kinds of structure we have in the province, I would suggest that probably the most logical way to set up these committees would be by bylaw of municipal councils. This would provide for a certain kind of decentralization and it would ensure that there was some body fairly close to the people other than the Department of Health which is setting it up.

I don't want to go too far into the question of centralization in the ministry. I think that's a serious problem, and I would like to debate that with the minister at some future time.

What I would like to talk about now, though—and this has already been touched upon—is the problems that are raised both for us in the House and for people in the industry by the dual steps of greatly tightening up the regulations on the one hand and of fixing a per diem rate of $12.50 on the other.

The minister, in here, has greatly increased the staffing requirements of registered nurses and registered nursing assistants, particularly for small homes. He has also required activity therapists, activity co-ordinators; he has made a number of other requirements about nursing homes which didn't exist before.

My guess—and he might deny it—is that when he went ahead and did this, he didn't count the cost. He sat down and the department consulting with him said, "These are desirable changes. This is the optimum; this is the kind of thing we would like to see." Se he went ahead and did it.

But meanwhile, the financial people in his department were trying to work out what they could afford at what was a reasonable price and maybe what they thought was a salable price politically — we have already talked about that. In fact, I doubt very much if he knows what the costs of the new programmes he is suggesting are going to be. I suggest that it is irresponsible not to know, and that in fact he should have had better knowledge before fixing the per diem rates.

Members of the Legislature have received a letter, which I have here somewhere, from the San Raphael Nursing Home in downtown Toronto—in fact, I don't think I have it, unless another hon. member can lend it to me—but that letter makes this point and suggests they just don't know whether they can do it or not. It's just a problem which I bring to the minister; I hope he will have some better answers than before.

Maybe he can sense that we are unhappy on this side of the House with this animal that is half an elephant and half a giraffe, by being half in the public sector and half in the private, and in fact we would welcome some steps that would make this more in the quasi-public sector than he has already done.

Mr. Speaker, that's about all the general points I have to make, but there are some specific ones which are still raising some questions. One is the flexibility of the new regulations; for example, the problems of nursing homes that don't quite happen to fit the new regulations, where they have bedrooms that are 145 sq. ft. and which were tolerated or permitted for two patients under the old regulations and will no longer be, according to these regulations; I would hope that that flexibility was built in.

I notice in my cursory look through the regulations that the minister is adopting a very rigid three-shift system, when more flexibility should certainly be called for.

I welcome what is said in the Act about trying to qualify staff on the job; I think that is one of the very vital needs because of the low level of qualifications of many of the people who are working as nursing aides in nursing homes around the province

I have already mentioned MacLaren House in my riding. This is a nursing home where the turnover has been very rapid, partly because of bad personnel management and partly because of an abysmally low level of wages. Orderlies, for example, were being paid $1.65, the provincial minimum wage. Housekeeping and kitchen maids, $1.65. Nursing aides, $1.65. I just don't see how the minister can defend this kind of thing going on around the province. I am told by nursing home operators that there is a shortage of registered nursing aides, particularly in the City of Toronto. Many may be in training. The training takes about 10 months. If there is a shortage I think I can understand it, because operators—perhaps more concerned about their balance sheets than their service to their patients—have kept the level of pay for nursing aides abysmally and unattractively low.

In Ottawa, again at this particular house of which I have knowledge, the RNs, the nurses, have been tied up in administration and have been leaving matters of pharmacology up to registered nursing aides. The minister raises his eyes to the heavens, and I would too. These girls have 10 months of training; maybe a year or so of experience. They were being paid $1.65 and the arbitrator has generously awarded them $1.85 in a new union contract—and the operator of that particular nursing home has been running away from the union representatives for the last two or three weeks and refusing to sign union contracts which will give nursing aides $1.85 an hour.

For anybody who takes the level of training and education required to become a nursing aide that is simply an abysmal level. I think that nursing homes have survived for many years on the good nature, the good faith and the willingness to be exploited of older women who enjoyed nursing home work, whose families didn't depend on them for their prime source of income and who were therefore willing to work for what are literally starvation wages. If the per diem cost of nursing homes is going to have to rise because of paying a better standard of salaries to the staff, I for one would have very few objections to the raise. The low level of salaries, leads, in turn, to a higher turnover of staff which leads, in turn, to a very low level of care, and I know that this is not the minister's intention.

I repeat, I hope that the minister will look favourably on this idea of citizens' committees and I hope very much that he will agree to let the bill go to the standing committee on social development rather than to seek to ram it through the House. For that matter, I hope that all ministers, at a more general level, would bear in mind that it is not the month of July, 1971, with a provincial election and attractive legislation to be put out on the ordre du jour for the electorate of the province; that, in fact, as a general principle it would be very desirable if legislation were not to be seen to be rammed through this House but were to be allowed to mature, if you will, in the minds of the Legislature; if a certain serendipity were to be allowed to enter in; in other words, if time were to be given between the stages of every bill beyond the most routine, so that members on both sides of the House could reconsider the principles and details of bills rather than waking up the next day and realizing the mistakes they may have made, the things they wanted to say, and this too can happen on both sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members who wish to address themselves to this bill?

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York East.

Mr. Meen: I had not intended, actually, when I came into the House tonight, Mr. Speaker, to rise in connection with this bill, but listening to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre I have to confess that I feel impelled to offer a few comments in connection with the principle of the bill.

I think, if one looks at the present situation of the nursing homes law in this province, we have to recognize that the new bill before us tonight is a vast improvement. I don't propose tonight—and I am sure the minister is perfectly competent—to deal with many of the arguments from the opposition benches, but one of the things that strikes me about this bill, which I had the privilege of discussing when it was before our caucus some days ago, was the way in which the rights of a nursing home operator could be dealt with under the existing law in such a summary fashion. If any of the members, Mr. Speaker, through you, have taken a look at the existing law, they will see that under the nursing homes advisory committee, a nursing home operator could be haled before that committee, subjected to cross-examination, subjected to testimony—unsworn, Mr. Speaker—subjected to evidence being introduced that was unsworn, that was hearsay, that was utterly inadmissible in any court of law and—

Mr. Deans: Sounds like the Compensation Board hearings!

Mr. Meen: —yet, when all was said and done and when the report of the nursing homes advisory committee was rendered to the minister, if members look at the section in the existing Act, for goodness sakes, the section reads, should the committee recommend that the nursing homes licence be revoked, "the minister shall revoke the licence."

To my mind it departed from all the tenets of justice which the hon. member for Lakeshore and we and many others have talked about over the last four or five years and as demonstrated in the McRuer report as something that should be really seriously considered.

I have to tell members that I was delighted to see in this bill an acceptance of the philosophies of justice within this area of our commerce which did not exist, and at this moment does not exist, under our law. I can say to this Legislature tonight, Mr. Speaker, that I am delighted with this bill. It provides the kind of procedure for the hearing of problems arising within our nursing homes which never existed before in this province.

I suggest to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre that rather than be critical of the procedure that is offered here, he should be thankful that this department and this government have adopted these recommendations and these philosophies because they go a long way toward accomplishing justice in an area in which we in the past, I suspect, were sadly wanting. Fortunately, it looks as though no real injustice ever arose but I am glad that we have now this opportunity, in reviewing this legislation and, indeed, utterly reworking it, to incorporate into it the philosophies enunciated by Mr. Justice McRuer in his report.

As I mentioned earlier, the hon. member for Lakeshore over the years has articulated it so well, and here again, we see it demonstrated here in this bill. I urge all members of this Legislature to support the bill as one of the finest pieces of legislation to come before us in this session.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill?

The hon. minister, then, may sum up.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health). Mr. Speaker, first of all, if we go back over the past four years, I am sure many of us from all sides of the House have spoken on numerous occasions on the need for a bill such as this to include nursing homes under our insurance programme for those individuals who actually need nursing care. I must confess I am very happy to have the opportunity of introducing this bill which I think has been badly needed for so long, and which is going to prove to be beneficial to such a large area of our population.

There are numerous questions which have been asked this afternoon and tonight about the bill. None of them really is too serious or very serious, in my opinion. I will attempt to answer most of them but I think members will realize there has been some overlapping and perhaps I will not get them fitted into the right niches as far as when they were asked. Some of them were asked several times.

It was suggested earlier that perhaps the smaller homes were going to be forced out. Certainly as far as I am concerned, I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the smaller nursing home. It is my opinion to license, as far as possible, nursing homes owned by local individuals or local groups of individuals in situations where the homes are required.

It provides a dual purpose. I think the local individuals who are interested in developing and operating a nursing home are concerned about individuals perhaps to a greater degree than the larger chain-type nursing homes which are set up under management which, in many cases, is not a local management. At the same time nursing homes pro-

vide a considerable amount of employment to the communities and this was brought out earlier this afternoon.

Certainly we as a ministry have no intention of trying to force any of these nursing homes out of business. As a matter of fact, we are anxious to hear from these people who are experiencing difficulties to see whether or not there is some way that we might be of assistance to them in improving their facility and perhaps coming up to the regulations which are a little stricter in some areas. I must point out that there are reasons for these regulations being stricter in some areas. As one of the members here this evening said, in some cases they were badly needed; in other cases there was no need for a change in the regulations.

It was also brought out that licences become valuable. Here, as members will notice from the Act, licences are not transferable and it is our intention not to transfer licenses. I question in section 18 where we say—it's not 18. Where is it?

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): What was that?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It is one of these sections.

An hon. member. It's all fuddle-duddle.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Section 7, subsection 6(b)—no, that's not it either.

Anyway the one I am talking about is where the directors of a larger nursing home are changed and it is required that the minister be notified of a change in directors. I am going to propose an amendment to that. Not only should he be notified but I think the minister should approve of the changes in directors because I think under certain circumstances this should be necessary.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): There should be 51 per cent Canadian content.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Pardon?

Mr. Paterson: There should be 51 per cent Canadian ownership.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I have already told members that as far as I am concerned it should be local ownership and I would give preference to local ownership, local individuals, local groups, Ontario groups and Canadian groups. If there is anything left after that they can have their pickings but I don't think there is going to be very much. I don't think for one minute that we in Ontario need to have foreign investment as far as our health services are concerned.

Mr. MacDonald: And our cemeteries!

Hon. Mr. Potter: There was some question about the percentage of beds that must be made available for the programme. Members are well aware of the reason for this, I am sure. We knew beforehand that approximately 25 per cent of the beds in our nursing homes were being used by people for retirement purposes or they were being used by our department for homes for special care under our mental health care programme. So we set this ratio of 25 per cent of the beds on a provincial basis to be reserved for this type of patient; the other 75 per cent to be used for the extended care programme.

By the same token, from our survey it was shown that approximately 60 per cent of the beds for nursing homes should be of the standard ward rate and the other 25 per cent and 15 per cent semi-private and private. Again, I have mentioned this on many occasions before and I can only repeat it here now. This was brought in as a general plan because we had to make sure and be assured that we had enough beds available for our patients.

We realize, as all members do, that there are areas in the province where even at the present time we would find that perhaps 90 per cent or 100 per cent of the beds are used for nursing home patients and that the ratio of 60:25:15 doesn't hold. And there are areas where perhaps the ratio would be 15 per cent standard ward and maybe as high as 60 per cent semi-private. You know, it is odd, in checking out, the one large nursing home that has been causing all the furore insists that it isn't being given an opportunity to give the patients the type of care that they want, as there's no need for any standard type of accommodation in its home and that it is really a deluxe accommodation, we find there are 40 patients put in there by the Department of Social and Family Services or one of the municipalities, so somebody is paying the higher rate. And for that man to tell us that there's no need for standard ward care in his home—

Mr. Deans: Which one was that?

Mr. Cassidy: Was that Highbourne?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It's one of them. Highbourne, yes.

The member for Parkdale questioned the advisability of introducing a nursing home programme at this time when it wasn't part of an overall plan. The plans that I have been envisioning for extended care or for

the future health services of this province are certainly recorded in Hansard, and are well recorded in the newspapers of Ontario.

Since it's all recorded there's no sense in me going into it again tonight. I think it's sufficient to say that nursing homes are just one small part of the plan that we have to develop to serve the future health needs of this province.

The rate of $12.50 a day was established after careful consideration and, while there have been considerable complaints about this $12.50 rate and the fact that they are unable to continue in business, I must say that I've discussed this with the manager of a larger chain, and I've discussed it with several operators of small nursing homes who assured me there would be no difficulty whatever in making money at these rates.

Mr. Cassidy: Have they read the regulations?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I discussed them with them. In discussing it with the executive of the nursing home association, it was pointed out to me first of all, that the larger nursing home really needed more money because its capital investment was greater than that of the individual who was in the small nursing home business, usually because he had had a home that had been in the family for some time and didn't have a large capital expenditure. And then a few minutes later they came back and told me that the reason the small nursing home operator was going to have difficulty was because he was going to have to put on an extra nurse a day, which he didn't have there before. So really their argument in each case was defeating the other.

Certainly where the small nursing home operator was required to put on an extra nurse, he didn't have the capital cost to contend with, and the larger nursing home operator who was complaining about the capital cost had the nurses on anyway, so that wasn't any argument.

Mr. Deans: So that, in fact, both could be right. It is possible they could both be right.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Certainly it is not the intention of this ministry to request any segment of society to operate at a deficit, or to subsidize the rest of the people of this province. We had that for a good many years in the medical profession before the days of medical insurance, when the profession subsidized the other people of the province by caring for the less fortunate without remuneration—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Is the doctor satisfied with it now?

Hon. Mr. Potter: —while everybody else received compensation.

Certainly, as far as I'm concerned—and I've mentioned this before — if any of these nursing homes are in a position where we can sit down and discuss their problems with them, I'm sure we can work out an answer to some of the difficulties. There's no question about the assurance that the patients in these homes are going to get good-quality care. That's one of the reasons why we have the regulations. Believe me, these regulations have been reviewed and gone over, I would say, probably 10 times as often as any regulations that have ever been brought into this Legislature.

Mr. Cassidy: But they have been reviewed by the association of nursing homes and not by this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, unfortunately—

Mr. Cassidy: Who comes first, them or us?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am bringing the Act into this Legislature tonight; I am not bringing in the regulations. If I had waited to have this Legislature prepare regulations that everyone would agree on, I am sure we would be here until doomsday.

Mr. Cassidy: The least the government could do as a general principle is bring in what it's got when it brings the bills in.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, quite frankly, the member doesn't know how lucky he is to have those regulations in here tonight. I don't think they have ever been here before. He got them when he asked for them, and he's lucky to have them now.

Mr. Cassidy: I thank the minister for his courtesy, but—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Cassidy: I thank him for his courtesy but I am sorry it had to be a courtesy; it should be a right.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for Ottawa Centre has already had his opportunity to speak. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The hon. member for Ottawa Centre is voicing a frustration we felt for years about regulations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has the floor!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I can't recall interrupting anybody else today or tonight here when they had their say—

Mr. Haggerty: Very patient.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): But the minister is a Tory.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): But the minister is a gentleman.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —and I think they might let me finish up here. I can assure them I won't be very long.

The Leader of the Opposition wondered whether the nursing home operators really had any consideration in this matter. Again I might say that within the past three weeks I have met with the executive of the nursing home association; in addition, I spent two half-days going over the regulations with the executive secretary of the association. I really feel pretty confident that the regulations we now have almost complete will meet with the approval of certainly the majority of the members of this Legislature and, I am sure, the majority of the nursing home operators.

The member for Wentworth questioned the costs and wondered whether they could make some money at the rates we are charging. Actually, as far as audited statements are concerned, I am not too interested. What I am concerned about is having a discussion with any individual or concerned individual in a nursing home operation who truly feels he isn't able to operate on these terms. I would be interested then to sit down with him and go over his budget which, the hon. members must realize, would have to be a controlled budget. There's no way we could operate in a strictly open-end agreement.

I think we must appreciate too that the type of accommodation we are prepared to provide can't possibly be a deluxe type of accommodation in which we are going to spend anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000 or $20,000 a bed to construct. It has been determined over the years, they tell me, that you can provide good nursing home accommodation in the neighbourhood of $3,000 or $4,000 a bed. I think if we are going to go to control budgeting, we would have to have a ceiling on capital costs that we could allow a return on. Otherwise we wouldn't be able to provide care for the number of people that we are responsible for.

Mr. Deans: Would the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Will the member let me finish and then ask his question?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I will be glad to. I will ask the question after.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Regarding the regulations, of course, as I have said, I felt pretty happy that I was able to get them to this stage today and they are almost complete.

Mr. Lewis: The minister should be.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Did he send them to somebody tonight?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As far as the inspection is concerned, I was a little surprised to hear the member for Ottawa Centre suggesting that the nursing homes up there were more than pleased with the type of inspection that was carried on before, because this was the main area of concern we had with the old regulations. The interpretation that was placed on the regulations by the local medical officer of health, or by the inspectors from the local medical officer of health, varied practically all over the province and the complaints we got were astronomical. The member suggested that—

Mr. Cassidy: I didn't say it was good. I said that what the province said was a back-up was even worse

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member suggested that the nursing home operators were warned before the inspection and that they didn't get inspected very often. I have had just the opposite story from the nursing home association and from many of the nursing home operators, that they did come in at unusual hours and sometimes at night, which disturbed them very much, and they came unannounced and came quite frequently.

However, I can assure you that under the new regulations we are taking it away from the medical officers of health and we are going to have the inspection by a team of nursing home inspectors who will be qualified to inspect everything. In other words, instead of having an inspector come in on Monday sometime to inspect the pharmaceuticals and somebody else come in maybe the next week to have the fire marshal's inspection, we are going to have one inspector who can inspect everything. I think this will be much more acceptable to the nursing

home operators and I think it will give us a better idea of how the home is being operated.

As far as the citizen involvement is concerned, once again in the programme that I can picture for this province, and as the member mentioned earlier, we have had in Ontario two or three district health councils in operation and I am most anxious to see these developed across the province. I can see a health council being responsible for the whole health of a particular district, and this health council would integrate and correlate all the health services. It would work in very closely with local volunteer organizations, and let's face it, without the volunteer organizations in most of our plans and policies we wouldn't get very far.

Whether or not these councils should be appointed or elected is something that I would certainly like to give consideration to. I think that they must be local people, they must have the responsibility of not only reviewing and researching and planning but they must have the responsibility of administering the total health care programme in a particular area. I think before long that you will see this gradually extended across the province. In the areas that we have had them now on a more or less pilot project basis, it is working out very very satisfactorily and I am sure you will find that they have a great deal to offer.

As far as the self-care experiment in Belleville was concerned, somebody mentioned—I think it was the member for York Centre (Mr. Deacon)—a rate of $25 a day. Really I don't know where he got that, because to tell you the truth I haven't any idea what it is. The programme is strictly an experimental one and they are playing around with various methods. They are using most of it as a self-care unit now and consideration is being given to try to use some of it perhaps for a convalescent or even a rehabilitation wing. What we are trying to do there, as with some of the other programmes in the province, is to determine what type of facility is truly the best type of facility to use for a specific purpose. This is only one of several programmes that we have in operation and we hope to get a few more going this year. Certainly the members in the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party both are aware of this, because both parties have programmes that we are now considering and hoping to get in operation within the next few months. And I am sure you will agree that none of us—there isn't anybody in this House and I don't think we have anybody in Ontario; I haven't run across them yet—is prepared to say that this is the specific type of programme that we should drop into every municipality and this is going to be the be-all and the end-all of our health programme in this province, because I don't think it is. I think in many cases we will find it has to be tailored to meet the particular needs of that area.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): I think the minister is right. I think we agree with his general principle.

Hon. Mr. Potter: You do, eh? Good. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. Cassidy: Did the minister say that we have programmes that he is now considering?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I don't think really there is very much else for me to add. There was some discussion about the problems with the people being admitted to the programme and I can only reiterate what I said the other day. The form was quite definite, there was a question of checking off some answers and we had to go by the reports that were sent in by physicians. I'm quite convinced, as somebody else was here today, that some of these forms were signed without the physicians even looking at them.

Mr. Lewis: The minister knows what doctors are like.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The doctor who complained about the 103-year-old the other day sent in another form today and, so help me God, if I didn't have them both there I wouldn't have recognized them.

An hon. member: For the same person?

Hon. Mr. Potter: It was the same person.

Mr. Lewis: That is a good point, isn't it? A good point. There are another 11,000 like that!

Hon. Mr. Potter: The member can hardly blame that on the programme, I am afraid. Now mind you, if they'd only belonged to the AFL or CIO, I am sure there wouldn't have been a mistake there.

Mr. Lewis: I'll tell the minister something—they have a stronger union than the others will ever have!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Tell us about the $100 million.

Mr. Lewis: Tell us about the money factor before the minister puts it away.

Hon. Mr. Potter: That is the only one! The only way I can figure this one out and members must admit that as far as money is concerned I don't know too much about it. The opposition members have got all that.

Mr. Lewis: I'll admit that the minister better worry about this one—that $70 million he doesn't know anything about.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I did pretty well here! Does the member want to know?

Mr. Lewis: Okay, go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Potter: The figure I've got means it is going to cost $84 million.

Mr. Lewis: Was that $84 million?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just a minute, the member wants the answer.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I know, at $84 million, we are closer than the minister was.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Well, I am pretty close.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The minister could be closer anyway.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Now that $84 million—that's net.

Mr. Lewis: That's net?

Hon. Mr. Potter: That's after.

Mr. Lewis: Thank God for that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Before tax. The homes for special care account for $30 million. You see, in these nursing homes we have been using a number of beds for special care patients under the mental health programme. There is $30 million off the $84 million there. That gets us down to $54 million and that's a lot easier for me to deal with.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister has only got $12 million to go.

Hon. Mr. Potter: In my estimates there is $31 million so that leaves me $23 million. That $23 million—I can tell the members where it is if they can dig it out. It is just like a cat's breakfast, spread through homes for special care—

Mr. Lewis: No, the minister has already called on that.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —no, I've got those already—charitable and municipal homes for the aged and the family benefits payments plan. It is through there—

Mr. Lewis: No—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, it is because I had the guy go through it but I couldn't find it. Anyway, I'll give it all to the members when we come to the estimates—

Mr. Lewis: No, the minister can't do that any more. No! No!

Hon. Mr. Potter: But it's there!

Mr. Lewis: That is just . . . come on.

Hon. Mr. Potter: All I can tell the member is that every patient in Ontario who needs nursing care is going to get it. We'll find the money somewhere.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 24. Shall the motion carry?

Mr. Lewis: No, Mr. Speaker, the minister said he would accept a question.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't hear any such agreement.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister said he would accept a question.

Mr. Speaker: What is the point of order? There is no provision for any such procedure.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order it is customary—

Mr. R. M. Johnston (St. Catharines): The member can ask him tomorrow.

Mr. Lewis: It can be asked tomorrow, that is true. It is customary—

Mr. Jessiman: Was the NDP leader out for dinner?

Mr. Lewis: —in the conviviality of this chamber that ministers will agree to answer questions, on occasion during second reading, if put.

Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. minister so agree? I didn't hear him.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, he did. He agreed volubly and happily.

Mr. Speaker: All right, I will—

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes, I said I would.

Mr. Lewis: He said he would.

Hon. Mr. Potter: It wasn't the NDP leader—it was the member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I yielded!

Mr. Lewis: I am asserting—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! I am informed that the hon. member for Wentworth had asked if a question might be asked.

Mr. Lewis: I am asserting my authority as leader, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister where the $30 million is in the estimates on home care?

Hon. Mr. Potter: As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is just like a cat's breakfast. It is all spread through there somewhere; I don't know but we'll find it sometime.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it is just not here. The minister has admitted it!

Hon. Mr. Potter: We are going to have lots of time.

Mr. Jessiman: We wouldn't want the member for Scarborough West to stay awake tonight.

Interjections by hon. members.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Renwick: No, standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: To the minister—standing committee or committee of the whole House? Committee of the whole House?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would be good enough to justify his decision. We have already discussed this in the House; surely he can't just cavalierly throw that out of the responsibility of the standing committee and push it through the Legislature tonight?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I am not pushing it through the Legislature at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the minister let the standing committee discuss it?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the minister has said if there are persons who are having difficulty in fitting into the programme that he would be prepared to hear them. I think that all members of the Legislature should have a chance to hear those people make their representation. For that reason, I ask him to reconsider and to allow this bill to go to the standing committee in order that those people can make their representation to the members of the Legislature in addition to the ministry.

Mr. Renwick: That is what the standing committee is for.

Mr. Deans: Surely we, too, have the right to hear what it is they find offensive or wrong with this legislation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What's the rush? It is law as of last week already.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the decision is discretionary with the minister.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain to us why, when the legislation is already law, we cannot go through the committee process?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Just for the same reason that members opposite are so obstinate that they want to have it in the standing committee. I want to have it in the Legislature.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lewis: Of all the infantile responses from the minister.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I resent that. There is no obstinacy whatsoever. It is simply a matter of providing a public forum for those individuals who are most affected by this legislation to appear and to make their views known. They cannot do it in this Legislature. There is not ample opportunity for them to make representation to individual members in order that it can be done on their behalf. There are people who want to speak to the minister and to the members of the Legislature about their concerns. It is not obstinacy, it is simply a matter of providing a democratic public opportunity for people to make their views known.

Mr. Lawlor: It smacks of arbitrariness.

Mr. Lewis: It is not typical of this minister to take up his ball and bat and go home to his own park.

Mr. Speaker: I must inform the House that the provisions of the standing orders are simply that the bill may be sent to the standing committee or the committee of the whole House, dependent upon the wishes of the minister. If the minister decides that it should go to the standing committee, so be it. If he decides it is to go to the committee

of the whole House, that is the way it is. This is what the hon. minister has indicated.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, if I may, the rules connote that the matters be dealt with rationally and we can't cope with an irrational minister.

Mr. Meen, Oh, come on.

Mr. Renwick: Let's put this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member has no point of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Watch Benjamin Franklin over there.

Mr. Speaker: The bill stands referred to committee of the whole House.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, would you please explain to us why, when we restructure the committees of this House, that every time that we want a bill to go to the committee so it can be properly dealt with we have to fight tooth and nail with the government to get it there and to deal with it properly?

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): The member should know by now.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the government intent on destroying the committee system entirely?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The government is not doing this minister any good either.

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

This bill has been referred to committee of the whole House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister have a statement to make?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Try to keep it brief.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I bring before the hon. members of this House the estimates for the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in the amount of $89,328,000, a sizable amount of money. I will be pleased to answer any question and discuss any matters arising out of the presentation of these estimates for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I want to make mention of the presentation made by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture to the minister and his cabinet colleagues. The federation is not usually noted for its sternness in attacking the minister or attacking the government generally, but in this instance I think it is fair to say that the federation was rather disgruntled.

As a matter of fact, they used that term in their presentation. They said that they were disgruntled about the way in which the government and the department were treating them, particularly in view of the fact that the income figures which they cited indicated Ontario was at the bottom of the totem pole insofar as realized net income was concerned.

I think it would be interesting to put those figures on the record, Mr. Chairman, because they are important, and I think they do reflect a very serious situation in Ontario agriculture.

The Ontario realized net income in 1969 was $442 million. In 1970, it was down to $387 million. In 1971 it was down to $296 million, and in 1972 the projected realized net income for Ontario farmers is $274 million. That is the lowest of any province in Canada.

So Ontario has suffered the greatest decline in realized net income between 1969 and 1972 of all 10 provinces.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Shame!

Mr. Gaunt: Now it seems to me that that is a real condemnation of the minister and of this government and of their policies with respect to agriculture in this province. Is it any wonder that, according to the 1966 census of agriculture, over 35 per cent of Ontario's farmers were farming part time and operating nearly 30 per cent of the province's farm land?

You know, it makes one sad to see what is happening in Ontario agriculture as reflected by these figures. Ontario agriculture is very important. It's very important here in the province; it's very important to the rest of Canada. And yet, we see these figures and realize that Ontario farmers are undergoing an extremely difficult and trying time—they have been for the past number of years, as is indicated by these figures.

This compares with a Canadian overall decrease of only 20 per cent. The decline in the number of farmers in the same period was only 12 per cent. We therefore have 12 per cent fewer farmers sharing 38 per cent less income. These income figures are not adjusted for inflation which, of course, only compounds the problem.

In 1969, interestingly enough, the average income for doctors was $36,000, for lawyers $31,000, and for taxpaying farmers $5,700. And when one makes the comment that lawyers and doctors are well-heeled, those figures would certainly support it. Over the last four years, the average income for doctors and lawyers would have increased, while the average income for farmers has decreased, thus widening the gap.

The OFA feels that income is the major problem for farmers and that any government programme should be aimed at increasing farm income. Farm income has been a problem, not only this year but for the past number of years. As a matter of fact, for the past seven, eight, nine years, the farm income problem has been the greatest problem facing Ontario farmers and facing the government of this province, and indeed of Canada, and facing all those other people who are involved in policy-making with respect to agriculture.

There are many other things in the OFA brief. Specifically, they suggest subsidies, at least to the extent of those available in Quebec, where subsidies are provided on the sale of eggs, turkeys and hogs.

They also contend—and I think it's quite valid—that nothing is being done to attract labour to agriculture. The farmer cannot compete with wages being paid in other subsidized industries, such as Ontario Hydro.

I think this is rather apparent in our part of the province, because we have a very large Ontario Hydro development project at Douglas Point; the wages that are being paid there are really tremendous when compared with farm incomes in the region. The travelling allowance of some of the people who are working up there is greater per week than many of the farmers are earning at the moment.

Just to underscore the importance of agriculture in this province, I want to place on the records the fact that there is more horsepower employed on Canadian farms than in Canadian industry. The farmers purchase nearly 30 per cent of the fuel requirements in Canada, nearly 40 per cent of the tires and a similar percentage of iron and steel.

As far as agri-business is concerned—which means the total sector employed in food production, transportation and marketing, together with those industrial complexes engaged in the manufacture of chemicals for farm use—these people employ about 35 per cent of the total Canadian labour force.

In other words, one family in three derives all or part of its income from agriculture.

As for the dependence of the rest of us on agriculture, Toronto alone, for instance, consumes about six million pounds of food daily. The daily ration includes 1,700 hogs, 1,500 beef cattle, one million pounds of milk and cream, 900,000 pounds of potatoes and 61,000 pounds of ketchup. Each week in this city there arrives 2,600 carloads of oranges, 13 carloads of tomatoes and 52 carloads of potatoes.

I think we have an idea of just what agriculture means to the Ontario economy and to the Canadian economy generally. That so few can produce so much to feed so many is, of course, the result of technological gains. I just put that on the record, Mr. Chairman, to indicate that as far as we in this party are concerned, the government's record in the field of agriculture is rather dismal.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right!

Mr. Gaunt: I hope that the minister and the government generally are in a position to take immediate steps to rectify the income situation, as it is pointed out in the federation brief, where Ontario, the richest and the most populous province in the Dominion of Canada, has suffered the greatest decline in realized net farm income of any province in Canada.

I want to turn now to the Ross report and to give my comments on it. This matter is one of great importance to the egg producers across this province. I have talked about the egg situation in the province before, and I hate to keep harping on the subject because I am sure there are some who will say: "Surely, not again. He is going to talk about eggs."

But I do want to make some comments, and hopefully some analysis, with respect to the Ross report and what it says, what I agree with and what I don't agree with.

Generally speaking, I would say that the report was commissioned initially by the minister to take him off the hook in a very difficult period. It was during the middle of the election when the minister commissioned the report. The heat was on; the farmers

were very vocal; egg prices were very bad, and things generally were not very concordant, particularly in view of the fact that the government was then in the midst of an election.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They were on the ropes.

Mr. Gaunt: The minister appointed the—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): There was also a problem involved.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, yes, there was a problem involved. That's right.

So the minister appointed Judge Ross to study the matter of egg production and egg marketing in the Province of Ontario. I think it was felt by many people at that time that the good judge would perhaps come in with a report in a month or six weeks' time. As a matter of fact, I think the minister indicated that he felt the report would be in by November, which leads me to believe that the government felt that this was a way of getting off a difficult situation.

However, the judge, to his credit, took the job very seriously. He delved into almost all facets of the egg industry and I think, generally speaking, he has come up with a reasonably good report.

He has looked at most aspects as the free enterpriser that he is; he freely admits that in his report. However, he was driven irreversibly and irresistibly toward the conclusion that the marketing plan had to be implemented without a vote, and that marketing plan had to involve marketing quotas, and so on.

With respect to the matter of ownership and control of egg production, he makes some interesting comments. The member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) mentioned them this afternoon. And he points out the extent to which the contract and direct ownership of facilities by feed manufacturers and hatcheries were involved in the egg industry. These arrangements totalled at least 42 per cent of the hens and flocks over 100,000 in 1971.

From this, of course, it is very clear that contracting and ownership by feed companies and hatcheries accounts for an extremely large part of Ontario's egg production. And the important point is that it has grown very rapidly, as the judge has pointed out, in the last two years.

In other words, vertical integration, as we know it, has grown tremendously in the last 24 months. The minister has said on a number of occasions that he doesn't like vertical integration; that he doesn't like to see it happening in any branch of the agricultural industry to any great extent, and yet it is happening to quite an extent in the egg industry.

The minister, I think, is going to have to assume some responsibility and move in to try to control the vertical integration in the industry. There are a number of ways in which he can do that and I think the judge has pointed out several of them. I am going to come to that a little later on in my remarks.

When he comes to egg prices and production costs, he indicates that as far as the production of eggs is concerned the operation costs are something in the neighbourhood of 28.8 cents. When one adds the overheads to that cost, the cost of producing a dozen eggs is something in the neighbourhood of 32.2 cents. When one considers that the average prices in 1971 was 21.6 cents, and that 1971 price was five cents per dozen lower than any other price experienced during the previous ten years, that in itself illustrates why there should be some very real concern expressed about the plight of the producer.

So far in 1972 the price picture has not been much brighter; except for a very short period of time in the new year the price has been around that level. So it is obvious that egg farmers are losing thousands and thousands of dollars every day.

The effects of production practices on egg supply—the judge goes into some analysis here as to the production practices and the actual effects they have had on the supply of eggs in this province.

There have been a number of factors which have increased the supply of eggs, of course—genetic improvements and so on. The vaccine developed for one of the biggest killers in the poultry business, has meant that production has increased dramatically. All of these things have combined—I suppose we could put them under the umbrella of production technology—to produce a greater volume of eggs and to increase the farmer's efficiency generally.

I was interested in the fact that the judge does make some rather enlightening and perceptive comments with respect to these efficiency improvements, the improvements in technology, and he says on page 32:

> In fact it can be easily argued that egg farmers have lost rather than gained from improvements in efficiency of their opera-

tions, because all of the benefits of these improvements have been passed on to consumers in the form of lower prices. The problem of oversupply due to the introduction of new technology is a chronic problem in agriculture and it affects the incomes of producers of almost all farm products.

I think this is one of the most difficult areas with which to deal in relation to farmers and their income and their operation. We have tremendous pressures on the one hand from government, from society, from the farmers themselves, to increase their efficiency, to increase their technology and mechanization. Yet, at the same time, when they do that they haven't reaped the benefits; the benefits have accrued to society generally and the farmers have been left worse off than ever.

I think the judge has recognized this and pointed it up quite accurately, so I really don't know the answer to that problem. It is a difficult problem, but it is one, I suggest to the minister, with which we are going to have to come to grips. We are going to have to face up to it, because farmers cannot go on along the same path they have been going, increasing their efficiency, increasing their mechanization, increasing their investment, and then having all these benefits accrue to society and to the non-farm sector.

The returns for egg production—the judge went into this matter quite deeply, I felt, and he realized that egg producers used a typical flock of 10,000 hens. He came up with the conclusion, I think, that the typical flock of 10,000 would have had a small loss of $750 per year, on the average, over the past 11 years, which is very interesting indeed. The enterprise would have made a profit in only four of the 11 years, and would have had losses the other seven years. I think it's obvious from this that the returns from egg production and the incomes of egg producers have been highly variable over this period.

The judge uses as his example a typical flock of 10,000 laying hens, and he uses as his basis the 32.2-cents-per-dozen cost of production figure; he goes on from there and relates it to the price received and so on. He takes into account the labour and capital, and when he does so, he comes up with the figures and the profit picture I have indicated to you.

In the years 1964, 1970 and 1971, the losses on the operation were greater than the overhead cost. In other words, by leaving the barn empty in these years the producer would have lost less money than by producing eggs. In those three years out of the 11 he would have lost less money had he just simply closed the doors and gone to Florida.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On welfare—or on research!

Mr. Gaunt: I think this points up very adequately the instability of egg producers' incomes, and this certainly must be considered as a critical problem in the industry.

I don't want to take too long or to spend too much time on this report, but I do want to mention several other matters.

The judge tries to delve into the causes of the problems facing the egg producers, and he breaks them down into three—the changes in demand for eggs, the changes in the supply of eggs, and the methods used for price determination.

He goes on to point out that there have been a number of reasons for the decline in consumer demand. Interestingly enough, and I think he's quite accurate in this, there's been very little research done in Canada to find out why the consumer has gradually—it's been a very slow thing—backed off eating eggs.

In my view I think this is a very good area for the Canada Department of Agriculture and the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food, in conjunction with the University of Guelph, to conduct a study into why this has been happening and what can be done to reverse the trend.

I'm sure the industry itself would be interested in becoming involved in that kind of study as well. I think it's very important; I think it's important that we know why these things are happening.

Sure we can say that people have moved away from eating eggs because of the tremendous increase in the development of breakfast foods. There has been tremendous promotion by way of advertising to encourage people to eat these breakfast foods.

The urbanization of society, where people are moving into the city, I think that has had an impact. The husband and the wife both work. Neither of them really have time to eat in the morning so they tear off to work and they grab something off the shelf which is easy. It is very simple to grab a box of cornflakes rather than boil two or three eggs for breakfast. I think all of these things are factors—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Or a can of instant liquid breakfast.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Or pancakes with maple syrup.

Mr. Gaunt: All of these things are factors, but the point I am making is that I think we should be prepared to undertake some real research into this area to see if, in fact, we can't reverse this trend which has been going on for the past 10 or more years.

The judge gets into the matter of pricing of eggs. There is one area I was disappointed in and I think he has done this on purpose; I think it was a deliberate thing. The judge really didn't get into the area of the brokers and the wholesalers buying up tremendous quantities of eggs during periods of low price and, when the price starts to move up to a certain level, they shove those eggs on to the market. They have been storing them during the depressed period in order to keep the price at a certain level.

I think there is an explanation for this omission. I think Judge Ross felt that with the evidence he had before him the conclusion which he had to come to was obvious and there was no point in trying to stir up the industry or to make any more bad friends than he had to. So he more or less skipped over that part and didn't deal with it in any real way, although he did allude to it briefly in one or two sentences.

As far as the pricing of eggs is concerned the judge made the point that the agreement with the grader is usually an oral agreement to pay a producer a price based on the prevailing wholesale price the day the eggs are received at the station. This has a number of unsatisfactory elements to it and I think he pinpointed those elements quite accurately.

Then he goes on to say:

> In view of these pricing arrangements it becomes critically important that the base prices be representative of total supply and demand conditions. There is considerable evidence this is not usually the case.

And I presume he is referring there to the fact that the pricing of eggs does not reflect the supply and demand situation because of the factor I just mentioned, where you get brokers and wholesalers buying eggs in large quantities when the price is depressed and then throwing them on to the market when the price reaches a certain level.

Now he says:

> However, a review of daily loose and carton price quotations during the years 1969-1971 shows beyond doubt that practically every significant movement in the carton price up or down is preceded by several days by a movement of the loose price in the same direction. It was frankly admitted that on occasions they edit the prices reported by graders in order to ensure that the carton price keeps moving in relation to the loose price. This would be done by omitting reported prices which are considered to be out of line with most others and more particularly when the loose price moves to within one cent of the carton price.

In other words, really what he is saying, Mr. Chairman, is that in the egg industry we have what amounts to a managed price. They manipulate the price and the information which is given out. By omitting certain prices they can actually control the market to suit their own purpose. I think that is a situation which certainly can't be countenanced any longer. It is completely unacceptable.

Then there is another matter which he gets into, and that's the matter of underpricing. He says:

> A serious shortcoming of the present system is that it results in a level of prices that on many occasions could be significantly higher without resulting in substantial surpluses. The primary cause for this condition is that, as presently organized, there generally is no strong pressure on the marketing system to secure the highest possible price from the available local and export demand for the supply of eggs that is offered from time to time. Marketers, both graders and retailers, who can influence prices are primarily interested in having prices established in such a way that they can control their margins to a satisfactory degree.

In other words, what he is saying is that the graders and the retailers have a certain margin from which they operate and they are really not interested in what the farmer gets. They are interested in taking that margin and, as long as they can keep the price reasonably low, they can accommodate their own purposes quite nicely.

He goes on to say:

> In addition, retailers will avoid setting prices so high that surpluses will build up, since this would make the retailing process much more complicated. It is much more consistent with mass merchandising techniques, particularly in this age of discounting, to underprice eggs. In view of the very inflexible consumer demand, retailers

can sell a given quantity at a price range of at least five cents.

So we see that the entire pricing system with relation to eggs is entirely unsatisfactory. I think it is fair to say that many in the industry, particularly at the producer level, have been arguing this for years and yet no one really was able to do anything about it. Certainly the egg and fowl board wasn't able to do anything about it because they really couldn't get a consensus among their own people.

That brings me to another point which the judge realized. He said that as far as he was concerned it was unrealistic to expect any large number of producers to reach a consensus on production restraints on a voluntary basis before a serious surplus had developed. So you can see the trend and the way the whole matter is leading.

He makes the point that the pricing system is unsatisfactory. He makes the point that it is impossible as it presently stands for the producers to get together themselves on a voluntary basis to control their own industry before a serious surplus situation arises. So really this is the crux of the supply instability issue. The farmers can't do it themselves on a voluntary basis and so there is only one other alternative. Of course, the judge set out that alternative in his recommendations.

With regard to the problems of organization in the industry, he mentions the contracts and the credit extended by supply companies, the fact that these have been important in the industry and the fact that a large part of the industry is now controlled by the feed companies and the hatcheries has been the result of tight credit restrictions on farmers who weren't able to get the necessary credit from the bank; they turned to the feed companies and the hatcheries in order to get this kind of financing and backing. To this extent, the control of a large part of the industry has slipped from the independent farmers to a few large companies, and the decision-making in these instances have become quite centralized.

He goes on to point out—and I certainly concur with him in this—that as far as the owner-operated farms are concerned, the family farms are the best type from the efficiency standpoint and these are the farms that should continue to produce the bulk of the eggs in Ontario, indeed in Canada. Yet he makes the point that unless something is done about this vertical integration we have within the industry today, that kind of operation is going to gradually slip and eventually wither on the vine.

As far as the business of financing is concerned I think it's fair to say that's one aspect of it. The other point relating to why the feed companies get into this kind of thing, I think, is that it ensures a continuous supply of the product to the various wholesalers and retailers. They are able to make these agreements and are able to actually make forward projections on a much more accurate basis than if 10 farmers were doing the same thing. That's another factor, there's no question about it.

Also I think we have seen in the poultry business a tremendous development of the type of operation that's concentrated. It is situated on maybe two or three acres of land and there's a production unit that can house 40,000, 50,000 or 60,000 laying hens—a tremendous factory when one considers that wasn't the case at all a few years ago.

It used to be that the poultry business, or the hog business, or whatever, was part of an overall farm operation where a lot of the feed was produced on the farm and fed to the livestock grown on that farm. But that has moved away, or at least a part of it has moved away, to the point where we've got tremendous specialization, where we've got these large units on a very small amount of land.

The separation of egg production from feed production has been a major cause of income instability for the egg producers. Farmers who use purchased feed have lower margins per dozen eggs after their cash expenses than farmers who produce their own feed. I think that's obvious.

I think the price of feed per ton, if one buys the prepared feed is something in the neighbourhood of $80 to $85 a ton. If one grows his own feed on the farm and buys a protein supplement, it's something in the neighbourhood of $57 a ton. There is quite a variation, and it's obvious that these highly specialized units have a higher cost of production factor from the feed standpoint than the other operations that grow their own feed.

The advent of these tremendously concentrated production units has seen the increased demand for credit, and when the banks wouldn't lend it, then of course, these people turned to the feed companies to do their financing for them. I think we can see the pattern and we can see the reasoning for it and why it has happened, but I think from

here on the important thing is what are we going to do about it in order to avoid this situation and certainly reverse it.

I want to get into the transfer of quotas and what this means to the producers, but before I do I just want to take one parting shot at the chartered banks. I think they have failed and failed badly with respect to financing—egg farmers, hog farmers, all kinds of farmers. I think that the banks generally have tended to view farm financing as something which they will do if they have to, but they don't like to do it. I think this has got to be reversed. Whether the government can move in and persuade the chartered banks that they have to move into this field to a greater extent I am not sure, but I think somebody has to get the message to them and get it to them quickly.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The hon. member is criticizing the free enterprise system.

Mr. Gaunt: Oh, I take the odd shot at the free enterprise system every once in a while. It is not perfect, you know. I wouldn't suggest for a moment that it was.

Mr. Renwick: I think the Ross report demonstrably shows that it is far from perfect.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I think the Ross report points up that there are some real flaws in the free enterprise system, and that when the checks and balances are imbedded in the market place the free enterprise system can work, but left to its own devices it can wreak havoc in certain cases.

Mr. Renwick: And the market place disappears.

Mr. Gaunt: In the matter of transfer of quotas, the judge says that the capital value of quotas will be high if egg production under the programme yields returns that are substantially higher than other production alternatives. In other words, if the implementation of the quota system is really successful and the price of eggs goes up substantially, then the value of the quotas will rise as well and become very valuable in terms of dollars and cents. He makes several alternative suggestions, and I want to make some comments about those in a moment.

I think I'll turn now to the matter of the recommendations, Mr. Chairman, and what the judge has to say with respect to what has to be done in the industry. The first recommendation that he makes has to do with the quota system. He says the Ontario Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board should be provided with the necessary powers to administer a marketing programme with sales quotas, and this marketing programme should be developed as soon as possible. In that I would concur. The marketing programme should be instituted without a producer vote. As far as we in this party are concerned, we support that provision with one important distinction. I spoke on this matter in December, and again a few weeks ago, and I said that as far as I was concerned the minister should put in a marketing plan without a vote. There was precedent for it.

This was done in the milk industry when the various groups could not get together, and the industry was in chaos and something had to be done. I think the egg industry now parallels the milk industry in that regard. The groups cannot get together. The egg and fowl board cannot come up with an acceptable plan. I feel the minister has no other choice but to put in a vote or put in a plan as quickly as possible. My only regret is, that this rather saddens me, I think the minister has lost very valuable time in this regard and it has cost the egg producers of this province thousands and perhaps millions of dollars.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Some of them have gone out of business waiting for him to act.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Forced out!

Mr. Gaunt: Some of them have gone out of business; they are going out of business every week. I think, had the minister sat back and thought about it for a few moments, he would have realized that one of the things that Judge Ross—

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Read the list out. I want to hear it.

Mr. Ruston: There is a new man in Middlesex South now!

Mr. Gaunt: One of the things that Judge Ross would have recommended was this very thing, because there was no other alternative. He couldn't do anything else. At the same time, the minister kept falling back on the report and using it as an excuse to take no action in that regard. I think that's a rather sad situation. Many farmers have gone out of business in the last two or three months.

Mr. Eaton: Read the list out. I want to hear it.

Mr. Gaunt: I think it could have been

avoided had the minister taken some action in that regard.

I said we supported the fact that the minister should put in a plan without a producer vote. The only qualification we make to that position is that there perhaps should be a vote in a stipulated period of time, maybe in a year or a year-and-a-half; the position being that if the plan is in and it's a good plan and it's working well, then the producers will support it and get behind it and give it the required percentage of support to keep it in operation But, at the moment, I think the minister has no choice but to put in the plan immediately.

The third recommendation is that the Minister of Agriculture and Food in Ontario should initiate discussions with other provinces and with the national Farm Products Marketing Council to reach agreement on the allocation of quotas between provinces, quota transfer and interprovincial trade practices and changes in provincial marketing legislation. I think that's obvious; I think everyone would concur with that, including the minister. I am sure he is quite prepared to do that and to undertake those discussions with the national council.

The fourth recommendation is that initial quotas should be allocated according to a combination of recent egg sales of producers and a capacity of facilities. Then he goes on to say that persons with fewer than 500 hens should be excluded from the sales quota programme. We had this discussion this afternoon in relation to my friend from Middlesex South's resolution. Whether it's 500 hens or what number it is, I think there should be a definition of what a producer is and a description of who can vote and who can't vote. I really believe the department is going to have to move on that one too. As was pointed out this afternoon, it should have been done a long time ago.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member means on all plans?

Mr. Gaunt: On all plans, yes. I think the guidelines should be laid out in all of these votes. I think everyone should be familiar with the rules of the game, and it should apply to all plans.

Judge Ross recommends serious consideration should be given to adopting methods of quota transfer, in which revenues from quota sales accrue to the egg board rather than to producers, or alternatively methods in which the quotas are allocated administratively with no quota sales at all, I must say I find the latter very attractive.

I have been one of those people who has said time and time again that I don't think the salable quotas are a good thing. I have said it in relation to milk, and I think it's been borne out. I have said it in relation to broilers, and I think it has been borne out. I may have a personal interest in this in that I do hold a quota from the Ontario Turkey Producers Marketing Board, and perhaps it would cost me a good deal of money if all quotas were to become non-salable non-negotiable.

I think it's the right thing to do. I don't think those quotas should have any monetary value attached to them, because it's leading us into all sorts of difficulties and trying situations, which in my view could have been avoided.

I think it makes it very difficult for the young person to get in. The capitalization required to buy a quota and get started is a very heavy burden to bear for a young person getting started in the industry. I think it prevents a certain amount of adjustment within the industry.

When one is borrowing money at eight per cent or 10 per cent, I think serious consideration has to be given when a young farmer would have to go out and pay $50,000, $60,000 or $70,000 for a quota, which is plainly and simply the right to produce that product—no more, no less.

It seems to me that method of dealing with quotas is totally unacceptable, and I certainly concur with the latter recommendation that no salable quotas should be allowed. Where the Farm Products Marketing Board, or some sub-agency under the Farm Products Marketing Board, even a separate agency, would have the administration of these quotas under its wing, it would allocate quotas and divide them among producers based on their production for the past year or whatever system they might deem to be proper and fair.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member is talking about commodities other than eggs now.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes. I am talking about an agency, whether it be a sub-agency or a separate agency under the Farm Products Marketing Board, to deal with all quotas—the initial allocations and the transfer of those quotas after a sale has been made.

It seems to me we are going to have to come to grips with this problem; I think it is becoming more imperative all the time. The price of a chicken broiler quota is going up.

The price of a milk quota is going up; I don't know what the latest figure is, but not too many weeks ago it was something in the neighbourhood of $23 or $24 a lb., which is a real factor in the cost of producing milk today, particularly for someone coming into the industry. It's a situation we're going to have to cope with.

I think the ideal situation would have been for the government to meet the problem head on at the time of the milk quotas. But at that point the advice was that the proper system, or the system with the least advantages—I think that was the phrase the chairman of the Ontario Milk Marketing Board used at the committee meeting — was salable quota, and this was the system under which the Milk Marketing Board decided to operate.

Now is the time to do it. We've got this egg situation; if the minister imposes the plan I think he can deal with the matter of quotas at the same time.

There is another recommendation that interests me here; it relates to pullet growers and their place in the industry. The judge recommends that pullet growers have firm contracts with the people they are going to supply, and if the commercial egg production people decide to go into the pullet business, the pullet growers should be allowed to go into the egg business to offset any loss of market or any loss of income.

I think the point he makes is valid. I think there has to be some protection for the pullet grower in this particular plan, because he is the person who actually supplies the commercial egg producer with his laying hens. He has an investment too; he has facilities and capital tied up and I don't think he should be thrown to the four winds.

> No. 13. Access to the market through a sales quota programme should be given to individual producers rather than to companies who supply these producers with feed and pullets.

I could not agree more. It should go to producers, not to feed companies or to hatcheries.

This morning I had a conversation with a gentleman who indicated that one of the feed companies had something in the neighbourhood of $36 million invested in the primary egg production business. Now that is a lot of money. It is a situation in which that company exhibits a good deal of control over the egg industry. I think one of the most effective ways to control that is to give the quotas to the producers, to insist that they are not salable so that these companies are not allowed to recover quickly. If they were given these quotas and they were salable, they could turn them over and recoup many of their losses rather quickly, I suspect; particularly if the egg price bounced back rather quickly.

I don't think we should allow that to happen. I plead with the minister to give this his serious consideration. I hold no brief for the feed companies; they got into this situation and all I can say is let them get out. They're big boys; they're over 21; they knew what they were doing.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: And they are very much in debt!

Mr. Gaunt: They are very much in debt and that's too bad.

Mr. Renwick: What about the contract producers?

Mr. Gaunt: But there are many farmers very much in debt too! I suggest that the minister, when he is putting in the plan, incorporate that in the plan and see that they—

Mr. Renwick: What about the contract producers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The limitation—

Mr. Gaunt: Yes. I was coming to the limitation. The matter of the 30,000-45,000 hens is another thing that should be in the plan; I think that's good. Manitoba has it in its plan, and while I don't agree with everything that Manitoba does I think on that point it is absolutely correct.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Even the minister agrees with that!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I gave them the idea.

Mr. Gaunt: That appears to me to be an optimum unit of production. I think once you get over that you are starting to move into the law of diminishing returns. It seems to me that if we are interested in maintaining the owner-operated family farm this is an ideal way to do it. I certainly hope the minister will incorporate that in his plan, which I hope he will be bringing down very shortly.

I feel I have expressed my view with respect to the Ross report. Very briefly I just want to turn to one other matter which has irritated me more than any other with which I have had to deal insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned.

I always get good co-operation from per-

sonnel and from the people who work in the department, but this particular situation has frustrated me and irritated me to the point that I'm going to raise it in the House. That is the matter of payment of capital grants. If there is anything that has been more inefficiently handled within the department I think that has got to be it. I just want to give you one example; and I've had a number.

Mr. Ruston: And the farm tax rebates!

Mr. Gaunt: The farm tax rebates are very bad too. They are almost as bad, I would say.

Mr. Ruston: We can blame that on the Ontario assessors!

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Is the member against them?

Mr. Gaunt: No, I am not against them but I wish the government would get the money out to the farmers when it is supposed to get it out. You know, it is very interesting; before the October election they went out just whiz-bang, one right after the other! You could just see the department people stamping them, thousands and thousands every day; but after October 21, why the machinery just ground to a halt. You could hardly get a cheque out of the department after October 21.

Mr. Ruston: A lot of them still have not got them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, let me get back to the matter of capital grants.

Mr. R. F Nixon: Yes. Stop interrupting over there.

Mr. Gaunt: The capital grants have been coming into the department, particularly last fall, at an unprecedented rate. There is no question about that—250 a day I am told. There was some excuse at that point for the department to be a little tardy in getting those cheques out to the farmers. But I have one instance here of a farmer who sent in for his capital grant in November—and there was nothing wrong with the application, absolutely nothing; he had his receipts, he had everything in order—and two months later, in January, he called me up and he said: "I wonder what has happened to my capital grant. It is well over $1,000. As you know, I lost my barn in a fire and I need that money?" I said: "I'll check into it for you."

So on Jan. 17 I wrote him and I said: "I've checked with the department with respect to your capital grant and I impressed upon them how urgent it was that you get it as quickly as possible. I gather the department is working on the November ones now and they indicated they would try and put a rush on yours, along with a number of others I have been inquiring about. Even at that, it appears as though it will be a month before you have your money."

That was Jan. 17. I didn't do anything more because I just presumed the department would handle it and get it out. I got another call from him at the end of February. He said: "I haven't got my capital grant yet. I wonder what's happened."

So I phoned the department and I asked them, and on March 3 I wrote another letter to him. I said: "I followed up the matter of your capital grant again and I have asked the department to give it special attention, which I had done on Jan. 17."

Mr. W. Newman: The member is asking for priorities, is he?

Mr. Ruston: Yes sir.

An hon. member: This is the wrong place for that.

Mr. Gaunt: This seems to be a long time in coming. Well if this is what you call special priority, I would hate to see—

Mr. W. Newman: No it is not, and the member knows that full well. He picked an individual case. That is not true

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman. I can give the hon. member a dozen cases—

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex-South): I can give him six more.

Mr. Gaunt: —that are very similar to this one.

Mr. W. Newman: They are hanging over from November? A dozen cases? Come on!

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, I can give you—

Mr. Foulds: They are eggs, and they are going to fall right on your head!

Mr. Gaunt: —a dozen cases. I certainly can. If the member wants to come over to my office I will certainly produce the evidence for him.

Mr. R. F Nixon: Did yours come through without delay, Bill?

Mr. Foulds: The member for Ontario South will have egg on his face.

Mr. Gaunt: In any case, I wrote him again on March 3 and I suggested that I had indicated to the department that it was very urgent that they get that cheque out as quickly as possible. Well I called again as a matter of follow-up around March 26 or 27 and I said: "Look, would you kindly get that cheque out to that gentleman. He has a junior farmer loan payment to make on April 1. He doesn't have the money to make it and he is depending on the capital grant money which was over $1,000 to make that payment."

I wrote to him again on March 30. I had been in touch with the department and I had to climb over a head or two, which I don't like to do, but in this case I think it is justified. I followed up just the other day to see what had happened to that cheque and it still hasn't gone out. It may have gone out now but on April 7, which was about three days ago—

Mr. W. Newman: Didn't he get a letter telling him that there was a delay because of the great influx of applications?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, he got one last November.

Mr. W. Newman: And you mean he has not got a cheque? Did he file it properly?

Mr. Renwick: That is right.

Mr. Gaunt: On April 7—

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): He will get it about 1975.

Mr. Ruston: Before the next election!

Mr. Gaunt: On April 7 I called again and found out that the cheque had gone to the department for printing—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He had to go over a few more heads.

Mr. Ruston: Chop a few more heads!

Mr. Gaunt: Then it is possibly another week or 10 days before the farmer actually has the cheque in his hand.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Has the member thought of phoning the policy minister? I think he could look after that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Has the member thought of asking the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) to write his letters for him?

Mr. Gaunt: I thought of that.

Mr. Lewis: He'll get much speedier response.

Mr. Gaunt: I just want to say to the minister that as far as I am concerned, this is an example of gross inefficiency within the department. Really, if farmers were to operate their business as poorly as that, they would all be broke.

Mr. Eaton: Was he one of the member's supporters?

Mr. Foulds: Government programmes will come alive in 1975.

Mr. Gaunt: I don't think there is any excuse for any government department to operate in that fashion. Surely if the department and these capital grants were organized in such a fashion as to get some sort of free flow it wouldn't have taken five months to get that capital grant out. Surely to goodness the department could handle a matter like that with more expediency than has been shown here. I know the minister would be concerned about that, and I hope he will look into it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Anybody who didn't get their grant before the election is in trouble.

Mr. Gaunt: Well that is really what it amounts to.

And this is another irritation; they didn't seem to have that problem before the election—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, how the money was going out!

Mr. Gaunt: They were really whizzing them out.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Boy, the department was on its toes then.

Mr. Gaunt: Here again, everything just seemed to slow down to a crawl.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Some of them got it who didn't ask for it. Isn't that right?

Mr. W. Newman: Why doesn't the hon. member for Huron-Bruce pick out an issue?

Mr. Ruston: Doesn't the member for Ontario South like this one?

Mr. W. Newman: He picked out an individual case.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister may have to start work.

Mr. Gaunt: Well I think the minister should be prepared to move into his department and see that this situation is cleared up.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He may have to start working again.

Mr. Gaunt: Well if need be I think the minister should go into that room where they process those cheques and he should follow those applications right all the way through. And if he has to do it himself, I'll pledge myself to go up and help him.

Mr. W. Newman: Is that a commitment?

Mr. Gaunt: I am convinced the minister and I could get them out quicker than those 27 or 28 people who are working up there at the present time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We'll write out the cheques and he can sign them.

Mr. Gaunt: If the minister and I sat down for five days a week for two or three weeks, I'm sure we would have the entire back-log cleaned up. I hope the minister will look into that situation.

Mr. A. K. Meen (York East): Has the hon. member for Huron-Bruce got his cheque yet?

Mr. Gaunt: Unfortunately, I am not eligible for one; I am sorry.

In any case, I want to conclude; the time is moving on. Those are the three areas that I wanted to talk about tonight; it certainly is not an exhaustive study by any means, but I hope it is a starting point for discussion.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before I adjourn the House I would like to say that tomorrow we will return to the committee of supply and a continuation of the discussion of the present estimates. It will be followed by the tax bills, Nos. 40, 42, 46, 41, 47, 45, 48, 43, 39, 44; in that order.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Bingo!

An hon. member: Remember that one!

Hon. Mr. Winkler: We will be interrupted on Thursday by the concluding speeches in the Throne Speech debate and will then return to the taxation bills.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Just before the adjournment of the House, since the Environment estimates are the first estimates that are supposed to come up in committee, and since the committee they are supposed to come before is going to be involved at least for the foreseeable future in the matter of the Workmen's Compensation Board, would the minister be able to tell us now or tomorrow what other estimates might be appearing before what other committee and when?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I hope to be able to present to the House a motion so that the estimates of Environment might be heard by the estimates committee.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adojurnment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, April 10, 1972

Nursing Homes Act, bill to amend, Mr. Potter, second reading 1027

Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart 1042

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1053



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 28



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors with us. Today in the west gallery the visitors are from North York "Out and About Group" of Willowdale, students from the Glendale School of Simcoe, and students from Welland High and Vocational School of Welland.

In the Speaker's gallery today we are favoured with some special guests. I would like to introduce to the House 25 civil servants from 11 countries who are at present seated in the Speaker's gallery. These ladies and gentlemen are attending a three-day seminar to hear how the government of Ontario ministries function.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: This tenth annual seminar has been arranged by the Ministry of Government Services in co-operation with the Management Board and the Ministries of Agriculture and Food, Education, Health, and Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

I should explain that our guests have been chosen by their respective governments to attend a special public administration course at Carleton University in Ottawa sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency. They represent Antigua, Barbados, Botswana, British Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kenya, Lesotho, Philippines, St. Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago.

I am sure that I speak for all members of the House when I wish them every success in their studies and even greater success when they are able to apply what they have learned to the greater advancement of the countries from which they have come. To each of them we extend the hand of friendship and goodwill.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to make a further statement concerning Canadian Gypsum Co. in Weston. Members of the House will recall a previous statement I made on March 14 which outlined the problems involved and the steps that the Ministry of the Environment was taking to resolve them. The pollution problem centred on emission of rock wool fibres and sulphur dioxide from two smokestacks. This has been the source of numerous complaints from residents of the area for many years, and although partial controls were installed by the company in 1969 and 1970 the pollutants continued to create a nuisance up to and including March of this year.

The first course of action open to the ministry was to place pressure on Canadian Gypsum Co. to take corrective measures. This was done. Violation notices were issued, three court actions took place and the company was fined by the courts. I have personally met with representatives of the company and with members of the community in an effort to resolve the problem at the earliest possible date.

I am pleased to announce that the discussions held with Canadian Gypsum resulted in senior officials of the company presenting a programme of corrective action to the ministry on Tuesday, March 28. The programme was confirmed by the company on March 30. Each individual item in the programme requires a certificate of approval and these will be issued as the engineering details are available to the ministry with a target date of May 1, 1972.

If there is a delay in meeting the requirements laid down in the programme the ministry is prepared to issue a control order. The control programme includes the following points: Control of phenolic odours from batt operation by Oct. 1, 1972; install additional equipment to control particulate and odours from cupola operation by Oct. 1, 1972; control particulate emission from batt cooler by Oct. 1, 1972; control fly-wool and particulate from blowchambers by Nov. 1, 1972; control sulphur dioxide emission from cupola and boiler by March 1, 1973; and pave the west yard and roadway by July, 1972. The estimated cost to Canadian Gypsum will be approximately $645,000.

This plan of operations will effectively clear up the problem that has existed for several years, and should be an indication of the results that can be obtained by opening lines of communication between the parties involved in cases of this type.

The Ministry of the Environment will continue to work closely with industry and the community in an all-out effort to ensure that the programme, as agreed upon, is carried out on schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. members will appreciate that while this will take several months to correct, we are now convinced that the solutions have been found.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, the decision to discontinue the monetary portion of the Ontario Scholarship programme, as announced yesterday by my colleague the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), was one of a series of decisions made in order to keep total expenditures within the limit of funds available for support to post-secondary education.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): He had no intention of announcing it.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It is my understanding that the Ministry of Education will continue to honour those outstanding scholars in grade 13 who show a high level of achievement in their studies. Ontario Scholarships are granted solely on the basis of academic achievement. The decision to eliminate the $150 grant which accompanied this honour was based upon an overall policy of directing the limited public funds available to those students who most need financial assistance. The government of Ontario recognizes the importance of scholarships. It seems inconsistent, however, to continue to provide monetary recognition in the form of scholarships to students regardless of need, while at the same time increasing the burden on others who need financial assistance.

May I emphasize at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the government is continuing its support of students from the lower income groups through the Ontario student awards programme.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Down $40 million.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Allowance has been made in the 1972-1973 estimates for an increase in grants under the Ontario student awards programme of approximately $2.5 million more than was expended during the last fiscal year. Any post-secondary student who requires financial assistance under the Ontario student awards programme will continue to receive an amount equal to his allowable education costs, as in previous years. When considering the Ontario student awards programme estimates for this fiscal year, the cancellation of the monetary portion of the scholarship programme was taken into account.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): There's no initiative for excellence at all. That's very representative of that government too.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The member has been improving his excellence in the last few days.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the minister want to repartee with me? That's an unequal battle. He shouldn't undertake it at all. He should sit there and be quiet.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

An hon. member: What's the minister going to say to that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): What he means to say is that it's half a battle.

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'd like to ask the Premier, on a matter of policy pertaining to planning, which I know is of great concern to him and the Treasurer, who is just taking his seat, about the planning decisions relating to Metro Centre.

Can he explain to the House how, in a policy position expressing government policy to the Ontario Municipal Board regarding Metro Centre, the government's position was to urge the OMB to give its approval and give notice to anyone appearing before the OMB that the government of Ontario approved of it, and yet a gentleman named Claude Bugslag, who is evidently our senior planner in the former Department of Municipal Affairs, has sent information to the Ontario Municipal Board which seriously undermines the government position and, in fact, brings to public attention that public transit facilities are not going to be sufficient to warrant the OMB giving approval?

I'm asking for some justification of this apparent dichotomy in government policy,

and secondly, can we as members of the House receive a copy of the information forwarded to the Municipal Board by the senior planner in the Department of Municipal Affairs?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think this question would be more appropriately asked of the Treasurer. I would just say in a general sense that the letter sent by the Treasurer indicated approval in principle of the conceptual approach to the Metro Centre. As I recall it, there were certain reservations expressed in the letter, saying that the Ontario Municipal Board should deal with this in its normal way. As to what I read about in the paper this morning, I'm sure the Treasurer could comment on that in greater detail but, with great respect, we don't see any contradiction.

Mr. Lewis: It's a total contradiction.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): The ministerial planners did.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could get the further details from the Treasurer, who is now in his place?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I could add very much to what the Prime Minister has said, except perhaps to correct one small matter. Mr. Bugslag is a senior planner, not the senior planner. There are a number of, let's say, classifications used by the Department of the Civil Service.

I think it should also be explained—and I'm sure members of the House are aware of this procedure—that the staff of the community planning branch, in effect acts as staff for the Ontario Municipal Board, and on any matter that is referred to the board the community planning branch is asked to provide its comments, which Mr. Bugslag has done.

I am pleased to table the memorandum from Mr. Bugslag to the supervisor of the official plans section under date of April 4, together with the statement of the minister which was made at the Municipal Board hearing on Feb. 23. I think when the member has read both documents he will find they are not in conflict.

The position of the government, as set out in the memorandum to the board by myself on behalf of the government under date of Feb. 23, approved the Metro Centre plan in principle. I think this has been detailed to the House before, but for as long as four or five years the government has been actively engaged with Metropolitan Toronto and with the two railways, particularly in terms of transportation, in finding ways so that a more suitable use than railway yards can be made of that particular part of what is a very priceless heritage to the people of this area, namely the waterfront. The role of the government in promoting the waterfront plan, of which this could be said to be part, I think is a matter of record.

We believe that the transportation problems generally were solved, or had gone as far as they could be to being solved. We indicated in my statement of Feb. 23 that our people from various departments would be available to the board. We in effect said we approved of the idea in principle, but that there were certain problems which the board in its wisdom could best resolve. Mr. Bugslag in his comments to the board has pointed out what he believes are inconsistencies between the official plan which is before the board and further control steps which he believes—and I would concur with some of this—are desirable as the board approves the official plan amendment and as ultimately it moves to a rezoning stage or to a further stage.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: Were the views of Mr. Bugslag, or the paper itself that is being tabled, available to the minister before he sent the letter to the board giving general support on behalf of the government for the proposal?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Bugslag's views were not necessarily solicited by me because that was the period of the transition, but the views of the planners from a number of government departments were conveyed to the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and to other ministers of the Crown. It is fair to say that the statement of the minister which was sent to the Municipal Board under date of Feb. 23 represented the opinion of the government as opposed to the opinion of a minister of the government.

The particular views which the planner has sent to the board, no, I had not seen. I think both I and my predecessor, and my predecessor before that, have studiously avoided knowing what the planning branch might send to the board by way of comments. If they are to act as advisers to the board in whatever role the board wants them to act on a particular matter, then it is better that there isn't involvement by the minister in that reporting relationship to the board.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: The minister then is pleased to continue his support of the project? He does not agree further with the statement by the chairman of the Municipal Board that there should, in fact, be a definite land-use plan for the whole of the metropolitan area before the programme proceeds?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The views of the chairman of the Municipal Board on that matter are well known. I think the views of both my predecessor and myself as to the advisability of Metropolitan Toronto approving an official plan at some point or another are well known. We would like to see that happen—obviously we would like to see that happen.

On the other hand what I would have to say is that an official plan for Metropolitan Toronto would require a substantial amount of updating from the unofficial plan which presently Metro uses. I think that would be a very lengthy process if there is to be the degree of government involvement at two or three levels and if there is to be some degree of citizen participation which we feel is part of the planning process.

I don't think it would be very difficult to say that the future of Metro Centre, or the redevelopment of that land, depended on an approval by the minister of an official plan for Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If the minister, however, accepts the advice of his planning people—I presume the regional development branch—why did his observations on Feb. 23 to the Ontario Municipal Board not reflect the same concerns enumerated to him in the interdepartmental memo of Dec. 22, 1971, in the progress report on Metro Centre, which raised a great variety of concerns about Metro Centre from transportation to commercial development which were dealt with—to put it generously—in a reflecting fashion by the minister, since these are the planners upon whom he depends?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Very basically, because most of those involved with matters of transportation and myself had become convinced, both in the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and at the government level, that the best possible arrangement in terms of a transportation hub, not only for the Metro area but in some respects for the whole of the province, was in fact being achieved.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask if the minister is aware of the draft proposal on Metro Centre from his department—it has nothing to do with the community planning branch—making the point that:

> The contents of the official plan amendments as adopted by city of Toronto by-laws 353-71 and 354-71 are totally inadequate from a planning point of view and thus are virtually impossible to review comprehensively.

It went on to talk of the requirement for a task force to evaluate those elements. The date of that is Jan. 26, 1972; the task force was to report by Feb. 15, 1972. From that day to this there has never been a task force report from the minister's department. The matter has died. Why has it been suppressed within the department?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not familiar with that particular memo to which the member has referred.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister familiar with the task force which was to look into Metro Centre and all of its aspects?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Without necessarily labelling it a task force, I am aware of the continuing involvement of a number of staff, of a number of ministers, over the last four or five years as I have already indicated. Some were at a very highly technical level; some at a planning level; some in terms of transportation and communication particularly; yes, I am aware of all those. There was in fact a liaison committee established I think four or five years ago between the principals —the city, Metro and ourselves.

Mr. Lewis: I understand that the work by the regional development branch within the minister's department has died since January for no explicable reason. It has just ended.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would not say that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: One final supplementary: Given the minister's apparent concern, is he now prepared to introduce an amendment to the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act setting a deadline for the adoption of an official plan as he has done in every single other regional government Act he has introduced?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It would be very difficult to set a deadline in the case of Metro. I think I have said to this House

in terms of the other regional legislation, the deadline is there as a guide, as something which we hope will happen and which, in fact, the regional municipalities are working toward and working toward very well. On the other hand, the deadline in legislation, unless it is accompanied by a penalty clause, is not going to be very effective. We can pass a bill in this House tomorrow and say Metro shall produce an official plan acceptable to the minister within two years or within one year but unless there is a will to do it, it's a useless piece of paper.

Mr. Lewis: I assume the minister would want to enforce his legislation but it comes back, by way of supplementary, to—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: How does the member suggest we enforce it? Throw the chairman in jail or something?

Mr. Lewis: I'll leave the enforcement to the imagination of the government. Why has the minister put it in all the other plans?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have already explained it is a guide which is in fact being followed.

Mr. Lewis: Then why not put it in the Toronto plan and have it followed here?

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): As a guide!

Mr. Lewis: Is it not true that his own regional development branch—at least those who have prepared material on Metro Centre —have been so profoundly sceptical of the plan as to virtualy repudiate it in parts and want the official plan, but cannot find it? Why now is the minister prepared to approve Metro Centre in principle when his own planners, not the community planning branch, but his own planners, have such severe reservations?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The severe reservations which the member speaks about are another figment of his imagination. If they in fact exist, they were not conveyed either to me or to the members of the government involved.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll put the question to the Premier again.

Concerning the second airport, once again; now that in fact more information is available indicating that the Pickering site was not even considered by either the government of Canada or the government of Ontario until relatively the last while before the final decision was made, should not the Premier or, failing the Premier, the Treasurer table all of the information that was available to this government and particularly to the Treasurer in putting forward a position, which must have been Ontario's position, which resulted in the decision to locate the second airport at Pickering? Secondly, and this is really not a facetious question: Does not the Premier believe that as far as possible Pickering is for people and not planes? And thinking back to certain decisions he has made in the past—

An hon. member: Forget that for now!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —would he not feel then that the public should have this information, in fact has a right to the information, and that the matter should be reopened by Ontario in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to extricate his colleagues from what was a very difficult decision for them to make.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Oh, never mind that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If I were the Premier I would try to demonstrate some consistency.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say this quite conscientiously, Mr. Speaker, that it was a difficult decision for the federal government to make. The location of an airport of this size is not easy—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, the Premier made the decision. The Premier and his Treasurer made the decision. The Premier is going to have to carry the responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and for the Leader of the Opposition to involve himself in what was a facetious question, the latter part of it—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not at all!

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as to whether Pickering would be better for people than planes; of course the answer to that is obvious.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right! The Premier can do something about it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And so would any other selected site. There is no question about this.

The point I made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, is relevant. The decision as to the need for a second international airport to serve the general Metro area was the responsibility, and properly so, of the federal government. It determined that we should have a second airport. There is no question that the Province of Ontario was interested in having that site geographically east of Metropolitan Toronto to give validity, as I said, to the Toronto-centred region.

If the Leader of the Opposition objects, if he feels the Toronto-centred region has no validity, that we should not be attempting to direct growth in that direction, then let him say so. Let him say the federal government made a mistake. But let's not have it both ways.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if that is the answer to the supplementary question, I'm afraid that it is unsatisfactory. The supplementary question asked for the information available to the Premier and to the Treasurer that made them opt for Pickering as the location. And believe me, talking about the Toronto-centred plan as a plan document is not the document that I'm talking about. If the Premier hasn't got further studies than that, then he entered into the decision irresponsibly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, obviously there have been further studies and documentation and it is quite obvious that the federal government itself—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Put them on the table!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —must have done a great deal of study and research.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Its information is available.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the Leader of the Opposition is saying it did not, that is for him to say. If the Leader of the Opposition wishes to say that the federal government acted in a completely irresponsible fashion in its selection of the site, let him say so. I don't happen to think it did.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I believe the Premier selected the site.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Davis: We did not!

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Premier certainly did!

An hon. member: The Premier certainly took the credit.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member for York Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Would it not be true to say that the federal government had a great deal of difficulty in selecting a site, when at the same time it had to find or obtain, or felt it had to obtain, the agreement of the government of Ontario on its location?

An hon. member: Very properly so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this has been discussed in this House before. Obviously this government has an interest because we have the responsibility for providing a great deal of the infra structure and the services to any airport site. I made these observations to the Leader of the Opposition as to the length of time involved; and this was the last session where I said—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: When Pickering was not even on the agenda!

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, with great respect, Mr. Speaker, without getting into what was considered on specific dates, there is no question that the area east of Metropolitan Toronto was the area where we have had an interest for a period of time. And so, Mr. Speaker, our interest has to relate to our responsibilities for providing services to any airport site. So we do have an interest.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the Premier going to table the papers? Is he going to answer the question? Is he going to answer the question or not?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Apart from the actual location, which is now clearly in question in terms of the other 59 that were discussed, what still baffles us, Mr. Speaker, and increasingly so, is: Why did the government of the Province of Ontario accept a second airport at all without documented justification? And if so where is it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member has been for the past two or three years. Not only have there been stated needs by the federal government—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): In limbo!

Hon. Mr. Davis: —not only have there been observations by the communications media—

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —related to the facilities that presently exist at Malton, there have also been representations made to the federal government from many sectors as to the need for a second airport facility within the general metropolitan area, and until very recently—such as the last two or three weeks—that really has not been a matter of debate. With great respect to the leader of the New Democratic Party, I think he is very well aware of the discussions that have gone on in the past two or three years, not just between governments, as to the stated need for a second airport facility, but I have yet to have heard him in this House, until today, raise the question of the need for a second airport facility.

Mr. Lewis: Right—no, I asked the Premier yesterday, as a matter of fact, to present the documents and I asked at an earlier date for documents on the second airport. But I am asking by way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker—perhaps the Premier will then answer the supplementary as I put it—I have heard of a request for expansion of the Malton facilities; I have heard of many requests for the use of STOL aircraft, possibly on the waterfront; I have heard many alternative arrangements justified; to this day, Mr. Speaker, and I am asking the Premier or the Treasurer, I have not yet seen the material which justifies a second airport as such. I presume that was made available to the Premier and one would think that for the interests of this discussion, he could table those documents, if not the technical documents relating to the choice of site.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, any documentation related to this would be properly made public by the federal government. I think it would be most appropriate if they decide to do so, as it relates to the proposed expansion of Malton international airport, as I use the term—some call it Toronto International.

This matter was discussed in this Legislature. It was raised by one of the members opposite; if memory serves me correctly the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite). It was raised by one or two members of the New Democratic Party here in this House.

When the proposition was made that there be a substantial expansion at Malton international airport we discussed it really at some length. The feeling then was that Malton should not be expanded and this view was presented, if memory serves me correctly, by some of the New Democratic leader's own party.

So the question then, and the need for either a substantial expansion at Malton or a second international airport site, was determined. I am only going by memory, Mr. Speaker. It started some two to three, perhaps 3½, years ago. It was quite obvious then to many people that a second airport site was in fact being looked at and there is no question about this or the chronological order of it.

Mr. Speaker: There has now been a reasonable number of supplementaries, does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

POLLUTION PROBLEM AT CANADIAN GYPSUM

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment further to his statement. What is going to be the disposition of the 10 charges pending against Canadian Gypsum on the basis of their pollution of the environment?

Hon. Mr. Auld: At the moment, Mr. Speaker, those charges are still current. I believe that the dates for trial haven't been set for—I can't remember exactly—eight or nine of them. It is my plan and proposal that we continue, but as long as the company is making satisfactory progress with its anti-pollution equipment these may be remanded from time to time so that we make sure it keeps on schedule.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Those charges then—when the minister says they are going to be remanded or continued, they are simply held as a sword, or a mallet, over the company in order to keep them in line during this period?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Yes, although as I think about it, there may be one or two that, hopefully, will go to trial anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. leader have further questions?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, sir.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Scarborough West.

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can the joint task force report dealing with the interchange and intermediate transit for Metro Centre be made public now so that it will be available as an official public document when the hearings resume next week?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, it will not be made available now, no.

Mr. Cassidy: Why not?

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, why should that information be privy to certain of the Metro Centre people, and not to the public which is to make representation, nor to the Ontario Municipal Board, and yet the hearings are now taking place and the transportation aspect of it is central to the entire discussion?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, this particular study is in the hands of the joint technical transportation planning committee and there are still representations being made to the policy part of that committee.

Mr. Lewis: If I understand it, that report will doubtless emerge somewhere in the middle of the hearings—yet another bombshell in the centre of the hearings for yet another delay for X number of weeks. Doesn't it make more sense—since it is in at least draft form, I gather, if not in finished form—to present it in advance so that the public can make comment and the board can pronounce?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Mr. Speaker, it is in just that state—draft form—and we are finalizing it.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister have a date on its likely emergence?

Hon. Mr. Carton: No, Mr. Speaker.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ONTARIO

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the provincial Treasurer if he is aware, on the basis of the unemployment statistics as given today, that at the present rate of improvement in Ontario's unemployment situation we will reach his goal of three per cent by 1983? And does he have any early policies to correct yet another increase?

Mr. Stokes: That is a good question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think we dealt with this at some length during the course of the budget.

SHORTFALL IN DAYCARE PLACES

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: If I understand it, the shortfall in daycare places, as a result of the programme announced during the election campaign, will be some 2,000; 4,000 were predicted, 2,000 have resulted. How is it the minister's intention to make up the disparity?

Hon. R. Brunelle (Minister of Community and Social Services): I think it was announced, Mr. Speaker, that $10 million would be available, and I think up until now about 60 daycare centres have been approved, and at a rough guess I would say it would provide for about 3,000 children.

Mr. Lewis: What is that, 2,000?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: About 3,000.

Mr. Lewis: The announcement said $10 million and 4,000 places; I recall the second part of the announcement as well as the first. Is it the minister's intention to make up that difference?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I think we have to live within that $10 million that has been allocated and, I would like to repeat, it's about 3,000 daycare places.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the minister would explain why, once again, the analysis and the planning of the government is so far off base that it estimated 4,000 places and came up with 2,000 or 2,200? What sort of planning is it that, in the middle of an election, doubles the number of places that you can get out of $10 million?

Mr. Lewis: It is called election planning.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: I did not make that statement, Mr. Speaker, and I don't recall that it did specify 4,000, and as I said—

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes it did; very carefully.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: It did, eh? Well, again I would like to repeat, about 3,000 will be provided for.

Mr. MacDonald: In fact, Mr. Speaker, would the minister also, if he looks into this, explain why the government said 150 nurseries and it comes up now with 60-odd nurseries; 4,000 places and it has come up with 2,000.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is 3,000.

Mr. MacDonald: Sorry? It is 3,000 places?

Mr. Martel: Those people are in bad shape over there.

Mr. MacDonald: It is 2,000, not 3,000.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Does the government intend to extend the period for 100 per cent funding, in view of the number of municipalities which have been having difficulty in getting their projects completed on time, in many cases because of delays in the ministry in having plans available and so on?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, we have received many requests from various municipalities and associations, and this matter is under review. I hope to be able to make a statement in the House in the near future.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a final supplementary, I want to get correction here; the Prime Minister and the Clerk and two or three people interjected and said it was 3,000 places that they have created?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: That's interesting. That's certainly different from the figures that were given back in January when the minister had 93 per cent of his money spent and he had no more than about 2,100 or 2,200 places. With the remaining seven per cent of his money he has now produced another 900 places? Who is he kidding?

Mr. Lewis: There were 2,085 places on Jan. 28, with 93 per cent of the money spent, so the minister is 2,000 short, by and large.

Mr. Martel: Another election promise.

DISMISSAL OF DOCTOR FROM ADDICTION FOUNDATION

Mr. Lewis: One last question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health. Has he yet—oh, he has a question he would like me to ask? I was going to ask something rather different. Has he yet completed his inquiry into the dismissal of the staff psychiatrist at the Addiction Research Foundation, and his impending report to the Legislature?

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): I am not making an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I am arranging to meet with Mr. Gates, the chairman of the Addiction Research Foundation, but I am not making any particular inquiry.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I had understood that in response to the member for Humber (Mr. Leluk) the minister had indicated he would look into the dismissal of Dr. Andrew Malcolm and report back to the House. I am wrong in that then?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I gave no intimation that I would have any inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: No.

Mr. Speaker: If not, the hon. Minister of Correctional Services has—

COST OF NURSING HOME PROGRAMME

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: All right.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: A question of the Minister of Health. Yesterday he did not have figures for the nursing home counts; perhaps he now has them, and I wondered if he would relate them to the House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What a set up! Let's hear it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It caught me by surprise!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: The member from Haliburton is being used again, eh?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Potter: I never had it so good!

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I should bring to the attention of the members the actual cost in the estimates for the nursing home programme of which I was ignorant last night. I was unable to answer properly the questions that were asked.

Perhaps we should start off with the former programme which was in effect up to March 31, 1972. This programme cost a

total of $71 million. It was made up of $32 million in homes for the aged; $17 million for nursing home beds under the general welfare assistance and $22 million under homes for special care.

As of April 1, we have estimated the total annual cost for the whole programme, that is, including the nursing homes, the homes for the aged, homes for special care and everything else, to come to $124 million. This is made up of $52 million for the homes for the aged and members will find this on page 277 in the estimates included in subsidies, operations and maintenance of the Charitable Institutions Act, homes for the aged and rest homes.

Under nursing homes under general welfare assistance, there is $22 million. This is found in the estimates, page 275, included in assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act. Homes for special care, $24 million; on page 309 in the estimates included in provincial aid for homes for special care—

Mr. Lewis: Actually, I think that is wrong. It is $28 million but go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Potter: —which leaves $26 million for the current extended care programme. On page 311, included under extended care health insurance benefits is $31 million. The other $5 million is to pay the cost of drugs that will be required.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary: Can the minister give us a breakdown of how the 23,000 approved patients have been allocated in these various programmes?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker, but I can't do it right now.

DISMISSAL OF DOCTOR FROM ADDICTION FOUNDATION

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, for a correction of the record. On March 13, 1972, the member for Humber said,

> Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Could the minister tell this House what the circumstances were surrounding the recent dismissal of Dr. Andrew Malcolm, a staff psychiatrist with the Ontario Addiction Research Foundation?

The latter part of the minister's reply says:

> I am not involved with the day-to-day operation of the research foundation. They do report to the House through me and I am asking the chairman of the foundation if he would give me a report on the action that was taken last week. When he does, I will be glad to bring it to the attention of the members of the House.

I believe he was therefore going to report on it.

Hon. Mr. Potter: I think I just mentioned a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, that I have a meeting teed up with Mr. Gates and as soon as I have that I will report to the House.

Mr. Lewis: The minister will report to the House?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I will report to the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Correctional Services has the answer to a question previously asked.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT OF DON JAIL INMATE

Hon. C. J. S. Apps (Minister of Correctional Services): Mr. Speaker, in my absence from the House yesterday, the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) directed a question to my colleague, the Provincial Secretary for Justice, regarding a question he had asked previously about the placement in close confinement of an inmate at the Toronto jail. I assume the hon. member was originally referring to a story which appeared in the Toronto Star on March 7 which read as follows:

> Karleton Armstrong, a 24-year-old American, awaiting extradition from Canada to Wisconsin to face charges in connection with the fatal university bombing there has been placed in solitary confinement in the Don Jail.
>
> The jail governor, Gerald Whitehead, said today that Armstrong was put in close confinement but refused to say when or for what reason. Armstrong's lawyer, Paul Copeland, said his client was put in solitary Saturday after he circulated a petition among seven cellmates protesting the solitary confinement of another prisoner, Charles Barlow.
>
> Armstrong has been charged with murder, arson, sabotage and destruction of government property in the bombing of a US defence research centre on the University of Wisconsin campus in Madison in August, 1970; a physicist was killed in the explosion. Armstrong was arrested in a Langley Ave. rooming house Feb. 17 by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

It's my understanding that the petition was circulated to 17 inmates and not to seven, as

quoted in the Star. I would like to make it clear that this man was placed in close confinement, not simply because he circulated a petition but because he stated in a hearing before the superintendent that it was his avowed intention to lead other inmates in a confrontation with, in his words, "the fascist guards and the administration of the jail." Indeed, I am advised that he said his beliefs required him to initiate such a confrontation.

When it was pointed out to this inmate that a confrontation could lead to violence and injury to other inmates and staff, and damage to public property, the inmate stated that this would be the fault of the administration.

Obviously, we cannot have confrontations of this nature in a correctional setting. This man was placed in close confinement for eight days and then removed. However, since he expressed his intention to continue his activities, he has been placed in another area of the jail with full privileges, with the exception of association with other prisoners.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: I did not get the information from the Toronto Star; I got it from the counsel of the accused. He asked if I would please look deeper into the matter and states that he is quite prepared to abide by the rules and regulations of the jail, and of the jail authorities, except for the one business of circulating petitions. Does the minister think that is adequate ground to keep him in close confinement, as the minister calls it?

Hon. Mr. Apps: Well, Mr. Speaker, in light of his previous statements to the superintendent of the jail when he was interviewed by the superintendent, it would appear that at that time he had other intentions than just circulating the petition.

Mr. Lawlor: I will go and visit him and find out.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. David.

NEW JAILS

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Government Services.

It is my understanding that the government of Ontario has made the decision to build two new jails in the Toronto area. Therefore, my question is, when will the contracts be let for these new jails and what is the phasing? That is to say, when is it likely that these facilities will be ready for occupancy?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, my ministry has received approval from Management Board to proceed with the architectural drawings for two new correctional institutions in Metro Toronto, one in east Toronto and one in west Toronto. To date, we have not received approval for funds for construction, but we are proceeding with the securing of the sites and the planning of the two buildings this year.

Mr. Stokes: The answer is about three years.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Since the Minister of Government Services has been so frank with the member for St. David, would he also tell us whether plans are in progress for the new Hamilton and region jail?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I do not really think that is supplementary but I am glad to answer the member. Similar approval has been received from Management Board to proceed with architectural drawings for the new Hamilton detention centre, which will replace the Barton St. jail.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sarnia.

MICHIGAN POWER STATION

Mr. Bullbrook: I would like to direct a question through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment.

Could the minister advise what liaison he has had with either the International Joint Commission or the environmental authorities of the State of Michigan in connection with the announcement last week by Detroit Edison that they intend to build a two-megawatt generating station at Lexington, Michigan? Could the minister assure the people of Ontario that such construction would have no adverse effect on the water quality of the lower lakes?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think I had better take that question as notice. I have had no communication myself and I

think that probably the route of communication would be through the International Joint Commission and perhaps the Department of External Affairs, because technically we do not deal directly with a US state jurisdiction. But I will get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Bullbrook: In view of the partial response by the minister, he might permit a supplementary question. Would the minister entertain looking into the correspondence directed by me some 18 months ago to both his predecessor and then Premier of Ontario, the Hon. John Robarts, and the reply that I received—that there was no intention on the part of Detroit Edison to build any such facility on Lake Michigan?

And by way of further supplementary: If there is no liaison between the states and the provinces in connection with the control of water quality on the lower lakes, why do we go through the charade each year of an annual meeting between the ministers, at an approximate cost of $80,000?

An hon. member: Good question!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister wish to answer that question?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I will put that together with the original question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

REPRESENTATION OF OHC EMPLOYEES

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister resolve the dilemma in which the employees of OHC in the various regions find themselves, there being no group which can bargain for them or represent them in negotiations? Since they are Crown employees, only CSAO can represent them, but by regulation, last January CSAO cannot represent groups that it did not represent prior to January.

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Windsor West, I don't think I can promise to resolve this, but I would certainly be glad to give every help that I could in this matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Cassidy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre on a supplementary.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the Minister of Labour make representations to his colleague in the cabinet to ensure that legislation proposed in the last session to resolve this dilemma would be introduced at an early date?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I should be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

ASSESSMENT ROLL

Mr. Good: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Revenue: Is it the government's intention to have the provincial assessments department confine itself to evaluation of property and give up its duties of making an assessment roll and that this function will have to be done by the municipalities in the future?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The province will continue to do that.

Mr. Good: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The province will continue to gather the rolls, as is being done at present. No change.

Mr. Good: Is that right? Well, somebody is giving out poor information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

ACCUSATION AGAINST ST. MARYS' POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): A question of the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Has the Solicitor General had an opportunity to look into the allegations by his favourite columnist in this morning's Sun, of the serious miscarriage of justice that took place in the St. Marys' police department where in effect a policeman was railroaded?

Mr. Lewis: An excellent column.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, again I will accept the question without accepting all of the language that the member uses. Some time ago. prior to the article in this morning's Sun—I am curious as to how much he gets a word, Mr. Speaker—I had occasion to look into the matter and was apprised of the situation.

In the article, reference is made to one Corporal Smyth, who on the advice of his counsel did not see fit at the initial trial, nor at the hearing of the appeal before the Ontario Police Commission, to take the stand in order to offer any rebuttal of the evidence which had been presented. As a result of this action of Corporal Smyth, there was no evidence before the Ontario Police Commission to the effect that the corporal was at any time in Tobermory. There was no evidence offered, nor was it mentioned in any way that Smyth's son-in-law was allegedly occupying a trailer situated at Bass Lake. Smyth did not at any time suggest to this commission that he had visited a fishery where his children were weighed on a fishery scale.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, we have exceeded the time for the oral question period. The hon. member may ask the question again.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the estimates of the Ministry of Environment stand referred to the estimates committee, in lieu of the resources development committee as previously ordered.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On the motion, I would just like to draw to your attention, sir, and to that of the hon. House leader, that by referring the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment to the estimates committee, if it is his intention to proceed with the discussion of those estimates while the standing committee on natural resources is examining the matters referred to it pertaining to the Workmen's Compensation Board, he must surely realize that some of the same personnel would be and should be involved.

It would be an inconvenience if both the estimates of the Ministry of the Environment and the continuing work of examining the WCB were to go on at the same time. I would hope that he understands this and can make arrangements so that there will not be this conflict later this week, or even next week.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will do my very best to facilitate the desires of the House, but this particular move was made at the close of the session last evening in response to a question by the House leader of the NDP. Now, I thought that was inherent in the request. If it is not so, I will check the matter and report to the leader personally.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, is it not possible to have another set of estimates? We are not allowed substitutions from the natural resources committee, if I recall. This means that the people sent to a committee designated by their parties, who have specific skills in the area of environmental matters and specific interests in the area of environmental matters, would be excluded from the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The hon. member is asking me for the permission of substitutions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think we will permit that.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you will permit that?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: On the estimates committee, but not on the other one.

Mr. Lewis: But what about the other committees? Has the minister now agreed to substitution on the other committees?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I have not at the moment, no.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, that is the point—

Mr. Lewis: Well, that's surely what it is all about.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the point, Mr. Speaker. And so that there is no confusion, I would point out to you, sir, that we are awarded three places on the natural resources standing committee, and the people concerned with that committee cannot be substituted. It means that the same people would ordinarily be conducting the discussion in the environmental committee at the same time. Surely with the work before us at the present time we can arrange it in such a way that there will not be this conflict. And I ask the House leader to give it every consideration.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think I am only reiterating my earlier position. I will do everything in my power to facilitate the hon. leader of the official opposition.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

DISTRICT WELFARE ADMINISTRATION BOARDS ACT

Hon. R. Brunelle moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the District Welfare Administration Boards Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, this Act provides for the transfer from the Act to the regulations of the authority for establishing the size of district welfare boards and the appointment and terms of office of their members. These changes have been specifically requested by many local municipalities. It is the belief of the government that they will permit greater flexibility in the operation of district welfare administration boards.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill, intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this bill would require that buses be equipped with safety belts.

Mr. Speaker: Before proceeding with the orders of the day, I should like to deal with two matters that had been raised last week.

The hon. member for High Park stated that he had been informed that his telephone conversations with the Workmen's Compensaion Board had been recorded on tape, and he asked me to declare this a breach of privilege. I think the hon. members will recall that I was asked to express my opinion at that time without having had the benefit of reading the press reports or doing any investigation.

My opinion at that time was that it was, indeed, not proper for this to have happened. I'm unable to find a breach of one of those special privileges which the assembly and the members thereof enjoy and which other citizens do not enjoy. Nevertheless, if proved, such action might well constitute a contempt, in that it might be considered to obstruct or impede a member in the discharge of his duties. As the hon. member has asked me to deal with this matter, I wish to inform the House that I will write to the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, advising him that if such action has been taken in the past it should be discontinued forthwith. This, of course, is without prejudice to any action that might be instituted in a court of law.

On the same day, the hon. member for Scarborough West asked me to rule as to whether the speech made at the Empire Club by the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board constituted a breach of the sub judice rule. Of course, at that time again, I had not read any of the news reports and I was not aware of what was the content of such reports. I did express the opinion that, perhaps, the action on the part of the Chairman might have been unwise or improper. Obviously, though, the sub judice rule does not apply. It applies only to things said in the House or the committees thereof and to members of the Legislature.

Therefore, the speech does not in any way constitute any breach of that provision. I would remind the members of the reason for the ruling. It is so that the rights of a person may not be prejudiced by remarks made in this assembly, the governing body of this province, in which statements are privileged, as the offended person does not have the normal right of recourse through the courts.

Again, I remind the members that my statements, which I believe were quoted in one of the daily press, omitted the word "perhaps" from "were unwise." Now, having had the benefit of reviewing the reports, I rule that there is actually no breach of any rule or the sub judice rule at all.

Mr. Bullbrook: The statements might still be unwise.

Mr. MacDonald: It leaves us in a very anomalous position. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a brief point. If I may go back one step, the reason for the immunity rule for a member of the Legislature is so that one can speak more frankly here than normally is said outside the Legislature. While some people are critical of that, it is time-honoured. It is part of the tradition of British Parliament. What, in effect, your ruling now indicates—and I don't say this critically of you—what it says is that somebody outside the House will have greater freedom to speak

about something that is going on in the committee than we here have.

Mr. Bullbrook: I wouldn't say that.

Mr. MacDonald: We have no right to comment on what is going on in the committee. Outsiders have the right to speak and he won't be in breach of the sub judice rule. I suggest to you it is a very anomalous situation.

Mr. Speaker: As I must point out—

Mr. Bullbrook: May I speak to that point, if I might. I disagree with what the hon. member for York South was saying. As I understand the interpretation of your rule, it is basically this: Because of our immunity there is no reciprocity because there is no right of action against us for any words that we say contrary to the interests of other people outside this House. Any words made outside this House might be either slanderous or defamatory and, as a result, there is that concurrent reciprocity. That is the answer to the ruling as I understood you made it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, the sub judice rule clearly and quite distinctly under our standing orders applies to hon. members of this Legislature only.

The hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the maple syrup producers of Algoma to present some maple sugar to every member in the House in the hope that it will help to sweeten the operations.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I hoped the member for Algoma was going to present us all with maple syrup, which brings back memories of pancakes, none of which I have had since Oct. 21, but they were delicious on that occasion.

Mr. Lewis: I would think not.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is there some fetish about Oct. 21?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It really is amazing how that continues.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why does that stick in your mind?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why do you think?

Mr. Speaker: Order of the day.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: The government notice of motion No. 3 by Hon. Mr. Davis.

RESOLVED: That, for the purpose of its inquiry into the Workmen's Compensation Board only, the standing resources development committee be empowered to engage counsel to assist the chairman and members of the committee in the inquiry, including the questioning of witnesses, and that persons whose interests may be affected by the inquiry be allowed counsel to advise and assist them, which counsel may question witnesses only through the committee counsel; also, that for the duration of this inquiry the committee be authorized to sit concurrently with the House and have its proceedings recorded and transcribed by the Hansard office.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we intend to approve and support the resolution. I want briefly to give my reasons for suggesting an addition to it, which I think would be an important amendment and improve its value considerably.

I should say to you, Mr. Speaker, that as a member of the House I have attended the committee meetings—not as a voting member of the committee. I have felt personally embarrassed that I sat through the hearings last week without standing in my place and offering some objection to the proceedings, having a certain sympathy for the chairman and the members of the committee, who found themselves thrown into the situation without much preparation, but more or less moving forward as circumstances dictated. I felt I didn't have the strength of character, I suppose, or the ability to make public what I felt was a substantial doubt in my mind that we should allow the hearings as they did proceed last week to continue. I say that very frankly. I hardly knew what to do, but I was aware that a miscarriage of justice was being perpetrated and that we were all equally responsible—not just the government but people on all sides.

It is interesting to see the reaction of the leaders of the government in this connection, because I am sure they have had reports of what went on from some people who I think were very personally involved and probably will be personally involved. There is no doubt in my mind that some of the charges that were flying like wildfire around that hearing, while they seemed to be disordered and frequently unrelated, still indicated the depth of the disorder at the Workmen's

Compensation Board. But of course we are not here to discuss that.

Having expressed my own deep concern for this situation I would like to recall to your mind, sir, that on all sides of the House there have been recommendations made to the government and to you, sir, as the protector of our rights, and our leader as far as improving the roles and procedures are concerned, that we improve the procedures at the standing committees.

In the past we have had the opportunity, for example, to call before us the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission to examine rate structures, but very rarely has there been an examination of the type that bears on personal allegations and allegations approaching criminality. I believe these changes are warranted for this series of hearings, and I sense the Premier expects recommendations similar to these from the commission that may be appointed in the future; they probably would be entered into after considerably more thought and research, but I would expect them to be essentially similar to the provisions here with some exceptions.

So tomorrow the hearings will recommence —and I suppose that is the best word to use. In my view, everything that has taken place to date should be thrown out. I can't see that we can use that tape-recorded transcript that is available as a basis for the continuation of the hearing.

I think that to be fair on all sides, at least, the committee counsel should instruct or advise the chairman and the committee to recommence its hearings, using expert counsel to perhaps order the flow of information so that it pertains to some terms of reference that will have more specific goals than just a general discussion about the Workmen's Compensation Board and the character of those people who serve it and are served by it.

The first point I would like to make, then, is that the committee should consider a recommencement of this whole affair. The second point is that really it could become a very big show indeed. The Premier (Mr. Davis) indicated that the government is prepared to pay the legal costs of the individuals concerned as well as to advise the chairman and the committee members.

This may not amount to as much as I would expect that it might, but we know that the chairman and the members of the board are all deeply involved. Certain members of the government, whether the Premier likes it or not, are involved; I refer specifically to the Attorney General (Mr. Bales), the then Minister of Labour, whose statement in this House was contradicted by the specific testimony of Mr. Cauley.

I am not here to argue that. I am simply putting that before you, Mr. Speaker, as a fact. It had to do with the discussions between Mr. Cauley and the then Minister of Labour as to the financial arrangements which were going to expedite and facilitate the termination of the former vice-chairman's service.

If you look at the records that are available you will find that Mr. Cauley specifically contradicted the hon. Attorney General, at the same time giving the hon. gentleman every personal support indicating that he, during that period of his ministerial responsibilities, had been seriously misled by those people who remained unnamed as far as the testimony was concerned last week.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is not correct to say that this investigation excludes members of the ministry. The very fact that the Minister of Labour and his series of predecessors were all there indicates their proper concern. I would say to you, sir, in this House and before the man involved, that the actions of the former Minister of Labour, the present Attorney General, must certainly come under discussion in the hearings that are going to be held when the committee is, in fact, reconstituted by this resolution.

It grieves me to say that but I am sure that the minister himself is going to be sure that he puts his view before the committee. He would therefore be subject to the examination of the committee—and what went on at that famous meeting at which Mr. Cauley was assured by the minister that he had the word directly from the former Prime Minister that Mr. Cauley "won't lose" if, in fact, he didn't bother the government or the commission too much and slid out of the way.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that inherent in the statement made by Mr. Cauley was the continuation of his full salary until the mandatory retirement age of 75.

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): I wouldn't want in any way to limit the discussion on this resolution but this is a procedural resolution allowing the committee certain rights or instructing the committee to do certain things as they relate to its procedure. With great respect to the Leader of the Opposition, I think it is quite improper for him to be making some of the observations he is presently making. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think they are entirely out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, before you make a ruling on this—and certainly I will abide by your ruling—I would simply recall to you that when notice of this motion was put before the House the Premier said the reason that he felt it was proper to put it back to the committee was that there were no allegations involving a member of the ministry. I would simply say to you, sir, that in response to his statement I'm expressing a contrary view which I and my party support.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): The member is out of order on this one.

Mr. Speaker: I must say in reviewing the motion and considering the tack upon which the hon. Leader of the Opposition was continuing his contribution to the discussion on the motion, it seems to me that it was pretty well a review of some of the things that had already taken place in the deliberations. I'm sure that we certainly are not here to do that but to discuss this motion.

Therefore I must say that it is only the motion before us that is being discussed and we should not bring up and review and discuss those things which have taken place in the past. I must agree with the hon. Prime Minister and I rule that this sort of discussion must be out of order.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. I would simply say to you and the hon. members of the ministry here present who are deeply concerned with this, as are we all, that when we talk about providing legal counsel the list of people who may very well have the right and the requirement to legal counsel is an extensive one. In my view it might well include members of this ministry.

Now I talk about the chairman, the members of the committee, the members of the Workmen's Compensation Board and possibly ministers of this government; the list goes on to include the secretary who was taken from her office crying out, "It's not true, it's not true." In other words there is a substantial list of people, individuals, who are going to require the protection that this particular resolution offers.

I will abide by your ruling. I certainly did not intend to review in any way the evidence given previously before the committee but simply to express my view that the ambit of the investigation of this committee does not exclude the members of the ministry who were involved with the decisions.

Sir, I would go on to say that the conduct of the committee itself is a difficult responsibility and the chairman who sits now in the back row, the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) has a heavy job indeed. I think that he would get support right around the committee table. Expert assistance by way of counsel is needed by the chairman as well as by the committee members in ordering the sequence of events so that the discussion is not going to wander over the ambit of all of the possibilities in the Workmen's Compensation Board.

But, sir, the thing that I have been trying to determine in my own mind is just what the committee is supposed to examine, because as a result of the hearings last week there is a tendency for the examination to centre on Mr. Cauley's testimony and how his services were dispensed with. We look at the references in Hansard and there is only the vaguest comment by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Guindon) and by the Premier that all of "these matters" will be considered by the committee and that both of the hon. gentlemen gave their personal assurances that all of the information associated with it would be made available to the committee. That is another argument, as to whether or not all the information has been made available.

But it seems to me there are a number of matters which have to concern the committee, some of them far more important really than others, since the sensitivity of them has led the Premier to put this motion before us. It is for this reason, sir, that I believe it is essential that we in this House agree on what the terms of reference actually are which will direct the counsel and the committee in the furtherance and the continuation of their examination. The idea that the Workmen's Compensation Board is simply referred to the committee for the general review of why the pensions are not as high as they might be and so on, is erroneous. The fact that all of us agree that we have to set up rather elaborate and careful machinery to safeguard the reputations and the rights of individuals who will be subpoenaed by the committee I think is sufficient indication for this purpose.

In looking at the Premier's own words, there is only a reference to "these matters." Now in his own mind, on one occasion he is thinking, I believe, of the special assessments made against Ford, General Motors and certain other corporations on matters of a poor safety record, and then when it is raised

again, he is undoubtedly thinking of more or less the bearpit which resulted last week, in which only Mr. Cauley and the circumstances of the termination of his service came under consideration. We have yet to consider the involvement of public funds, or at least Workmen's Compensation Board funds, in the investment in private enterprise which is going to result in a new headquarters being built for the Workmen's Compensation Board. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we have to agree in this House specifically, or as specifically as we can, the four corners of what this committee is going to investigate and what we expect to receive back from them.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): If we do, we will be overruled. But that should be the way it should be done.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should take steps to direct the committee to undertake this sort of an investigation and not leave it wide open to some sort of a general review of that whole area of operation. I believe that as far as the committee is concerned we should instruct it as follows, and I would move, seconded by Mr. Good, this amendment to the motion, Mr. Speaker, that the following words be added to the motion:

That the House instruct the committee to determine:

1. The facts surrounding the termination of active duty by the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. John Cauley;

2. Whether public moneys, or moneys controlled by the Workmen's Compensation Board, were improperly or wastefully spent;

3. Whether the responsible minister properly carried out his duty in this disposition of the termination of Mr. Cauley's services;

4. Such matters as pertain to the Workmen's Compensation Board concerning remission of levies for poor safety records and the use of Workmen's Compensation Board trust funds in private development.

I further recommend:

5. That the committee determine whether or not these and related matters warrant further investigation by a judicial inquiry.

Now in moving this, Mr. Speaker, it in no way detracts from the general reference of the Workmen's Compensation Board to the standing committee which deals with all commissions. It simply sets the four corners of what amounts in fact to an investigation by a committee of this House, which is a close approach to a judicial inquiry. And I would be prepared to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the allegations made by the former vice-chairman last week are found in fact to withstand examination under cross-examination, as being true and viable, then the recommendation from the committee might very well be that a further examination by a judicial inquiry would be required.

Mr. Speaker, having been present at the committee meeting last week, I believe that what we are establishing here is a precedent of substantial importance. We are, in fact, as a Legislature, putting a matter of grave public importance and concern before a committee of the House rather than a royal commission. We underscore the importance and sensitivity of this reference by establishing legal machinery whereby the rights of individuals are safeguarded, which I believe is entirely proper and we are prepared to support that aspect of the resolution. I believe in order to meet our more specific responsibilities we cannot continue to refer the matter in such a vague and general way but in fact must ask the committee to report to the House their findings and their recommendations on these specific matters.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, briefly and perhaps not as orderly as might be wished—which conveys some of the uncertainty in my own mind—I rise to commit the support of our party to this resolution; I may say, Mr. Speaker, not to the amendment, for reasons I will shortly state.

I think it's probably fair to say that the events of last Wednesday were probably one of the most surreal chapters of the Legislature which I have sat through as a member and clearly need correction. I am inclined to think and those of us who sat through the committee proceedings—particularly my colleagues who are formal members of the committee—are inclined to think that the resolution which has been submitted by the Premier goes a considerable way to that end.

Reading what transcript there is available of last Wednesday's proceedings, it is hardly believeable. I am sure it is as disconcerting and as distressing to every member of the House although public mea culpas may not attend to that. All of us felt some embarrassment and bewilderment at what was occurring. I do want to remind the House, because I think it is important to remind members, the government members as well, that in the middle of that morning, in fact at the very

outset of that morning, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) who is on that committee, moved that a transcript be made available and taken and it was voted down.

At the adjournment of the morning session the member for Wentworth proposed a judicial inquiry which again was not accepted. I think what the member for Wentworth was doing throughout that morning as an official member of the committee was reflecting the unease and anxiety which all members of the proceedings felt at being subject to the evident disorder and disarray emanating from that committee. However, there are responsibilities which devolve upon the chairman, if he will forgive me, although I know he experienced a similar discomfort. I suppose that for many of us, from the experience of previous committees of that kind, from the debates in this Legislature, and from the lack of involvement in any similar exercise, the proceedings did not develop as they should have and had to be rescued—because not just the committee proceedings but the Workmen's Compensation Board was on the ropes.

One of the important matters to make clear, Mr. Speaker, is that the public, quite rightly, does not tend to differentiate between allegations involving senior administrative personnel of a board of this kind and the general reputation of the Workmen's Compensation Board and all its activities.

What has been happening, of course, is that the reputation of the board had suffered one of the most serious assaults ever in its history—it will be very difficult for it to recover—and we view this resolution as one of the vehicles whereby we can introduce some relevance, some order, into the system.

Another point that I think might be made, Mr. Speaker, is that the distinction which the Premier has tried to draw—I want to measure it carefully—I think has been a valid distinction. That is the distinction between a judicial inquiry which flows rather naturally when a minister of the Crown is clearly under implication, allegation, suspicion, and so forth, and an initial step, as we see it, by way of a legislative committee looking into a semi-autonomous board reporting through the Legislature.

I think it's fair to say that it was not the perception of the New Democratic Party in attendance at last Wednesday's meeting that would lead us to believe that the present Attorney General, the former Minister of Labour, had been found guilty of anything. As a matter of fact, I don't think that is the role of the committee.

In any event, our perceptions were profoundly confused. That the former Minister of Labour, the present Attorney General, was undoubtedly involved in the proceeding and in the conversations with one Jack Cauley is clear. What flows from that is very unclear at the moment.

It may be that a judicial inquiry might have to be ordered, but at the moment we feel rather more comfortable with this vehicle until the facts are ascertained. Mr. Speaker, isn't that, in fact, the role of the committee? This is not a court of law. We are not trying the guilt or innocence of people.

As I understand it, we are looking into the facts as they emerge from various newspaper reports, various allegations made by witnesses, various alleged irregularities or improprieties. Guilt or innocence may have to be determined by a judicial inquiry or a court of law, based on the decision which the committee arrives at—but it's not a presumption with which the committee starts. At least, that is the way we are inclined to view it.

That brings us to the matter of the Liberal amendment. There may be occasional instances where the House should dictate to the committee the frame of reference and the context for a hearing. We are inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier's scrupulousness in this instance, in referring it to the committee without strictures is probably the right way and that it is the committee which should decide on the terms of reference for the inquiry. In fact, if it flows from the committee, as we have seen it in the last two meetings, then it is likely to be more wide-ranging rather than constricted.

The Leader of the Opposition has set out four fairly major areas and then thrown in the term "and related matters." Related matters can be discarded very quickly. My sense of the chairman of the committee, in view of his own flexibility, and of the committee members themselves—I can think of a number of committee members—is that they will not be satisfied. Perhaps I'll be proved wrong, but as I listened to the member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. Allan), to the member for Muskoka (Mr. Miller) to the member for Parry Sound (Mr. Maeck) and to the chairman, I had the sense that on the Conservative side of the House there was as much interest in pursuing all the things that

flowed from the various articles and allegations as there was in confining it.

I may be wrong—that was the sense—but that tends to happen in a committee. That tends to be inherent in the committee process; that tends to be inherent in the cross-examination which will flow within that committee. Therefore the committee is probably most competent and most able to decide what it is it wants to look into.

Maybe I am being more cynical than that. Maybe I am saying that I have as much or more confidence in the flexibility of the committee as I do in the flexibility of what a formal government amendment might say.

I would like to give the committee a chance in this instance. I would like to think that this is a precedent of such major innovation that from it can flow a pattern for future similar actions; not for all committees, but for future similar actions. And that the committee should therefore be provided with the latitude to make its own decisions. Which raises some questions.

It is not the counsel which instructs the committee; it is surely the committee which instructs the counsel. Therefore, how is this to be arranged? How is this to be entered into? How will counsel be chosen? From among which lists of various counsel possibilities will the witnesses choose? How will the proceedings develop? How will the cross-examination of individual members of the House be facilitated? How will all of these matters emerge?

If it is meant to meet immediately on that, I would suggest caution. We would have wished to have that done tomorrow when we thought the committee was to meet formally again. But I would think that all of those matters are inherent in the first stages of a committee meeting. And that is something which is very unclear in the minds of the New Democratic Party at this point.

I think therefore, Mr. Speaker, that although we understand the spirit which moves the Liberal Party amendment, in this instance we are inclined to support the government resolution, not the amendment. We consider this a very clear break with tradition. Some of the things which the Premier has introduced, specifically those relating to verbatim Hansard, availability of counsel, etc., should be a part of all committee proceedings; with the addition of research personnel in the other committees.

Although it is unfortunate that the Workmen's Compensation Board had to suffer the arrows of outrageous fortune in this instance, I am glad the Workmen's Compensation Board has been the vehicle for showing how the committee system has operated rather impotently in the past and how it might be made more effective in the future.

The Provincial Secretary for Justice threw at me across the floor the other day that I had been bobbing up every 5 or 10 minutes in the committee, and that this was clearly not the characteristic carrying-on for committee proceedings of this kind. Whether or not I agree with him, I will concede that there are occasional interjections from the member for Scarborough West, and some questions.

But I do think it does make this point. What happened at the committee, of course, was that the repartée, the cut-and-thrust, all the rest of it which is part of this House, was transferred holus-bolus to the committee. We never got a sense of the seriousness of the proceedings.

Now that seriousness is clearly a part of the proceedings, now that we are going to approach it anew—although I do not think you can begin from the beginning, because we have had two days. It is all there. It is all out. You are not going to wipe the slate clean. I do not know how you would do that.

I do not know how you would get Jack Cauley to retract his words. We will start the cross-examination process and elucidate them. But it has happened. It is an event. It has occurred. So we keep going. We will treat it in the best possible faith, Mr. Speaker.

It is our intention to try to make this committee work. We are quite uncertain as to how it will proceed. We know that we will be a little uncomfortable with it and that there will be moments when it is awkward. But for the sake not only of this investigation, but for the committee system generally and in the future, we are determined to see it through and see it through admirably and fairly. And for that reason we will support the Premier's resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. A. J Roy (Ottawa East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few comments as far as the motion is concerned. I support the words of my leader, Mr. Speaker, about the fact that it is very important to determine the rules or the terms of reference of this particular committee.

Now, I might say at the outset that for one who has sat in just as an observer in this particular committee, I quite agree with the leader of the New Democratic Party that there seems to be sort of a circus, or even college atmosphere in this committee, with accusations flying in various directions. Then, not only were accusations flying in various directions but witnesses were sort of talking at random, going in no methodical fashion. There would seem to have been no help in directing them to any specific issue.

I really think that the motion presented by the government here will certainly go a long way to correct this particular failing of the previous proceedings. But, Mr. Speaker, as my leader said, we would have preferred a royal commission or a judicial inquiry for these particular reasons.

It is always important in our system of justice, be it only an inquiry, that justice not only be done but appear to be done. I would support my leader when he says that like it or not, there is a case here where a minister of the government will, at the very least, end up being a witness before this committee. And yet how do we convince the public generally that the proceedings that will take place are absolutely impartial, when the government members on the committee far outnumber all other members? That's the first thing.

So that if the terms of reference are left with the committee—

Mr. Lewis: They outnumber us here too.

Mr. Roy: That is very true. But—

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That is democracy.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Perverse, but democracy.

Mr. Roy: —on the committee, they are the ones who are going to decide the rules of the committee, the terms of reference.

Mr. Lewis: It is a mistake but it happens. One lives with it. One learns from it.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the terms of reference should be determined now, on the amendment as presented by my leader. Because when you have not only the government or an officer or a minister of the government being a possible witness before this committee, and yet the government members of the committee outnumber the others, no matter how impartial you want to be, it is very difficult to convince the public that this is going to be sort of a, as we say, an equity—a thing with clean hands.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, how are the terms of reference being narrowed, if this is a problem?

Mr. Roy: It is important to determine that the terms of reference here are wide enough to satisfy the aims of this particular committee.

Mr. Lewis: What kind of logic is that?

Mr. MacDonald: They will find more restrictions in 10 minutes than the hon. member could dream up in an hour.

Mr. Roy: Who will, the government will?

Mr. MacDonald: No, the committee will.

Mr. Roy: The committee will.

Mr. MacDonald: The lawyers will.

Mr. Roy: Well, don't let the lawyers determine the rules of reference; it should be the committee members.

Mr. MacDonald: That is why the committee can create its own terms, but if you give them—

Mr. Lewis: That is what is important about the committee.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Roy: Yes. The second thing; the leader of the New Democratic Party stated that the purpose of the committee, of course, was to get the facts out. But once the facts have been obtained, who determines at that point what to do with them, once you have all this evidence? Who determines that at that point? Is it the committee again that determines what to do with this?

There again, you are faced with a situation where if there is the possibility of having a minister of the Crown being a witness with an overwhelming number of government members on this committee, it is just like having the accused sitting on the jury, in a way.

So, respectfully, Mr. Speaker, I feel that—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt the hon. member because I recognize he hasn't perhaps much experience in these matters yet, but to use the term "accused" is quite improper in this House. No one is going before that standing committee, under this resolution or any other,

standing as an accused person. I think that should be very clearly stated.

Interjections by an hon. member.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, there was no intention of accusing anybody.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member said as much.

Mr. Roy: I was making an analogy in this particular case. I was just making an analogy.

I never accused anybody, but the Premier will admit that there surely is a likelihood that there are some ministers of the Crown who will be witnesses on this committee.

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, of course.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The same as when the committee was sitting before. No question about that.

Mr. Lewis: They have already spoken.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They have already given evidence.

Mr. Roy: There was no intention whatsoever of accusing anyone of anything. All I was making was an analogy in this case.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is not the way the member phrased it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He was comparing it to a legal case where there is an accused, so do not continue the misrepresentation. Why is the Premier continuing that misrepresentation?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

An hon. member: For which he has endless background.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Do not make poor analogies.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Roy: This is why we feel, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment as put forth by my leader should be supported. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise personally in support of the measure that has been taken by the Prime Minister—Premier, or whatever you want to call him.

At the time that the committee was meeting I can say to the Premier that the embarrassment that was felt by the Leader of the Opposition was felt as acutely or more acutely by many of the members of the committee.

In thinking through how one would resolve the problem that was obvious before the committee on that morning of last week, I could think of no way that the government would have accepted any effort by members of the committee to appoint counsel. The first thought that came to mind was that we should resurrect our old war cry and ask the government to adequately equip the committee with counsel and the like in order that we might proceed in a more orderly way.

I was convinced from past experiences in raising this matter that it wasn't going to occur. I was convinced by the rather negative attitude, if I might say so, of some of the members of the committee toward the suggestion of a recorded Hansard and by the fact that they defeated that motion, that there was little possibility of the committee ever getting the opportunity to have a proper counsel and to have the matters conducted in a proper and legal way, in a way that would safeguard the rights of all the people who at that point were being accused of certain things and people whose names were being brought into it by Mr. Cauley.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Those guys get too many votes in these committees—no doubt about it.

Mr. Deans: For that reason I asked that the committee consider recommending to the government a judicial inquiry; it struck me as perhaps the only likely vehicle for getting this thing back on the track. I am delighted that the Prime Minister has chosen this way. I think this is the appropriate way. I think, in fact, this is the way that every single committee of this Legislature ought to operate. There should be sufficient staff for every single committee of this Legislature.

Mr. Lewis: And every single member.

Mr. Deans: And every single member, right—bear that in mind; that is important—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am glad that made the member laugh.

Mr. Deans: —in order that we can operate efficiently and effectively.

There are a couple of things about the affairs of the committee, though, that I am very personally concerned about. One is that I understand it is the intention of the govern-

ment to proceed immediately, today, with the structuring of the committee and with discussions between the committee and the counsel about the ways in which they will proceed tomorrow.

I find myself in rather a bit of a conflict. I have played some role in the affairs of the committee, and hope to continue to play a major role in the affairs of the committee. I happen to have in the House the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) sitting desperately awaiting his estimates to go through the House; I have a role to play in that too, as I happen to be the critic, for some reason.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Agriculture?

Mr. Deans: Unfortunately, yes. Now, I want to ask whether the government would consider a method.

Mr. MacDonald: We never thought of the present Minister of Revenue as a trade minister until they put him in the position—

Mr. Deans: In order that I might maintain my interest—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, but the critics.

Mr. MacDonald: —so don't get pretentious suddenly.

Mr. Deans: In order that I might maintain my interest in the committee and play some part in the formulation of the terms of reference—

Mr. Renwick: Mind you, many of us could take over the agricultural work.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Riverdale has resolved the problem; he has offered to take over as critic of the agricultural portfolio.

Mr. Deans: The hon. member for Riverdale rarely ever speaks out of turn.

Mr. Lewis: The hon. member for Riverdale speaks better than he sows.

Mr. MacDonald: They'll be surprised at the role he plays in the estimates.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry if I am holding you up. Were you in a hurry to go some place?

Mr. MacDonald: He is the overnight expert on eggs from the legal point of view.

Mr. Deans: What I want to ask is whether the matter of the estimates might be held back in order that this committee structuring can be proceeded with, with all of the committee members there and in their place, in order that we might play a role in determining what kinds of terms of reference this committee will have.

Other than that, I want to ask, in terms of the way in which the committee will operate, whether it was the intention of the government that committee members would be free to maintain the role they have always played in directly questioning the witnesses and that, as I understand it—just for my own clarification—only the witnesses would be required, if they so desired, to speak through counsel? Is this correct? Fine.

Then other than that, I agree with my leader that, of course, the terms of reference for the committee should be as broad as possible, the terms of reference should be set by the committee, and there's no need for this House to dictate terms of reference to this committee. The amendment to the motion would—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): And all members entitled to opinions.

Mr. Deans: —in fact, restrict rather than broaden the opportunities for a full investigation.

Mr. Haggerty: Zero in.

Mr. Deans: I think that's unnecessary. I think it is unnecessary for there to be an amendment because everyone in this House knows what it is that we're investigating.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the point. What the member knows it is, is not precisely what someone else might know it is. It is the ambience of those matters.

Mr. Deans: We are investigating, as a standing committee of the Legislature, the affairs of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): We have done that for five years.

Mr. Deans: It was called before the committee in the proper course of the committee's work. It is appearing now to answer to the standing committee of the Legislature for its actions, whatever those actions may be, and it should be left exactly as it is.

Mr. Good: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: I've been a member of the government commissions committee for the last four years and each year we have had the Workmen's Compensation Board before us.

We are dealing with an entirely different matter from those of previous years. There's been no similar resolution before this House dealing with extended privileges for the standing committee in engaging counsel. We concur in this resolution but we feel it must go further to delineate and confine the areas which we are to hear.

Mr. Lewis: No, no. Why confine it?

Mr. Good: If one looks carefully at Hansard, it is impossible to find a clear-cut statement from either the Minister of Labour or the Premier of the province on exactly what matters would be dealt with starting the first Wednesday after we returned from our Easter recess.

Mr. Lewis: Have we been confined so far?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member would be the first one to object if we had.

Mr. Good: Let us start with this fact—the Liberal Party is not starting with any presumptions at all. We are here to get facts relating to several issues. Already, the Workmen's Compensation Board has denied the committee certain facts which we thought were essential. If it is designated in the resolution from the Legislature perhaps the Workmen's Compensation Board will not see fit to deny the committee certain facts which we have been unable to obtain under present regulations. Unfortunately, the New Democratic Party is caught on the horns of a dilemma in this whole issue.

An hon. member: They sure are.

Mr. Good: Now, may I simply say this—

Mr. Deans: The member wouldn't care to tell us what those are, would he?

Mr. Lewis: What are the horns?

Mr. Deans: What are the horns—since, in fact, we do all the work?

Mr. Good: —there must be in the resolution certain guidelines and the matters on which we are working so that the facts relating to certain things can be brought out. Now whether they do include testimony and things from the minister, the Workmen's Compensation Board and everyone else involved in it, can be brough out much better if we know exactly what our duties are.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that to safeguard and prevent many accusations from flying around and getting off on to side issues and red herrings and well off the track as we did last week, there must be a more specific delineation of what the work of the committee is to be.

Mr. Deans: That is why we have the counsel.

Mr. Good: I think members should support this amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I have only certain querying remarks to make as to how the government envisages the committee operating. Unquestionably this is a breach with our traditions and a most fruitful one if we handle it with discretion and wisdom at this time, as to how these things are going to be structured and committees operate.

This party is in thorough accord with the steps being taken. It is procedure that bothers me. A moment ago on the first part, the business of the role of the committee member himself vis-à-vis counsel for the committee; I suppose that would take the form—not necessarily of the members of committee feeding counsel with questions but up to a considerable point doing that too—of counsel clearing out the underbrush and main ground in going through it and obviating numerous questions. But always preserving at the end of the day, as an afterthought so to speak, or in the case that an area isn't precisely and exhaustively covered, the right of the committee to step in and pursue his own form of examination. I understood the Prime Minister to say that that kind of thing was feasible in the cards.

The second thing that bothers me a little more has to do with the second part of the resolution, that people whose interests are affected may obtain counsel, which counsel, in turn, may not carry on his own form of examination at his own pace as he sees fit, as is normally done within the wider judicial process, but must turn to an amanuensis, some form of interpreter, in the nature of the counsel for the committee itself, and have his questions siphoned through that particular process. I find that questionable, time-consuming to say the least, and not likely to lead to the result intended.

I know of no other procedure in which this is done in this precise way. In hearings before the Municipal Board, for instance, the procedure there is not, if there are counsel present, to permit members of the public to ask questions directly, but to utilize the services of counsel to get those questions across. There is some sense in that because it eliminates reduplication and all kinds of side and irrelevant issues from central points being explored. But to say that fully qualified counsel appearing before the committee would not be given the amplitude and scope, but will have his method of attack or appraisal or questioning procedures somehow put through the litmus paper of another lawyer who is on a par with himself, seems to me to be pushing the matter pretty far.

I would ask the Premier to give some consideration to that. I wonder whether he might not say that this kind of internal procedure, as in an infinity of other matters which couldn't be envisaged standing here at the moment, may not be resolved by the committee itself in the course of its deliberation as to the best way, because we are on totally experimental grounds, feeling our way as to the best manner in which to conduct this new form of inquiry. As to the terms of reference, surely it must be obvious that from what we have heard thus far in the committee that certain areas have come to light. But can anyone prevision or preclude by terms of reference what may emerge at any time during the course of the hearings from any quarter whatsoever, from witnesses or members of this committee themselves?

Therefore, it would be most unwise to set down strong rules of procedure in a hearing that is only prefatory so far, only getting under way, and in which wide areas and swathes may be cut into the total operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board. Now, a fortiori on that point, even latterly to the committee's hearings, there are the revelations made about the internal malaise, the wiretapping, and the taking of records. Who can tell what will emerge in the course of these proceedings? Therefore, to restrict it by setting up contour lines of this kind seems to me truncating and nothing to the point.

On that one point, I would ask, one point as to the role of counsel to witnesses. I don't think it is proper in this connection to talk about cross-examination. I don't think that's the purpose involved, as it is different from a judicial inquiry in that particular regard. But as to exploratory type of questions, the Prime Minister as a lawyer himself well knows that the way in which we frame our questions, the angle at which we proceed, cannot be interpreted by a fellow solicitor. We all have our style. To set up that screen between the two parties may be doing a disservice to the witnesses who are supposed to be being protected in the course of the hearing itself.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I will just be a few moments. I want to add my support to the well chosen words put on the record by my leader. I would like to say that I am convinced, I think in the jargon of the cocktail party, this is a good news day and a bad news day. The good news is that at least we are now attempting to give to the committees of this House some powers, but, concurrent with those powers, some degree of responsibility. If you will recall, this House did defeat a motion put forward by the leader of the New Democratic Party on March 3 of this year in connection with the powers of the committee.

I say to him and to his party that I felt that the attempt to delineate the responsibilities and duties of the committees was an appropriate one. So that is good news. Notwithstanding the comments we hear from the government, made from time to time, that we are becoming a congressional type of system, we are recognizing the responsibility of protection to people, individually and collectively, and at the same time that the legislative function should be paramount in our eyes.

However, I am concerned that there was then made, at the time of the motion, a certain delineation of responsibility that was in itself responsible. I am concerned with the very wording of this motion itself. We are going to support the motion, primarily because of the good news aspect, because we are taking cognizance of these responsibilities and duties and the need for the protection of the individuals who come before it. But, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider the words, for example, "and that persons whose interests may be affected by the inquiry be allowed counsel to advise and assist."

I am given to understand that the Premier yesterday said that those counsel would be paid for out of the public purse, so that means, in effect, unless I am wrong, that General Motors of Canada Ltd.'s counsel will be paid for out of the public purse. I take strong issue with that, strong issue. That is wrong. It is bad in drafting, bad in intent.

It certainly isn't the intention of the government that that be the situation. Ford of Canada Ltd. can well afford the expense of engaging its own counsel, because the government doesn't engage Ford's counsel. The government engages the commission counsel and he is subject to the direction of the committee itself. But then the government lets, as I understand it, Ford of Canada Ltd. go down on to Bay St. and pick out whatever advocate it wishes and bring him forward to assist and advise it at the public expense.

I would very much appreciate if the Premier could explain to me the reason, nay the rationale, for that type of attitude. I think it is a manifest deficiency. I think the intention was good. The intention was to say, in effect, that if that secretary was being in any way slandered, or libelled through publication, or defamed in any way, that she should be able to come before that committee and set the record straight with advice of counsel. But the government has gone too far. This is the basic problem, that this is a vulcanizing job. That is all it is. It is a patchwork superimposed on the establishment of those committees 18 months ago. We should hang our head in shame relatively, because we did establish this particular procedure for the committees only about 18 months ago. Now we find ourselves, of necessity, coming to grips with the weaknesses.

I said during the course of the Throne debate that surely here is something that we don't have to have the bureaucrats involved in. There should be an establishment of a select committee now to look into the whole function of the Legislature and its committees. I say to the House frankly, I inquire of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, through you, what he means by the words, "be allowed counsel to advise and assist them, which counsel may question witnesses only through the committee counsel"? I can't understand that.

Frankly, I don't know what the member for Lakeshore meant. As I understood his words, he wished to restrict to some extent or felt there was no purpose or need for cross-examination in a tribunal of this nature. I take issue with that. Cross-examination is the very weapon that is necessary to get at truth. Perhaps that wasn't the context or the meaning that he was putting forward.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is a broad distinction between this and judicial proceedings.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well that is artificial. The Premier says, in effect, that he wants to draw a distinction between a judicial inquiry and this particular function of the committee itself. I think that is artificial. I submit to the Premier, through the Speaker, that there is nothing wrong in permitting the counsel to the witnesses to ask questions of other persons who might put forward allegations deleterious to the position of their own clients. I see nothing wrong with that at all. But I want to close by saying the intention of this party in moving the amendment in no way detracted from the support that we gave to the motion itself. The leader of the New Democratic Party in his comments said that last Wednesday was a very chaotic—I forget the exact words—a chaotic day, a shambles. I think part of the problem there was that there were no specific terms of reference. But in point of fact we are not in any way restricting, we're adding to. We're saying: "You have gone and acted in connection with the matters relating to the Workmen's Compensation Board. That is the purview of the committee, continue on. If matters arise that you wish to investigate further you are in no way fettered by this amendment." We're saying: "It is your bounden duty to this House as a whole, as a committee of this House, to investigate these matters, to investigate the question of Mr. Cauley, to investigate the question of public moneys improperly or wastefully spent, to investigate whether any responsible minister of the Crown has been in any way negligent in his duties," and such other matters that might come before the committee. That in no way restricts the ability of that committee to carry on the scope as wide as possible as it sees fit, to investigate and report to this House. But it says: "Aside from the general obligation that you have, we charge you with this duty: Come back to us and give us the answers to these questions that we couldn't get responses from the minister on." That's the only purpose of this particular amendment. I take pride, frankly, in supporting such an amendment.

Mr. Lawlor: Did the member draft it?

Mr. Bullbrook: I didn't draft it at all.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two comments. I really welcome the motion as put forward by the Premier of the province yesterday on this difficult question. I welcome it for two reasons. One, principally because it made the very minor adjustment, for this purpose, of the rules of the Legislature with respect to standing committees. It didn't attempt to make it a very special instance. It didn't attempt to dictate the

terms of reference of it. What it did recognize very clearly was that the deliberations of this assembly and the deliberations of its committees are unique and different from and distinguishable on practically every count, from deliberation of other bodies in the Province of Ontario which have obligations of this nature to discharge.

The second reason flows from the first, and that is that the government didn't simply have the question of saying sort of, on the one hand or on the other hand will we have a judicial inquiry or will it be dealt with by the standing committee of the Legislature, as if it made no never mind as to which of the two courses would be followed and as if there was no distinction of any merit to be made between the two proceedings. It was a much more fundamental and basic decision, it was a basic decision to recognize that this asesmbly has obligations which are its obligation and not obligations which can be discharged by the appointment of a commissioner under the Public Inquiries Act.

I think that the very recognition of that fundamental distinction between the two methods of proceedings gives us an opportunity in this House for the slow and gradual evolution on a sound basis for the expanding work of the committees of this Legislature, which all of us I think agree is an essential component of the responsiveness and adequacies of our democratic institutions in this kind of a society. I think the problem has been just how do we go about doing this; in that particular area, I welcome the extreme caution and the extreme care with which the government has framed this resolution within the terms of reference of the standing committees appointed by this Legislature as part of its deliberative and examining function.

Therefore, I think for those reasons it is obvious to us that we cannot possibly support an amendment which would attempt to analogize by imposing terms of reference on a body of this Legislature, appointed by the Legislature to do certain things and with the confidence that they will be done properly. Indeed, I think it would be most unwise if the committee even thought in terms of reference when it goes into its deliberations. Terms of reference by nature are specific and restrictive. What we are really talking about is the areas of concern that warrant and merit investigation by this committee—and those areas of concern are best left to the committee within the ambit of the rules of the House and in accordance with the traditions of this assembly.

For that reason we oppose the amendment not only because we fail to understand it but because we endorse the substance of the government's motion and believe that it is a most sound and constructive, careful step in the gradual evolution of an adequate standing committee system of the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Renfrew South.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, initially, being perhaps close to the matter at hand, I had not intended to speak on this motion. However, in reconsidering it, I thought perhaps I did have some duty here.

I did want to mention that we all know that what occurred in the committee last Wednesday is common and general knowledge. Perhaps I should take some or all responsibility for those happenings, but on the other hand in another sense I do not apologize, because what happened last Wednesday, I think, had to happen.

I think it would have been premature if a motion such as the one we are debating this afternoon had come before this Legislature, say prior to the time the committee met to hear matters pertaining to the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Haggerty: We never knew where we were going. That's what happened.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Yakabuski: Naturally I am pleased that this motion has been brought forward this afternoon. I think the government did have a number of options open to it, one being a royal commission, another being to appoint a judicial inquiry or to set up a judicial inquiry and a third being to bring in a motion such as it has this afternoon.

I might mention that if this motion had not been brought in this afternoon, in my opinion our committee would have had to meet tomorrow morning and state that it was no longer able to continue in the manner of last Wednesday. I think we would have had to draft a report tomorrow for the House, stating that we did not feel we were capable of continuing because of our structure, and of course I think our report would have been quite similar to the motion that is before the House at this time.

I am pleased that the government has seen fit to bring in this motion because I think it's really a victory for the committee system. I think it will result in the strengthening of the committee system in the future. Therefore,

Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to support this motion.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have two or three brief points that I would like to make.

The first one has to do with the apparent belief on the part of the Liberal Party that they, by this amendment, aren't going to be restricting a wide-ranging investigation of the Workmen's Compensation Board. If that was their intention, I respectfully suggest to them their amendment is not drafted correctly.

If the amendment had said "notwithstanding the generality of the foregoing, this House instructs the committee to deal with" one, two, three, four and five, then they would not have restricted the generality of the foregoing. But I can assure them, from the experience that I have had personally and from observation in this House, that when committees have been given specific terms of reference, the committee has become restricted to those terms of reference and a legal interpretation of those terms of reference.

That was the reason for my interjection to our friend from Ottawa East. Having suffered personally the consequences of this process, as well as having observed it in the last 15 years in this House, I can tell the hon. members that the lawyers will zero in and argue the crossing of the t's and the dotting of the i's with regard to what was put down in the term of reference. And anything that isn't within the terms of reference is out.

In short, if the Liberal Party wanted to have listed these five specific points it should have done it within the context.

Mr. Haggerty: Then move an amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not going to move an amendment because I am not in favour of it. I am not in favour of it, because quite frankly in our view we should have a wide-ranging investigation.

In the Pandora's box or the can of worms or whatever other analogy that you want to apply to this situation the committee may discover, as they continue to investigate, that there are areas not listed in those five which the committee will want to pursue and clarify and report back to the House. But, if the committee restricts themselves by those five, they will be bound by it.

I leave that point. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition, and more particularly the hon. member for Sarnia, whose legal mind is not really working at its best this afternoon, that past experience would not produce what they apparently sought.

Mr. Lawlor: I am surprised the government didn't adopt the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Speaker, the brief comment I want to make in connection with it is this. Speakers on behalf of this party have already said that we are supporting this resolution, not only because we are convinced it is the best way to cope with the specific problem of the Workmen's Compensation Board now before this standing committee—indeed, it is a better way than a royal commission—but more important, that it is potentially—I was going to say an historic breakthrough, and upon careful consideration, I think I will use the term—an historic breakthrough for the operation of standing committees in this Legislature.

My only regret with regard to the resolution is that it is only a potentially historic breakthrough. This resolution comes some 18 months or two years after a unanimous motion was passed by a standing committee—it was moved by my colleague from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), and was seconded by a member on the government side of the House—requesting the government to provide staff for standing committees and to provide the taking of Hansard so that we would have a permanent record of what went on. That, like so many good resolutions around this Legislature, just drifted off into limbo and nothing happened.

Here—unfortunately only for a limited portion of the life of this committee, and for one specific purpose, but that's the breakthrough—the government is going to staff a standing committee. Indeed, it is interesting to put this in the historical perspective of the experience or the traditions of this Legislature.

We have had a committee, namely the old standing committee on privileges and elections which, up until a very few years ago, certainly back in the days of Leslie Frost, was regarded narrowly as the "scandal committee." Allegedly if it affected the privileges of any member of the House, it would revert to that committee. But if some scandal, some allegation that was, in Mr.

Frost's inimitable phraseology, "digging up some dirt," then out it would go to the committee on privileges and elections. It was a travesty, an incredible travesty. Because we attempted to do there what we had attempted to do with the Workmen's Compensation Board and, of course, you couldn't do it. But if my friend thinks it is a kangaroo court setup—you really had a kangaroo court setup under those arrangements.

In the developing traditions of this Legislature we passed the stage of regarding the Committee on Elections and Privileges as exclusively a "scandal committee." It became a committee in which it would look at the broader range of privileges and even, on occasion, alleged misdemeanors in connection with elections that had taken place in this province.

With the experience we are going to have in the next week or 10 days, I hope we can persuade even the government that the faltering steps that it has taken in reference to just one issue is really the pattern in which it should move for the staffing and the effective work of this committee throughout all of its life, and of all of the committees of this Legislature.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand up and say a few words as a member of this committee on the government side. Like the chairman, the member for Renfrew South, I feel compelled to say a few things. I have listened to the comments of the members of the other parties; the leaders of the two parties. At one point they likened this discussion, last Wednesday, to a ball game. That the cut-and-thrust of this House was carried into the committee. This is true. I think, though, that they will realize that the steps being suggested by the government in this motion are a definite step forward if the responsible functions of the committees are to be encouraged.

I feel, too, that they have a large part to play in this experiment—if one may call it that—in determining whether this step will have a bearing on future committee procedures. If, in fact, our discussions tomorrow —which will deal greatly with the future course of some people's lives—are allowed to become a political football rather than the search for truth, I feel this system will fail. And I would say to them that in supporting this motion, they should also realize that those of us on the government side are just as interested in finding truth in this matter as they are. I would ask them to co-operate with us in this search for truth tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: We might reverse that if the government co-operates with the opposition.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have been an observer at a couple of these meetings of this committee. I would like to point out that part of the problem is nothing more than the age-old problem we have had here, to a great degree. That is, in having a committee room facility that would allow for an atmosphere, and would allow for decorum and procedure to flow in a manner much better than the way we have had it.

Much of the problem that was present in the two committee rooms that this committee worked in during its last day was that there were members of the committee who could not hear the testimony. There were members who did not have the opportunity of making notes to ask questions later. There were things of this nature that just simply have to be ironed out if you are going to have a proper committee-room atmosphere.

The select committee on the rules and procedures did advise this House that we required a committee room much larger than committee room No. 1 in this building for the use of just such functions as we have had to face in recent days. When you do not have a proper room, you do not have control. You do not have procedure flowing. You do not hear properly and you do not have people placed where things will work in the proper manner.

What kind of House would this be if everyone was on the same level as with the chairs and tables that you have in the operation of your committee; without these speakers to make sure that people hear what you say, and things of this nature. You just don't have the facility for proper decorum and operation. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the considerations the government has to make sooner or later for the accommodation of the members in this House.

I would support the member for York South in the first point that he made and not the latter. In the first instance, I think he had a very valid point, in that the Liberal Party does not have a motion that would do what they wish it to do themselves; they would find themselves somewhat hamstrung

at a later date and try to wiggle out of the box they have got themselves in.

Mr. Speaker, those are the only points I would like to make at this point in time. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I won't delay the discussion of this resolution any longer except to observe that as I read again the amendment to the resolution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and listened very carefully to the member for Sarnia, I really wondered whether or not he was attempting to rationalize what I think is a somewhat illogical approach to what we are attempting to do.

What we are setting out in this resolution, the hopes we have for the standing committee and how it may function, would be inhibited, without any question, by the amendment that has been proposed by the Liberal Party in this Legislature. I say that, recognizing that while it would be nice to have a definition and perhaps would be easier for the committee to come to grips with some of the issues if they could be clearly defined. But surely, Mr. Speaker, we would be usurping the rights of the committee and what we hope they will be able to accomplish for this Legislature, if we were to define specific terms for them in this instance in the way that has been suggested in the amendment to the resolution.

I think it is only proper on occasion, Mr. Speaker, to express thoughts—and I do this to the leader of the New Democratic Party, because on occasion I am critical of some of his observations—and I would say that his contribution in this discussion represents one of his more reasoned contributions in this House.

Mr. Lewis: I thought the Premier would think that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let's not go overboard.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I won't get carried away because this would not be appropriate either.

Mr. Lewis: I will have a difficult time enough living with caucus now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I do know this—and I cannot help but observe this, Mr. Speaker—that I read the report in that very credible newspaper, the Globe and Mail, this morning, that the leader of the New Democratic Party was delighted and said with a smile that the government had accepted what he had suggested Saturday night. However, I would only point out to him that because of the complexity of this matter—and this takes nothing away from his observations—some of this actually had been determined as of Friday of last week.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He didn't go overboard, see.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is not one of the Premier's better moments.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the Premier find the Globe and Mail credible last September and October?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the member find the Globe and Mail incredible?

Hon. Mr Grossman: It turned out to be credible.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the point that I think must be emphasized—and it was raised to a certain extent by the member for Lakeshore—is that this is a committee to investigate and to inquire. No one is there standing accused. It is very important that the conduct of this committee hearing be in the hands of the committee members.

While I have a great deal of respect for the legal profession, I think it is quite obvious that there could be a number of counsel involved and they could usurp the proper function of the members of the committee themselves. This is why the resolution has been drafted. It has been drafted with great care to make it abundantly clear that it is the members of the committee who have the responsibility, the onus, to conduct the examination with the assistance of counsel. And while the witnesses will have the rights and the protection and the advice of counsel, it is the committee's hearing; they are the ones responsible. This is why the resolution has been drafted in these very careful and, I believe, very logical terms.

I would point out to the member for Sarnia that we were concerned too about the position he brought to our attention. We felt it would be very difficult in a resolution of this kind to delineate how witnesses might obtain counsel or how they might be remunerated. I can only assure him it is not the intent of government to pay for the counsel for such firms as General Motors, Ford or others of that kind. But we felt it would be almost impossible to start delineating that in the context of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this does represent a very significant departure from the traditions, by and large, of the standing committees. I look forward to the experience with substantial optimism recognizing that it is a very difficult responsibility that has been given to them, at the same time expressing very real confidence in their capacity to resolve many of the issues that have been presented to them in a way that will make this whole legislative experience more appropriate and more meaningful for all of us who are involved.

I think it should also be pointed out, Mr. Speaker—and I know what the member for York South would like me to say—that we are not regarding this as a precedent per se to relate to all standing committees of this House. I observed to the press and I guess I said here yesterday that perhaps one should be looking at the possibility of a select committee to function in situations comparable to the one in which we presently find ourselves. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition when he asked which commission may be appointed, there will be a commission to assess the role of the members and many other things, including the functions of the committees so that we can develop, hopefully, more appropriate ways of dealing with these matters.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see the very enthusiastic support for the resolution from the members opposite, with the exception of the official Opposition. In the amendment, perhaps on reflection, perhaps after very careful consideration by the member for Sarnia, they may now recognize the lack of logic in what they have presented. They may even, Mr. Speaker, wish to withdraw their amendment at this moment and make the resolution itself unanimous.

Mr. Bullbrook: Before the Premier resumes his seat, would he permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: From a legal point of view, would he explain to me—perhaps I am having one of my more obtuse days—how the amendment in any way restricts the committee. It gives the—

Mr. MacDonald: I explained it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I beg your pardon?

Mr. MacDonald: I explained it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, perhaps I can't accuse myself of being unduly obtusive if I don't understand the member for York South.

Mr. Renwick: The member is having an obtuse day.

Mr. MacDonald: It was in the English language.

An hon. member: It was a brother lawyer's explanation.

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps the Premier—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only answer this way—

Mr. Bullbrook: If I might just be permitted—could the Premier explain to me; it is an addendum to the motion. It doesn't in any way restrict the committee in its functions and duties. It imposes and charges them merely with the duty to report back to the House—

Mr. Lawlor: That is not a question. It is the whole debate all over again.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The hon. member—

Mr. Renwick: Let's get on with it.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am asking a question, if I might.

Mr. Speaker: Well, it sounds like a speech to me. The hon. member may direct a question to the Premier who agreed to answer it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes. Would the Premier explain to me the words in the amendment that restrict the general abilities of the committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are not there.

Mr. Bullbrook: They are not there.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, I will just read the first part of it " . . . that this House instruct the committee to determine . . ." and then it sets it out specifically. It then excludes the original reference by this House to the committee of the Workmen's Compensation Board. We are confined to five items—

Mr. MacDonald: Right. Right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —as one reads this amendment. Even if that interpretation is not accurate, if, in fact, it does not restrict then what in heaven's name is the need for the amendment at all?

Mr. Bullbrook: To determine and report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: To determine and report.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the member's obtuse day.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I be permitted to ask a question?

An hon. member: No, the member is not.

Mr. Speaker: We will, of course, place the amendment to the motion first.

We were dealing with hon. Mr. Davis' motion that, for the purpose of its inquiry into the Workmen's Compensation Board only, the standing resources development committee be empowered to engage counsel to assist the chairman and members of the committee in the inquiry, including the questioning of witnesses, and that persons whose interests may be affected by the inquiry be allowed counsel to advise and assist them, which counsel may question witnesses only through the committee counsel; also, that for the duration of this inquiry the committee be authorized to sit concurrently with the House and have its proceedings recorded and transcribed by the Hansard office.

Mr. R. F. Nixon had moved that the motion be amended by adding that:

This House instruct the committee to determine:

1. The facts surrounding the termination of active duty by the former vice-chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. John Cauley;

2. Whether public moneys or moneys controlled by the Workmen's Compensation Board were improperly or wastefully spent;

3. Whether the responsible minister properly carried out his duty in the disposition of the termination of Mr. Cauley's service;

4. Such other matters as pertain to the Workmen's Compensation Board concerning remission of levies for poor safety records, and the use of Workmen's Compensation Board trust funds in private development;

5. Whether or not these and related matters warrant further investigation by judicial inquiry.

We shall deal with the amendment first.

The House divided on the amendment moved by Mr. R. F. Nixon, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Braithwaite	Allan
Bullbrook	Apps
Deacon	Bales
Edighoffer	Beckett
Good	Belanger
Haggerty	Birch (Mrs.)
Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)	Bounsall
Nixon (Brant)	Brunelle
Paterson	Burr
Roy	Carruthers
Ruston	Carton
Smith (Nipissing)	Cassidy
Spence	Clement
Worton—14	Davis
	Davison
	Deans
	Drea
	Dymond
	Eaton
	Ewen
	Foulds
	Germa
	Gilbertson
	Gisborn
	Grossman
	Guindon
	Hamilton
	Handleman
	Havrot
	Henderson
	Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)
	Hodgson (York North)
	Irvine
	Jessiman
	Johnston
	Kennedy
	Kerr
	Lane
	Laughren
	Lawlor
	Lawrence (Carleton East)
	Lawrence (St. George)
	Leluk
	Lewis
	MacBeth
	MacDonald
	MacNaughton
	Maeck
	Martel
	McIlveen
	McKeough
	McNeil
	Meen
	Miller
	Morningstar
	Morrow
	Newman (Ontario South)

Nays

Nixon
(Dovercourt)
Parrott
Potter
Reilly
Renwick
Rhodes
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Snow
Stewart
Stokes
Taylor
Turner
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardle
Welch
Wells
White
Winkler
Wiseman
Yakabuski
Yaremko—83

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 14, the "nays" 83.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. Would the hon. members agree to the same vote in reverse in favour of the motion?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I think we made it plain that we supported the main motion. And we would now make it plain again by our vote if you so choose.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion as put carry?

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. Bullbrook: How do you get a recount?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the committee is shortly to be convened and, if so, where and for how long?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Perhaps the chairman of the committee might answer that. I understand there was some thought that they might meet very briefly very shortly. The member might direct the question to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Yakabuski: It is hoped that the committee will reconvene in about 30 minutes.

Mr. Lewis: Where?

Mr. Yakabuski: Down in committee room No. 1.

Mr. Deans: For how long?

Mr. Yakabuski: To deal with some structural and procedural matters prior to resuming tomorrow at 10 o'clocks.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the farmer from Wentworth.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is certainly a pleasure to have a portfolio that I am so conversant in. There were those years that I spent in the last Legislature dealing with matters I knew nothing about and here, finally, I have sort of risen to the point of having a portfolio that I am quite capable of dealing with—I hope.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin first of all by quoting to the minister a statement that was made not so very long ago and I quote:

> The farming industry in this province is a depressed industry. It is an industry in which the majority of individual entrepreneurs cannot earn decent livings for their families.

That statement was made in the Ontario Federation of Agriculture brief to the minister and to his colleagues in March of 1971. It is a statement that many of us in this House have made over a number of years and a statement which has been denied to a great extent by the department. It is a statement which has not been given nearly a sufficient degree of thought by the department nor by the government. I say to you before dealing with the matter of the farmers and their problems that because of the just recent past event and the setting up of the committee I want to be out of here by 5:30 to be part of that committee, so I am going to cut it down.

The first point is this. In dealing with the matter of the recent egg marketing report

there were statements made by the Federation of Agriculture and by other individuals and organizations interested in the welfare of farmers that there hasn't been a clear avenue available to the farming community to express its views to the government. I quote from two statements, one made by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture in 1967 to the government in which they said:

> In our view of history the process by which governments interpret and satisfy the needs of the electorate has grown continually more complex and difficult. We have seen the withering away of the meaningful contact between the elected representative and the individual elector.

And on the other hand in 1970 they said much the same thing:

> We come to you today with one major concern. The concern is how we can bring the needs of the farmer to the government of Ontario, discuss these needs and have them acted upon.

What we are discussing is known as the consultative process of participatory democracy. I want to suggest to the minister that in regard to the matter of the recent report on the marketing of eggs, that this would be an ideal opportunity to make available to the farming community, its representatives and the individuals concerned, the chance to appear before the Legislature and the minister and to express their views.

What I am asking in actual fact is that the minister refer immediately to the appropriate committee the matter of hearing of opinions on the recently-prepared brief, and that this be done quickly. That farm organizations and individual farmers be invited together with consumers to make their views known, not only to the department but to every member of this Legislature through that committee. And that the committee be charged with the responsibility of coming forward to the department with a recommendation for action and the minister obligate himself to this House that there will be consideration given by his department to whatever the committee decides as the best course of action, having heard all of the statements and all of the concerns of the people who are most involved.

I believe that the Minister of Agriculture comes within the natural resources committee and that this should be referred immediately to that committee and it should be able to deal with it right away. Having heard that, and having recognized that this would go part of the way towards satisfying what has been a long-expressed concern of many sectors of the community—there have been many people who have said that they have felt that there hasn't been adequate opportunity for the presentation of views and concerns; that they were never absolutely sure that the things that concerned them the most ever got to government. In fact, they were absolutely sure that the things that they were presenting took some considerable time to be acted upon.

Another view that has been expressed by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture is one which I agree with and I think that it should be said here today. And that is that the basic problem of the farmer is, in fact, his inability to earn a decent income. The farmer wants to maintain a completely autonomous, free-enterprise, capitalistic operation, but he relies very heavily on government grants in order to do this. He relies very heavily on government participation.

The farmer in fact does rely to a great extent on government action to shore up what in many instances is not a particularly viable operation. Not that he hasn't got the skill and not that he hasn't got the desire, but simply because he is unable to extract from the marketplace sufficient amounts of money for the sale of his produce. It seems to me in looking at the farming community that in spite of all the desires of farmers they are rapidly becoming the most socialized sector of this society. There is more socialism involved in the farming community than in any other single, identifiable sector of society.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): The industry is doing all right.

Mr. Deans: The farmer's problems, and I say this to the minister, are rarely understood by the vast majority of urban dwellers. They are basically no different from the problems that confront the remainder of society. The statement that I make is borne out by a statement that appeared in the proceedings of the workshop that took place at the Guelph Agricultural College on Jan. 5 and 6, 1972. It says on page 24:

> The views expressed by the federation can be found in representations by industry, labour, consumers, the whole spectrum of interest groups in Ontario.

And so what we are really dealing with are problems that confront not only the farmers, but almost every sector of society.

Nevertheless, I want to zero in on what I believe to be the most important problems

confronting the farmer. They are, and I will itemize them for you:

1. An inadequate income level;

2. An inadequate income level;

3. An inadequate income level.

In spite of all of the briefs and all of the suggestions, the tax problems that are brought to our attention, the capitalization difficulties, the machinery price problems, the increased production costs, and all of the other things that we hear on a day to day basis. There is little that couldn't be resolved if the farmer were able to gain a greater access to the price of his commodity at the retail level, if, in fact, he shared more substantially in what it actually costs the consumer to purchase what it is that he produces for the consumer's needs.

The net income of farmers in Ontario has consistently declined in total. I'm not talking about individually—some farmers, of course, have increased their incomes—but the net income of farmers in total has consistently declined in the Province of Ontario. In 1969, as was said yesterday, the net income was $442 million It has dropped to a point in 1972 where the projected net income—whether it proves to be accurate or not is a matter for conjecture—is $274 million, and we might point out it is worthy of note that other jurisdictions have suffered similar kinds of problems. This is not unique to Ontario, but Ontario seems to be suffering more than other jurisdictions, for whatever reason. Perhaps we'll come across the reasons.

One might tend to assume that all that's required is to increase the price of the produce at the retail level and the problem would be solved. I suggest that this is not true. In fact the costs have risen at the consumer level in many instances, but in many instances the costs in fact have reached a point where the consumer too is suffering considerably from the pressures of the marketplace. So it is not adequate just to say that all the farmer need do is raise the cost at the retail level and he'll automatically benefit from this at the farm gate end. This isn't the case. I don't think in fact that it would borne out by too many statements of other people.

The price of farm produce at the consumer level is not an accurate reflection of what's paid to the farmer for his effort in time and investment. In fact one might tend to assume that there might be unconscionable gouging taking place at the retail level, when one looks at what a farmer gets for any particular commodity and what you've to pay to buy the same thing in the store. You might think that somewhere between the farm gate and the counter in the retail store there is someone making an unusually high degree of profit with a limited amount of effort.

Maybe we have to start to encourage the farmer, maybe we have to start now to re-encourage h'm, because there was a time when the farmer did involve himself more in the direct sale to the consumer. But maybe we now have to take a look back into history and see whether or not it's possible to encourage the farmer to involve himself once again in the direct sale of his produce to the consumer, so that while it may not result in increased cost to the consumer it certainly would result in a better and a higher degree of return at the farmer's end.

What I'm saying to you isn't new. This has been said over and over again. The whole problem of providing an adequate income for farmers has been raised by myself, by many other members, it was raised yesterday by the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt), it has been raised on numerous occasions by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) in years gone by. It is not something that we are suddenly recognizing as a new phenomenon. In fact, it has been with us for 10 years or more.

It has been evident throughout the Province of Ontario and throughout the Dominion of Canada that action was desperately needed to try and improve the economic conditions of the farmer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): And still is.

Mr. Deans: And still is, as the Leader of the Opposition says. It still is, basically because it seems that no matter what is said, no matter when it is said or by whom it is said, it never is reflected in any positive actions by the government. It's not only the government that has to act, but it never seems to be reflected in positive actions.

I refer the minister to a report which I'm sure has been well worn out on his shelf, the 1967 report prepared by Hedlin Menzies and Associates for the Ontario conference on agriculture. I know that it's dog-eared and worn, but nevertheless contained in this report are statements, statements which if this report had never been made in 1967, could have been made today with almost exactly the same validity, the statements, if viewed with some care, could be applied to almost any farming situation in the Province of Ontario.

They begin by saying and I read from the preface, "The food industry is in trouble. Farm income is too low and many processors in the food industry are facing difficult times." This same statement can be made right here today and this is now some six years later. This was the result of a considerable study so we can assume that in fact the statement being made there was a statement which was probably being made in 1964 or before. In fact it is as true today as it was in 1967 when the report was printed.

They go on to say, "Solutions are possible but they can only be developed after a detailed examination of the food industry to determine what structure will meet the legitimate objectives of farmers, processors and consumers."

We could say the same thing right now, that the solutions to these problems are complex. They are difficult and they can only be resolved if we have an indepth look at what happens to the value of produce between the time it leaves the farm gate and the time my wife or your wife or anyone else goes in and purchases it in a store. This statement stands good today and the reason it stands good is because in spite of the actions that have been taken, in spite of the many hundreds of reports that I have looked at and read, little seems to have been accomplished in coming to grips with the obvious problems.

It says, "The solution cannot be designed and applied overnight. It requires an overall food policy, careful long-term planning and a variety of new programmes." Now I ask the members seriously, where is the variety of new programmes in the Province of Ontario for dealing with the difficulties that farmers have been facing? The only thing that has been done in this province of any real consequence that I can see has been the move, ever so slowly ever so carefully—and that may well be necessary—into marketing boards. That has been the only real change in the operation of farmers and even that isn't a short-run change. It hasn't simply occurred in the last month or two or year or two. It has taken place over a number of years but there haven't been the kinds of innovative programmes coming out from the government in order to meet the needs. There has been the hand-out kind of programme where we give a little bit of money here and and a little bit there. It seems to be a little bit more immediately before election time.

Nevertheless we seem to be able to come up with a patchwork programme to deal with what are immediate problems. We never seem capable of coming up with an overall policy that will provide, not only for the immediate difficulty faced by the egg producers, that not only provides for an immediate solution to the problem that was being faced by the turnip producers or any other segment, but an overall policy that will ensure that the farmer is gaining reasonable return for the effort and the amount of time that he must put into the production of food.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): All at once? That will be too much for the Tories.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that may be so.

I quote again from the report and it is said quite clearly in the report on page 3, "The farm problem will not be solved by raising prices alone." I have got to say this about the farmer in all fairness—that's one thing that the farmer, basically, has never done. The farmer has been extremely careful, extremely responsive and understanding of the problems of the urban dweller. The farmer has consistently been prepared to take less rather than push and have higher prices.

I am sure that had they banded together in years gone by, they could quite easily have created an atmosphere that would have derived for them a much greater return for their produce, but they felt this sense of responsibility, as they always have. I now recognize that in return for this—and I say this without fear of contradiction—I don't believe that the urban community has responded in the same way.

I don't believe that the urban community has understood the kind of sacrifice that has been made by farmers in Ontario and all across the North American continent in order to maintain a reasonable level of good prices. But the urban community could have helped.

It could have helped if it had acted through the government to try to ensure that in the price of food there was an adequate —I hate to use the word dribbling down, because that's what it is—distribution of the wealth as generated from the sale of foodstuffs, and that the bulk of that distribution went to the primary source rather than going to the secondary source and to the wholesaler and distributors.

In spite of never having been a farmer we have in the family a long history of farming connections and I think it fair to say that I recognize, and I have said in this House many, many times over, the vitally important role in the economic growth of this province and this country that the farming community plays. I have spoken so often of

the need to protect—and I use that word advisedly—ourselves against the loss of the farming community, against the loss of the lever that we have against the ever-increasing prices from the imported products. That may well mean that we will have to take very strict measures. It may well mean that we will have to sit down with the farming community and redesign the method of distribution of foodstuffs in order that they get from the farmer to the consumer and that the price paid gets back into the farmer's pocket for his use and to meet his needs.

The nature of the problem is set out very clearly in this report. It says:

> One of the very real dangers in an analysis of the farm problem is that the economist will regard the problem from one point of view, while the farmer or the consumer, regarding it more locally and personally, will be offended by the apparent detachment of the economist.

I think we have all seen that from time to time. It's so easy to drag someone in from an institute of higher learning, an economist, and ask him what's the matter. He'll be able to tell you how you ought to set it all out in black and white. But he doesn't take into account the real needs, the human needs of the people who have spent lifetimes, and perhaps even generations, in developing something, in which they have a great deal of pride, something called the family farm. And because of the introduction of the conglomerate farming and because of the introduction of the corporate farming, it is rapidly being pressured to the point where nothing short of direct government action and assistance will save it.

I say that the economist may well feel, as some of them have stated, that if the farmers all disappear it won't matter, because there will be somebody else to take their place; that if the individual family farm were to go by the wayside there would be the corporate farm which could produce what is required.

But that isn't sufficient. I don't believe that argument, although it has been made. I think it's wrong. I think the strength of the nation is in people being able to produce food themselves, and to preserve what is inherent in the farming community, the desire to be an integral part of the growth of this province and this nation.

It is because of these things that I feel so up tight—and that's using a common term—about the way in which we have gone about trying to cope with farm problems.

I have limited time, unfortunately. Nevertheless, as you can see I have all kinds of other things I wanted to say to you, but I really do feel there may be another opportunity.

I want to turn for a moment to a couple of other matters in a related field. It concerns me when I read it, and that's why I raise it.

In 1967, the consumer spent $10.5 billion on food and beverages, and the value of this food produced in Canada, was $5.9 billion. I don't have the figure, but I assume, I think quite rightly so, that a good proportion of that was produced here in Ontario.

What bothers me is that the imported amount, the amount attributed to imports, was $0.8 billion. This left a figure of $3.8 billion attributable to food processors, transporters, packagers and retailers. That meant that about 40 per cent of the cost of getting the produce from the farm gate to the consumer in a form that it could be consumed was taken off in transporting, purchasing, processing and packaging.

I wonder, seriously, whether, by some legislative process or by the encouragement of things like co-operatives, which seem to be dying, at least in urban communities, but through a co-operative effort or that kind of process and direct government action in areas such as packaging and transporting, if we couldn't make sure that a greater portion of that money the average housewife is prepared to pay—even though it hurts—goes back into the pockets of the farmers of Ontario.

I also wonder if more of the 40 per cent that's taken up in areas other than simply the growing of the produce couldn't go directly to the farmer.

I think this could be done. I think we abandoned, without sufficient effort, the whole idea of the co-operative endeavour that would involve the farmer and might involve the urban dweller.

Although I don't want to harp on about it, and I realize it is still being done, I feel it is one measure that we might consider promoting in the major metropolitan areas. This would be not so much to reduce the price, although inevitably it would result in that, but to ensure that a fair return was received for the effort and investment of the farm community.

It is one way we may be able to make sure that more of that 40 per cent is channelled back into the farm home, into a place where it can be put to good use, into

an area where expansion of the farm community can then become a reality.

There has been a great deal of talk about the family farm in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): Farmers are independent. They like to run their own show.

Mr. Deans: The member for Algoma interjects that the farmers are independent, they like to run their own show.

Mr. Gilbertson: Don't make a big song and dance about it. It's true.

Mr. Deans: That's fine. But since the member for Algoma has said it, I want to get it on the record. That was exactly what I was talking about. Unfortunately, in this independent streak that farmers have, they expect—and quite rightly so—that the government will move in—

Mr. Gilbertson: They may not be making as much as the member for Wentworth is.

Mr. Deans: —with subsidies when prices are down and grants when it is impossible to get whatever it is they are after, and that it will take action to reduce costs to the farmer. In other words, they expect the government will expend considerable sums of money to ensure the free enterprise ideal they have. In fact, they are not free enterprisers. There is no more co-operative group in the world than the farmers acting together.

Mr. Gilbertson: But they are also very independent.

Mr. Deans: They have entered into more co-operative endeavours in the farm community than we have ever seen in the urban community. In fact, the farmer is no more an independent operator than any other individual. All he wants to do is to be left to himself to operate his farm, but he also wants to be guaranteed a reasonable income for the work he is doing.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Chairman, Management Board): That is quite a mouthful.

Mr. Deans: That requires, as it does everywhere, that he enter into co-operative arrangements.

I don't mean co-operatives in the term of co-operative operations, but operations in which there is co-operation, not only between farmers but also between farmer and consumer. The only body that would be able to try to pull this thing together at this time in my view is the Ministry of Agriculture.

In any event, it has always been assumed that it's the farmer who is opposed to change and, for that reason, unwilling to accept the necessary, perhaps more radical, policies. There is no evidence for this assumption. Indeed one might ask what more deliberate and unambiguous action is required of farmers than they have already taken. We have been here when it happened—they marched on Ottawa, they marched on Queen's Park. Of recent years, or since a year and a half ago, it is not quite as common; but until two years ago it was becoming rather commonplace to see farmers getting together and trudging down the highways in an effort to try to bring to the government's attention the problems that were confronting them.

I say to members that there is no evidence that the farmer himself is not interested in working to establish and better his own welfare. The problem really is that the government has not been too impressive in its reaction to the problem.

In February, 1969, the minister cut off the long-term mortgage loans to farmers under the Junior Farmer Loan Programme. He said that the five per cent interest rate was unrealistic in today's money market. He said this was based on a report of farm income which recommended fewer and more profitable farms in Ontario. I think he would agree with me there are certainly fewer farms in Ontario, but the figures we looked at before indicate that they are perhaps not more profitable. This is a concern of mine.

On May 12, 1970, the federal-provincial agreement was signed to provide $60 million over the five year period from 1970 to help people move off small, uneconomical farms. This programme was not new but it was rather a continuation of a programme under the federal Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act under which $50 million had been spent over the previous five years. All that had been done really was that $10 million additional had been added in the intervening period.

In fact while moving people off farms may well be one of the solutions, this was not the way to do it, because there were not adequate retraining facilities, there were not even jobs. There were no jobs outside of the farm community for those people to go to, and there was no way for them really to integrate themselves into the community, even if they wanted to; and I suspect that most did not.

Nothing more was done in that year. On March 31, 1971, the Ontario government announced an expansion of the capital grants

programme for Ontario. Very interesting! The original purpose was to assist commercial farm operations in Ontario in financing the farm improvements necessary to lower their production costs and improve their income. Last night we heard a bit about the capital grants programme. It is really quite interesting the way things change.

I want to read this letter to the minister—and then much to my chagrin I want to go to the meeting of the committee on resources development and see what is going on.

The letter is addressed to me; it is dated March 7, 1972.

> My dear sir:
>
> My father and I farm in the Mount Hope area, and we have made several capital expenditures in the past year for which we have applied for a capital grant from the Department of Agriculture. We seem to be having a problem in getting payment for this.
>
> I talked to your secretary concerning this matter sometime in January. She did some checking. At that time it was indicated that this would be forwarded to us about the end of February. The explanation given for the delay was that there had been an unexpected response to this programme.

And then in quotes he says:

> "Our application for this grant was forwarded to the local department of agriculture office approximately December 1."
>
> This explanation I could at least partly understand except that we know of two other farmers who have applied for their grants considerably later than we did and they have already received their cheque.
>
> There are two points which I would like to make in connection with this. Although, we as farmers are certainly appreciative of programmes of this kind, we are certainly beginning to wonder if this was not just an election gimmick.

You know I can hardly blame them for wondering that

> The maximum sum which a farmer could receive under this programme was increased early in 1971 from $1,000 to $3,000, plus another $500 for removal of dead elm trees. This represented an increase of 350 per cent. Surely, the government was not naive enough to be surprised at and unprepared for an increased response to the programme?

I think that is fair criticism. When one increases the amounts of money made available one must take into account the fact that there will be more people making application and the department should, in fact, be prepared.

> Secondly, when a farmer applies for the grant he makes application on forms provided by the local agricultural department. He must also supply receipted bills for the work done. These bills are checked by the local agricultural authorities; a local inspector is sent to the farm to check the work and then the application is forwarded to the accounts branch of the Ontario Department of Agriculture in Toronto. At this point, as I understand it, the checking is all duplicated except for the farm inspection. This is where the holdup comes in.
>
> I am not sure that this duplication in Toronto warrants the money that must surely be spent to administer it. I do not know whether anything can be done about this, but I am convinced that it would be in the best interests of all Ontario farmers if some of this government inefficiency could be circumvented in order to speed up the processing of these grants.

I think it is fair comment. It is not mine; it is the comment of a man who has been involved in the farming community for a good number of years. I will make the letter available to the minister so that he can answer it personally if he wishes. But it is fair to say that if the government's going to introduce immediately prior to an election a programme of increased grants, then it has got to be prepared to meet the influx of demand.

Secondly, if in fact,—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Martel: Don't get excited.

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't believe that. He doesn't think that, if the government is going to make more money available it has got to be prepared to try to process it so the people can get it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think it is so profound that it is hardly worth mentioning.

Mr. Deans: I would have thought that too. In fact, I think most of us would have thought that; but evidently it isn't. It isn't so profound that it is hardly worth mentioning, because in fact it didn't happen.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It's working very well.

An hon. member: When was the letter dated?

Mr. Deans: March 7. The second point—and this is all from December 1, okay? The second point that is made, and I think it is valid, is that:

> Considering the checks and balances that are instituted at the local level, it hardly seems necessary to go through the whole process again when it gets to Queen's Park.
>
> If you haven't got confidence in the people at the local level, for God's sakes replace them. But if they have the job of checking these methods out, then having once checked them out, let's make sure the matter is processed immediately from Queen's Park on the authority of those individuals. It doesn't make sense to hold it up further by putting it through another accounts branch here and having it completely rechecked.

I have other matters that I will raise with the minister during the estimates. I want simply to say to him that I don't think the piecemeal, hodge-podge approach of grants to meet the needs of the farming community is going to be adequate in the 1970s and the 1980s. I think we're going to have to find, and it will require some rather radical changes, an idea of getting through to the consumer from the farmer and getting his share of the purchase price back to him.

The effort by the department in the field of marketing boards is in some ways commendable, and it may well go a way toward meeting the problem. It could go much further. The marketing boards may well provide the vehicle, the primary vehicle, for the distribution of the produce in order that the consumer can get at it, in order that the farmer can share in what is obviously a bonanza that is being shared by people in the corporate world.

I suggest that it is unconscionable to permit the kind of profit-making throughout the vertically integrated industries in the farming community that is going on and obvious to most of us.

My suggestion to the minister is that the old, and I think rather time-worn ways are no longer adequate. In every single branch of government there have to be completely new approaches taken to meeting the needs of the consumer in general and the electorate. The only way this will be done is if there are brand new thoughts injected.

We can't rely on the old ways of getting the produce from the farm gate to the kitchen. We are going to have to find new ways in order that the farmer can share, and in order that the consumer will not be overburdened. Thank you.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the comments made by the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) yesterday, and I have listened with interest to the comments made by the member for Wentworth.

Reference was made to the OFA brief at some length by both members. While I recognize the points brought out by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture concerning low farm income in the Province of Ontario—and we all recognize that it is certainly a problem with which we are all concerned and readily admit that it leaves a very great deal to be desired—I have not heard either one of the hon. members come up with any really concrete suggestions as to how it might be alleviated.

With regard to the Ross report which was mentioned yesterday. My hon. friend from Huron-Bruce— I am sorry he is not here now; I know he had to go away for today; he'll be back, I believe tomorrow he said, or for the rest of the debates. He mentioned the fact that we used the introduction of the Ross inquiry as an election gimmick, to get over the period of the election.

Mr. Martel: You wouldn't do that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well after listening to him deal practically entirely with that in his speech—he used that to make his address yesterday—I wondered if it wasn't worth just that to him, material to make his speech. I felt there was little point in reviewing a report, to the depth which he reviewed it yesterday, after the report had been already published and was in the hands of not only producers but every member of this House who wanted to see it, as well as in the press.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He was very concerned about what action you might have taken, even though it is maybe four years late.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is very true. He says it is four years late and makes the suggestion that this was the thing that should be done; yet I well recall the same hon. member standing in this House a few years ago,

when we sat to deal with another commodity, demanding my resignation because we stepped in to do what he says now we should have done—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is no comparison.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes there was, a very great comparison; but it was more politically adept to say those things at that time and to say these political things yesterday.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No; you don't know anything about politics do you?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well I sure do, and that is why I am over here and that is why you are over there; and that is why you will remain there too. Let's make that abundantly clear.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: So those farmers know how to vote too, you better believe it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now with regard to many of the matters raised in this debate, I sympathize and express warm appreciation for the report that was submitted by Judge Ross. I think it has a great deal of merit. I think there are many things about it that we should be dealing with as quickly as we possibly can. What the reaction of the egg producers is to all of the suggestions I don't know, I must confess I haven't had any feedback from producers at all. We will be interested to see what reaction we get.

But I do want to say that to me, some of the things Judge Ross has recommended are worthy of a good deal of further consideration. It seems that over a period of time, with the independent attitude that farmers generally possess—and I am one of them, which was referred to by the member for Wentworth—that farmers have been reluctant to accept the philosophy of a co-ordinated approach to the production and marketing of eggs in the Province of Ontario, and indeed throughout Canada.

I suppose part of it could be attributed to the fact that as long as in other provinces of Canada there were no production controls or marketing controls on eggs, there would be little use in our farmers doing the same thing as the broiler board had done in 1966; and that was to implement production controls, and having accomplished that, they then left the door wide open for other producers in other provinces to ship their commodity in here and virtually destroy our market.

I think the illustration of the broiler plan prompted egg producers to have many reservations about implementing an egg plan. Now however, after the federal legislation has been passed to provide for national marketing boards, I think the farmers of Ontario, the egg producers of Ontario, feel that with the implementation of national supply management we will be able to accomplish something.

I now feel, generally speaking, that most of the egg producers of Ontario would have a sympathetic feeling towards the introduction of supply management. That doesn't say all of them will have that feeling; and of course I suppose that is to be expected. But it does seem to me that we have to recognize the fact that the farmers' ability to produce as has been mentioned yesterday and today, is virtually unlimited. When we see that control production of many commodities has resulted, really, in more of the commodity being produced by fewer and fewer people, with the results flowing directly to the consumer, and not generally speaking, to the farmer through his efficiency, one has to ask himself: Is efficiency in agriculture really the only answer? I do think it has to be coupled with supply management.

There is little doubt in my mind that we can continue to have an agricultural industry in this country that is viable at all unless we do introduce some type of supply management; and I suppose that the type of supply management might be different for almost every commodity.

When one thinks of the beef industry, we have virtually built-in supply management through biological control. The source of every pound of beef in this country and anywhere in the world starts with one old cow producing one calf per year. Nobody has found how you can produce more calves per year from that cow.

You can throw out the hatchery and fill it with an incubator of modern type and fill it with fertile eggs and we can have hens producing by the thousands within six months. We can virtually do the same thing with broilers, we can do the same thing with turkeys; and given a few more weeks we can do almost the same thing as far as pork production is concerned. In these commodities, particularly poultry products, I think there has to be a form of supply management if we are going to have our producers enjoy any kind of a decent standard of living.

Those are the things that Judge Ross has suggested in his report and that I think we

have to deal with. I think we also have to put the operation of the poultrymen's business back in his control. For too long, with great respect, our farmers have turned to the feed companies, to hatcheries, for credit to purchase feed to run their operations. It seems to me the time has come when we have to standardize the type of agreement that is signed between feed dealers and farmers, between hatcheries and farmers. We perhaps should explore the possibilities of providing or assisting the farmer with some type of credit to assist him to buy feed at the best possible price he can get it, and not put his name on a contract where the feed price can escalate after he has signed the contract.

It seems to me those are the things we need to do if we are going to get the farmer's business back in his own hands and control.

Now there is great mention made concerning the capital grants programme in our province and the time it has taken to process many of the applications. I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I share the concern that has been expressed, and no one regrets more than I delay of the processing of the capital grant applications. But I take strong exception to the comments that were made by both of the opposition parties to the fact that the grants were apparently easily processed prior to the election and immediately afterwards there became a great difficulty, as though the government was trying to do just this.

Let me now enunciate, for the record, Mr. Chairman, the actual facts and figures pertaining to this capital grant programme in Ontario this year.

We have had this programme in effect since 1967-1968, when the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton) was provincial Treasurer. In 1967-1968 we had 9,500 applications. In 1968-1969 we had 10,000 applications. In 1969-1970 we had just under 10,000 applications. In 1970-1971 we had 7,600 applications; and in 1971-1972, last year—we had 17,934 applications for construction and drainage grants alone. Then you add to that the removal of old orchards, 486 applications; the removal of elms, 10,223. Now let me enunciate the figures for the grants processed to October 31, 1971—8,199, for a cost of $5,160,000. The grants processed from November 1, 1971, to April 7, 1972—25,067 for a cost of $17,500,000.

Is there any wonder there were difficulties in processing those loans in that length of time?

There was no possible way that we could cope with those kinds of figures. More than three times as many loans were processed from Nov. 1 almost to today as were processed in the fiscal year prior to Oct. 31.

My friend from Huron-Bruce raised the point of a constituent who had had difficulty. He was kind enough last night to give me the name of the constituent. We searched out the problem; we searched out the record.

I want to report that the application my hon. friend referred to last night was fairly complex. It combined an application for three different types of capital grants—field enlargement, elm tree removal and the construction of a corn crib. The application was signed on Nov. 26, 1971; it was inspected on Dec. 2, 1971. I think that is pretty rapid inspection at the local county level.

It was received in the accounts branch of our department on Jan. 4, 1972. The application was reviewed, and it was determined there was other information required and it was sent back for further information. It was received back in the accounts branch from the area on Feb. 23, 1972. It was processed by the accounts branch of our department and forwarded to the Provincial Auditor on March 21.

I want to make it abundantly clear that it was during this time we had this incredible influx of capital grant applications that virtually flooded the staff working in that branch.

The cheque for $1,100.69, as my friend indicated in his statement last night, was processed this week and has been mailed to the applicant.

There is no one who regrets that delay more than I do, but I have to say in defence of those people who work in that branch that there have been some real problems in processing these applications.

Every application that comes in for a capital grant has to be processed against any capital grant application that has been received and approved prior to the one that is received now. We have to know how much has been paid out in capital grants so we don't exceed the maximum of $3,000 for an individual farmer. We have to know, as well, which category it fits in. Is it an ARDA capital grant or is it a straight Province of Ontario capital grant?

We feel the programme has been of immense help this year. In capital grants in this province, Mr. Chairman, we have paid out $22,677,000 to date. Believe me, that is a real lift, in my opinion, to the farmers of the

Province of Ontario. Admittedly, the programme has developed greatly in this last year. I believe people have become aware of it to a greater extent than previously and they are making use of it—some of them for the second time around.

I want to make it abundantly clear that we have every intention of streamlining the process of handling these capital grants as rapidly as we possibly can. The new procedure that has been introduced recently in some departments, and will apply across all government departments I believe—the post-audit of accounts—should speed up the payment of these cheques greatly.

Frankly, I have been in favour of this type of an operation for some time, and I am delighted to know the government has approved the operation of the programme. We're getting it into effect now, and I think this should cut off at least a few weeks in the handling of these applications and the return of these cheques. But we haven't got it in operation yet; I hope we will early in the new fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clear up one statement that was made by my friend from Wentworth. I know he wasn't trying to mislead the House, but he did make the statement that the new $60-million ARDA agreement we have with the federal government, which ends in 1975, was to buy farms to move farmers off the land. Now Mr. Chairman, nothing could be further from the truth.

The old agreement certainly did contain the opportunity to assist farmers to get out of a trap in which they might find themselves: where there was no one to buy the farm; where they could sell the farm to ARDA; where they could accept retraining; where they could take another job in the alternate employment opportunities that we provided across the province—and we have provided many of them.

Because that part of the old agreement was so successful, the new ARDA agreement focused increasing attention on the alternate employment opportunities. We have that very much inculcated in the new ARDA agreement and in its operation.

There are farms being purchased. There is no question about that at all; and I think rightly so. As a matter of fact the small farms programme which has been generated by the federal Department of Agriculture and has been promoted by the federal minister, is in my opinion almost a blueprint of the programme that we have operating under the ARDA agreement here in the Province of Ontario—and they hope to apply it right across Canada.

The reason I have objected to the implementation of the programme by the Farm Credit Corp. in Ontario is that I felt it was a duplication of service provided. In fact we now have a programme in Ontario doing almost exactly what they proposed to do. I made the suggestion, to the federal officials, with some vigour, that we should turn the amount of money that would normally flow to Ontario in the small-farm development project over to the ARDA directorate of our department. We would give the federal government full marks for any contribution they make to it—as we are now doing—and let the ARDA directorate carry it out in Ontario to avoid the duplication of bureaucracy, which I think can be found if the programme is proceeded with on the basis described by the federal government.

I think it has a good deal of merit. I am not opposed to the programme. I am simply opposed to its method of implementation, and I have stated that on many occasions.

Now Mr. Chairman, it's approaching 6 o'clock and I will welcome the opportunity to discuss and debate the matters of our budget as we proceed into the estimates on a vote-by-vote basis after the dinner hour, with your permission.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is near enough 6 o'clock p.m. we might close one eye. And being 6 o'clock p.m. I do now leave the Chair and we will resume at 8 o'clock p.m.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Pollution control programme at Canadian Gypsum Co., statement by Mr. Auld 1057

Ontario scholarship programme, statement by Mr. Kerr 1058

Metro Centre plan re transportation facilities, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. McKeough: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 1058

Location of new airport, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 1061

Pollution problem at Canadian Gypsum Co., questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. R. F. Nixon .. 1063

Metro Centre plan re transportation facilities, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Lewis 1064

Unemployment in Ontario, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 1064

Shortfall in daycare places, questions of Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Cassidy 1064

Dismissal of doctor from addiction foundation, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Lewis 1065

Cost of nursing home programme, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. R. G. Hodgson, Mr. Lewis 1065

Solitary confinement of Don Jail inmate, question of Mr. Apps: Mr. Lawlor 1066

New jails, questions of Mr. Snow: Mrs. Scrivener, Mr. Gisborn 1067

Michigan power station, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Bullbrook 1067

Representation of OHC employees, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. Cassidy 1068

Assessment roll, questions of Mr. Grossman: Mr. Good 1068

Accusation against St. Marys police department, questions of Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Shulman 1068

District Welfare Administration Boards Act, bill to amend, Mr. Brunelle, first reading .. 1070

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 1070

Notice of motion No. 3 re WCB inquiry, Mr. Davis, agreed to 1071

Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued 1089

Recess, 6 o'clock 1099



Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 29

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Foods.

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I wonder if I could draw to the House's attention the fact that we have about 300 guests in both public galleries and the Speaker's gallery tonight from the riding of Scarborough North. May I take this opportunity on behalf of the House to welcome our guests here tonight.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): What are you going to do, talk about veterinary colleges?

On vote 1401.

Mr. Chairman: We are dealing with item 1, main office. The hon. member for Brant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, it is really rather fortunate, I think, that the hon. Minister of Education has been able to arrange for a visit of so many people from his constituency tonight of all nights when we are discussing farm matters, the problems that the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart) has in egg marketing situations, and so on. I am sure that they will be interested in the details of these problems and in the views that are put forward.

It is, in fact, a very important matter indeed, and I think the Minister of Agriculture and some other members present here tonight would feel that the interest shown by the citizens of Toronto in this matter is exemplary and should really be copied by the other members of this Legislature.

It is a matter of grave concern to myself, and I think to the Minister of Agriculture as well as others from the rural community, the difficulty we have in trying to convince people in the urban areas that the farm industry is in fact a depressed industry, and to allay some of the suspicions the urban taxpayers have from time to time that the farmers are simply a weak part of our economy that is always asking for some sort of handout, some sort of grant, some sort of subsidy, some sort of unfair assistance.

I believe the people in the urban areas frequently forget, a fact that you are aware of, Mr. Chairman, that much of the food they purchase day by day is at prices that are very similar to those that were paid, certainly to the farmers, back in the hungry 1930s.

As a matter of fact, when I go home and I see that my wife has come in with another one of those great grocery orders—you know about six or eight of the brown paper bags—I ask her what she paid for eggs and bacon and certain other staples. I regret to inform you, Mr. Chairman, that like some housewives and providers, she is never just quite sure what she pays; she is prepared to say that the whole order cost $40 or $45.

But I think the Minister of Agriculture is aware that egg prices, for example, have been depressed not only for the last three months or the last three years, but for the last eleven years. The statistics have shown, without any equivocation, that this particular farm product has been produced, on the average, at below cost; it is possible to buy five dozen eggs for $1, depending where you are prepared to shop for them. Even in the supermarkets with the large markups, egg prices are exceptionally low and have been for a good long time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister more specifically what his views are in the production controls that he believes are necessary. Before he answers I would assure him I agree entirely that production controls are essential. The total sales of eggs in this province seem to be about the same no matter what the price is; housewives don't seem to be aware of the fact that when the price gets down to about 30 cents or 35 cents a dozen—they might be interested to know this—that the breakeven point for the farmers is 32.5 cents a dozen. When the housewives

here in Toronto pay 40 cents, the farmers are getting about 27 cents or 26 cents a dozen—well below the breakeven price.

I would agree with the Minister of Agriculture that production controls are essential, and in fact he does believe this. He should be able to give assurances to the House, and through us to the farm community if to no other group in the province, that we are going to have action now that the royal commission report has been in the minister's hands for some days and has been tabled here.

I would like to ask him further for his reaction to the suggestion from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) that a committee be constituted or that the committee that deals with farm matters hold hearings on the recommendations, because the minister is surely aware that Judge Ross in his royal commission report indicated that in fact the farmers had no choice on the matter, that unless they had an agency-style marketing programme, with production controls, they would be forced out of business in even larger numbers than has been the case.

I think this recommendation is a very interesting one, because as the minister pointed out, Judge Ross is not from the farm community and he has no connection whatsoever with the egg business or any other aspect of the farm business. He points out himself, without regard to any of his former political allegiances, that he is definitely a free enterpriser and had to be convinced that this sort of artificial control of production was the only answer for the farm community as far as fairness and justice in the pricing structure is concerned.

When he went on to say that the minister should not consider having a vote of the producers, I thought that he went a great distance indeed. His justification for recommending to the minister, or whoever reads the report, that a vote of the producers on production control not be held was that the producers had no choice. Now if a learned judge, with all of the objectivity that goes into his responsibility as a royal commissioner, is prepared to make that recommendation, then certainly it's up to us to give it very careful and immediate consideration.

We've talked about this before. I don't have the skill to convince people who are not aware of the facts of the emergency of this situation. I know that the minister is aware of it and would agree that rapid action is necessary. For this reason, I don't find particularly attractive the thought of holding an additional series of hearings.

Mr. Chairman: With all due respect—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right! I'm asking the minister now what his course of action is going to be in view of the events associated with the royal commission.

Mr. Chairman: I think you're a little out of order. We are dealing with vote 1401. Marketing boards, which you are talking about do not—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The main office, under vote 1401, deals with salaries—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, with great respect, this is a matter of emergent policy that was dealt with in the opening statements of all the speakers so far. As someone has pointed out, there is no marketing board of an agency type for the egg business now. Since the minister has already given some response, I thought that since we are talking about the salary of the minister, among other things, and since we're talking about policy matters, he can surely give us some firmer indication of his course of action.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member's remarks, I would suggest that Judge Ross, to me, has provided a very comprehensive report.

I made a note of the member for Wentworth's comments this afternoon on further hearings based on the Ross report. I was rather pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition suggest a moment ago that that idea wasn't particularly attractive to him, because I can assure you it wasn't attractive to me. I think we've had enough hearings on this matter of the problem in the egg industry, going back over the last two or three years.

Egg producers expect some action, and not further hearings. As far as I'm concerned, I think we are prepared to try to develop a plan, perhaps based to some degree—I would think to a very marked degree—on what Judge Ross has recommended.

After all, Judge Ross has held a series of meetings right across the province, beginning I believe in southwestern Ontario, at London, at Ottawa and in Toronto, during which there were ample opportunities for people to come before him and express their own private or organizational viewpoints. They had the opportunity to present written briefs and did.

There was ample opportunity for discussion with the people who did the research work for Judge Ross on the report. I think he has come up with, as I said, a comprehensive report that is detailed in the type of plan that he feels is necessary.

He suggests, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that perhaps the egg producers have little or no choice in the matter. I don't know whether I would want to lend my words to that, just quite as definitely as that, but it would seem to me it would certainly be in the best interests of egg producers if production or supply management were brought in for their particular commodity.

I believe anyone who understands the situation as it has obtained over the last number of years as far as egg production in Canada is concerned could see coming the disaster we have faced in the last few months. It was quite evident, and I suppose it can only be said that the commercial interests, the feed companies, as good businessmen with very keen competition among them, were out trying to sign up as many farmers as they could to use their feed, without any consideration being given, really, to the price of the end product, which in this particular commodity is eggs.

With that thought in mind several of us over the years have suggested there should be some type of a national marketing plan established for eggs, similar to the Canadian Dairy Commission. We suggested that to the hon. Mr. Olsen in 1968. I was hopeful we could have had some type of a national commission brought in for eggs, but the federal government in their wisdom decided to have a National Marketing Act which would apply to all commodities if the producers wanted such a plan.

We know there was great debate, great discussion; there were long delays, I believe much longer than the federal government felt would likely be the case when the bill was introduced.

Amendments were made to the bill, and now it comes back, really, to the place where we thought, or at least where we recommended, it should be; that is that there should be supply management, applicable only insofar as poultry products are concerned in the initial instance, and that is what the federal bill really does today.

We are moving on the recommendations of the report insofar as negotiations with other provinces are concerned. Tomorrow our assistant deputy minister, accompanied by members of the civil service staff of the Farm Products Marketing Board, will be attending an interprovincial and federal meeting in Ottawa to discuss the interprovincial-federal relationship and the establishment of a national plan.

The Leader of the Opposition is quite correct when he suggests there doesn't seem to be much increase in the consumption of eggs in Canada even when prices fluctuate a very great deal. It has been established that consumers in this country eat about so many eggs—the figure escapes me, but there is little variance in it. I think it is only about three or four eggs per person variance between a low price and a modest price to the producers.

When eggs reach a figure that seems to be too high to the consumers they do back away from the purchase of eggs to some degree. But this would be, really, where farmers are receiving a reasonable price for eggs. Their cost of production as established in the report varies, but is basically about 32½ cents a dozen. They have to have something to live on, because that is the cost of producing. Farmers have to have something beyond that or the plan is no good.

We have found in years gone by that when there were about 190,000 cases of eggs produced a week the price to the producer was reasonable. He could live on it; he could pay his expenses and have something to live on. The consumer was happy because the price was not exorbitant. There were enough eggs to go round.

But when we got to the point where we were producing 200,000 cases and then 210,000 and 215,000 and 220,000 cases of eggs a week, there was no place to put them; virtually no market for them.

The breaking plants absorbed as many as they could; cold storages today are filled with egg melange and egg products, including dried eggs, to the point where there is virtually no room left to put the blessed stuff. There is no place to ship it out of Canada, because there is a world surplus of eggs; in every country of the world, even the developing countries, thanks to what has been done by people within this province.

I can think of two people who have done an excellent job of helping people to help themselves in developing countries by showing them how to produce eggs, to produce poultry products; to upgrade the protein supply of food in those countries by this method. The result is there is an overabundant supply of eggs; and as I mentioned

this afternoon it is so easy to increase egg production.

Now we feel, and I think this opinion is shared generally now by most egg producers, that there is no point in enjoying the wonderful freedom we farmers like to call our own if we are going to produce ourselves into economic oblivion, and that is just about what is happening as far as eggs are concerned.

We intend to get right down to business on this report, and I am hopeful we will be able to come up with something that is satisfactory to the producers in Ontario; which will be a co-ordination of a national quota for egg production across Canada, with Ontario receiving its share based on the historical production of this province, which is roughly 40 per cent of the total production of eggs in all of Canada.

Now this means there will be some exports continued out of our province and it will mean there is some import of eggs into our province. However, we are looking at this on a national basis, recognizing that the movement of eggs out of Manitoba seems to be normal as far as parts of northern Ontario are concerned; and certainly shipping eggs out of Ontario into Quebec is quite a normal situation as well.

We respect the rights of farmers and egg producers in other provinces to enjoy a standard of living to which they are entitled. We simply say that we would like the same kind of a standard of living for our producers as well. I am hopeful we will be able to achieve that objective

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): If I may pursue on a little less grandiose scale what comes through to me from reading the Ross report, and I think it is an excellent, descriptive report of the situation of the egg marketing industry and how the industry operates in the Province of Ontario. But doesn't the minister draws a conclusion in the face of the overwhelming evidence in the report? If you read it, and you reread it, and reread it, what comes through, page after page after page, is the overwhelming concentration of the industry in a rapidly decreasing number of hands in the Province of Ontario.

It seems to me that if one makes an effort to study what Judge Ross says about the price-fixing mechanism, the market mechanism for establishing the price—if one can grace it in such a fixed and rigid way with the term market price—and if one then relates that, or endeavours to relate it, with the high degree of concentration which has taken place in the industry over the years both, at the level of the grading station, at the level of the producer himself, at the level of the size of the flocks, doesn't the minister—from the point of view of the consumer in the Province of Ontario—draw the obvious conclusion? That is that only the consumer but the so-called independent farmer-producer, is not being played off against the consumer but is being played off in the middle because of the causal connection between the concentration of the industry, the endeavour to keep the price down to drive the producer out of the market or to make him dependent on those who want to control the market and the price which the consumer pays; and on the other end of the spectrum the price which the producer gets for it.

Now isn't there a causal connection there which the plan recommended by Judge Ross doesn't come close to dealing with; even though his recommendations appear to me to be very appropriate in terms of some aspects of the solution of the problem? When the minister reads what happens in terms of fixing the Toronto carton price, the Toronto loose egg price, the way in which it is so structured to produce an underprice to the consumer on the market here, one can only relate that, not to the long-term cyclical rise and fall of egg prices, but to the new ingredient in the market—that is the overconcentration of the industry in a very few hands.

Now isn't that a significant factor in the report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is and if my hon. friend had noted, Judge Ross suggests that there should be a maximum limit on the number of eggs that any one producer can produce.

Mr. Renwick: Well, all right, now let me try to ask the minister this question. When you have a situation where at the present time, as I understand it from the report, 42 per cent of the egg production in the Province of Ontario is presently controlled by a very, very, small number of people, how does that mean that the concentration of control in that aspect of it is going to be affected at all by establishing quotas for particular producers, unless you require a decontrol and a decentralization of the industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that these are details of a plan that has to be worked out.

Mr. Renwick: No, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They certainly are. I cannot give any undertaking tonight as to what the details of the plan are. Certainly that's a part of the problem, there is no question about it at all. I'm not denying it.

Judge Ross suggests that there should be a maximum number of hens owned by any one producer of 30,000 to 45,000, somewhere in that range. That's what he suggests. But he also suggests that there should be some thought given to those producers who have larger flocks than that at the present time. In other words he is talking about a grandfather clause in the plan.

Now whether or not that is valid or not, I'm not so sure. I have many reservations about that, because of the very points my hon. friend brings up. But I think we have to respect the production facilities that are already in operation. These are matters that have to be worked out.

While Judge Ross talks about general principles of a plan in his report, he does not go into the details that have to be gone into.

The details that emanated after the plan for the Milk Marketing Board was proposed; we had a report on that and there were certain general guidelines and principles laid out in that, but the plan had to be developed after the report was submitted in 1965. The legislation that we passed simply provided for an Act—provided legislation to generate a plan. Judge Ross is talking about a plan but he isn't giving the details as to how these various points should be implemented in that plan.

I think the suggestions that he has made must be taken into consideration. In fact, I would insist they be taken into consideration in the development of the plan. But we in this House are in no position to develop that plan here. I fancy that after it is developed by, I think, people who are knowledgeable in the industry, we will be in a much better position to debate it then.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the minister says that there is no time to hold any further hearings on the matter and yet he now indicates that the fleshing-out of a plan on the basis of the information contained in the report is going to take a considerable period of time. I think it is going to take a considerable period of time, if the minister will concentrate his attention upon what is required to decentralize the industry.

What, for example, is going to be done about the proposition that four of the feed companies—four only of them—have extended credit up to something like $6 or $7 million? How is that credit going to be repaid or a substituted credit provided if there is going to be any removal of the basic control which the small number of hatcheries or commercial feed outlets or large producers or large chain stores have upon this industry?

That is one matter. The second is: When Judge Ross specifically states that he is not making any recommendation with respect to reducing the size of the units that are presently engaged in the production of the eggs in this province, is the minister going to take any steps, and what are the steps going to be, to decontrol the industry? The minister doesn't seem to have any consideration, any real conception of the extent of the concentration of the industry as set out in the report.

Let me ask the minister bluntly, is he at all concerned that three of the grading stations which supply Loblaws and Dominion Stores and Steinberg's, for example, are owned by those stores; and that they fix the price arbitrarily when they transfer eggs from those grading stations onto the shelves in the stores? Does that concern him?

Does it concern him that the Toronto carton price is set, not by 170 grading stations, not by 50 grading stations, but is set by on average about 20 grading stations that feed the Toronto market? Is he concerned that less than five per cent of the eggs in a market of last resort determine the loose egg price on the wholesale market in Toronto, which in turn determines the consumer and producer price?

Is the minister concerned that Judge Ross specifically states that it is the marketing mechanism, not the supply and not the demand?

He goes to great length to explain to a layman like myself the economic conception of demand and the effect of supply when you have an inelastic price situation related to that demand, though all of those generate long-term consequences.

He specifically says that the pricing arrangements are such that, the net effect has been a gross underpricing of eggs in the Ontario market, mainly in the urban centres, mainly in the city of Toronto which mainly determines the price at which eggs are sold both to the consumer; and ultimately also determines, of course, the basic price which the producer gets.

Are those matters of any concern to the minister; or is he thinking entirely in the traditional question of an allocation of the

supply on a quota basis, believing that in some way or other will solve all the problems? Will the minister answer those questions?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the question this way by saying that all of the things my hon. friend has mentioned, are well known to us. We simply suggest that an egg marketing plan which would embrace agency powers would look after all of the things my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I want to be more specific. The minister is not just Minister of Agriculture. He is Minister of Agriculture and Food. I assume, therefore, that there is some element of responsibility on this minister with respect to food prices in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): Especially in northern Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: If that assumption is in any way correct, if there has been since a year ago an overall increase in the cost of food in the Province of Ontario of something like seven per cent; and if one assumes that this traditional opposition between the consumer and the producer is not the real problem, then will the minister give some attention and make some comment about how he thinks the wholesale-retail price of eggs should be determined, in the Toronto market, for example, as one of the major urban markets in the Province of Ontario?

What would he do about that market pricing mechanism described in detail by Judge Ross? Does he really think the simple, mere allocation of a quota on some relative scale of optimum farm operation for the independent owner-operated farm producer of eggs is the answer to all of those problems; or does he think the government is going to have to focus very close attention on the method by which those who control the market place in eggs determine the price? Does he agree that the use of the term "marketplace" for that price determining mechanism is an injustice to the term market?

What is he going to do about the pricing mechanism? I would like the minister to answer the questions.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, as I explained earlier this evening the plan has to be drawn by those who are knowledgeable in the field. For me to stand here, two or three days after receiving the report, and having read it say this is how everything is going to be done, to me is begging the point. I am not in the position to do that, but there are people who are knowledgeable in the field who, I think, have now to sit down and draft the plan, bearing in mind the things my hon. friend has suggested.

Certainly we recognize that quotas themselves to producers, whether they be in Ontario or Quebec or Manitoba or British Columbia, are not the answer entirely. A quota is part of the answer, just the same as is the source of feed; the source of pullets; the source of chicks; the hatchery operators —all of these are tied in—the method by which eggs are sold; by which they are distributed; by which they are priced—all of this is a part of a plan that I would like to see drafted and drawn up and brought in.

I recognize the points that have been raised, but I have no specific answer to those things as of now. We will have those answers, but I haven't got them tonight.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): You have had that problem for a year and a half now.

Mr. Renwick: Let me make this suggestion —or let me suggest to the minister that all of the special elements related to eggs relate in fact to the food supply industry in the major urban areas of the province, and therefore across the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is not right.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if one thinks there is a free marketplace in vegetables and in butter and in other food products in the poultry line, then I must be completely removed from reality about it.

An hon. member: You are!

Mr. Renwick: The fact of the matter is that the minister knows that the pricing of food products in the major supermarkets and convenience outlets in the Province of Ontario is not based on a market determination made for those prices.

I don't want to draw the question too broadly and let the minister off the hook. If the minister will look at the report, the report says that the price of producing eggs can be reduced, using the example that is put in the report—assuming for the moment that it is correct by about five cents if the particular producer grows his own feed, purchases the additional ingredients which he needs, mixes it on his own farm and feeds his flock on the farm. He shows pretty conclusively that it is about five cents. The interesting thing about the comment is that

Judge Ross says a few of the egg producers use that. Then he goes on to suggest that if more people did that they could reduce the price of eggs.

There is no indication in the report of how that particular state of affairs is going to come about. There is no mechanism shown in the report that's going to transform these large flock operations, how to divorce them from the growing of grain for feed purposes even though they are very specialized in their operations and dependent upon the commercial feed outlets for the feed which they use on them. How are they going to be transformed back into this particular type of ideal, independent, owner-operated farm?

Does the minister have any indication how that switch is going to take place? How is that method of decontrol going to take place?

As long as you allow a high degree of specialization in the very large flocks related to the commercial feed business then in the long run the commercial feed business is going to have an even more overwhelming control of the egg production of this province.

The minister knows the report says that the 760 largest flocks in the Province of Ontario, over 5,000 hens—for practical purposes averaging I think he said 15,500—produce 82 per cent of the eggs on the marketplace. The minister also knows that 42 per cent of the eggs produced with flocks of 1,000 or more, 42 per cent—at least 42 per cent, being careful to use that phrase—are controlled now through contract production and other forms of credit lending by very few people in the market.

How is the minister going to go about decentralizing that operation unless he does consult with the egg producers about this report? Mr. Chairman, does the minister really think that somewhere within his department he can come up with the way in which this report is going to be implemented without discussing it with the producers? Many of the elements of this report are probably known to a large number of egg producers. Many of the generalizations in the report may be known in their specific application to one farmer or to one producer, but without him knowing the overall impact.

Surely in the long run, if the minister is serious about doing other than simply instituting a quota system for supply management, if he's really serious about dealing with the market pricing of eggs for the benefit of the producer and the consumer on a supply management basis, he has got to have some kind of hearing to involve the producers, the chain stores and the grading stations, who are getting, and always have got, their marginal protection by their marginal discounts. He has got to get them involved in saying: "We want an open marketing system for eggs." How else is he going to develop this particular plan for the egg industry?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member not know that we have an Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board in Ontario now? Does he not know there are committee men in every county and district in the province? Does he not know that?

Mr. Renwick: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Then wouldn't he think it natural we would consult with those people? Wouldn't it be reasonable to suppose we would, in the development of a plan? Those are the people who are affected.

Mr. Renwick: All I am saying is —

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Is the member suggesting that I should stand here in this House tonight and lay down the law as to what the plan is going to do for this and that and everything else?

Mr. Renwick: No.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Tell us, if the minister has any ideas.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have given the member the undertaking that those people in the industry who are knowledgeable about it —

Mr. Gisborn: Has the minister any ideas?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, it's one sure thing I have got a lot more knowledge about it than my hon. friend in the back bench.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister doesn't seem to.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): The minister is not showing it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That is what we intend to do.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister is hiding. He has no opinions of his own tonight.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): That is what the member thinks.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that we are simply begging the point —

Mr. Gisborn: The minister is defunct of ideas.

An hon. member: Defunct – devoid.

Mr. Foulds: Devoid as well.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are begging the point to be debating about these kind of things here, right now, with the Egg and Fowl Producers Marketing Board only having received the report as of yesterday – it was distributed only on Monday.

Mr. Lawlor: A man of the minister's capacity should be able to absorb that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We received it from the printers; it was sent out yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is more than what we have had from the member for Lakeshore.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think my hon. friend is suggesting that we go too far in saying what we are going to do. I think it is up to the Egg and Fowl Marketing Board and its committee men to decide what they want to do—the industry people, the people who are feed suppliers, the people who operate grading stations, the people who operate egg brokerage firms that move the eggs. Surely these are people who have an input to make to us—and I am sure they will—but for us to decide what we are going to do here to me, is quite out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am not suggesting for a moment anything that is out of order. What we are asking the minister is not to lay down the law to anybody. Just precisely the opposite. If there was that degree of confidence from the industry in that board there would have been no need for this report, because the arguments that are made in the report for the institution of a quota system are arguments which would prevail with any sane kind of a person. The fact of the matter was the board was unable to get the confidence of the very people who were involved in it.

I am not castigating the board. All I am saying is that the board itself was not able to cope with the problem and the minister had to commission the study. The other side of the coin is that—it is all right, the minister is getting a little irritated. I like it when the Minister of Agriculture and Food gets irritated! I enjoy that very much.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): You do not look so calm yourself.

Mr. Renwick: I want to know from the minister, in his estimates, when we are voting his salary, whether he is going to do anything at all about the marketing mechanism which determines the Toronto carton egg price and the loose egg price in the city of Toronto? Is he going to study that to eliminate the rigidities, the price fixing and the inelasticity of that price? Not only is the consumer getting something at a price under what he should pay but the farmer and the producer at the other end are losing out and have lost out under this minister for some 10 years. Is the minister going to do anything about that marketing mechanism by which the price is determined? Is he?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The greatest minister in the history of this province!

Mr. Renwick: The only one.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The greatest!

Mr. Renwick: He must be if he is the only one.

Mr. Foulds: He sounds like Cassius Clay.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the minister going to do anything about the pricing mechanism?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have answered my hon. friend at least three times.

Mr. Renwick: What are you going to do?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is nothing more that I can say.

Mr. Renwick: What do you say?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I have said three times this is a matter that has to be discussed by those who are knowledgeable in the industry.

Mr. Renwick: And who is knowledgeable?

Mr. W. Hodgson (York North): Not you, anyway.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): Not you over there!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say the people who are involved. They are the people—

Mr. Stokes: You have all the wisdom, eh?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, no!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, is the minister publicly going to have an explanation from the leading chain stores and supermarkets and convenience stores as to the

method by which they determine the price? Is the minister going to have any public hearings about the grading stations to determine how they determine the price? Is there going to be any public determination of the role which is played by the poultry division of the Canadian Department of Agriculture in setting the price?

Is there going to be any attempt made to expand the market of last resort price determination, so that it is not determined by one wholesaler in Toronto consulting with five other wholesalers and daily fixing the price? Are those matters which the minister thinks deserve public scrutiny or public attention; and which were not aired at the Ross hearings and were not part of the Ross hearings, and were never intended to be by this minister? Is he now going to extend it to those areas to cover the problems that were raised by the Ross report?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, as I say I cannot give any positive answer on this at all. It is a matter that has to be determined by those who are drafting the plan. An agency plan simply takes hold of the entire commodity and it determines how the product is going to be handled. The milk industry is a typical illustration, where the Milk Marketing Board buys all the milk in the Province of Ontario. It sells the milk to the various processing plants. Now that is agency control, complete. I should say that something like this may have to be worked out in the matter of handling eggs. If it is, it seems to me that those matters which my friend raises will be taken care of.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Are you the agriculture critic?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the contradiction that occurred when the Leader of the Opposition suggested there should be no necessity to have any further hearings, and the minister aligned himself with the Leader of the Opposition and suggested that my colleague, the member for Wentworth, was suggesting some interminable delay, does the minister not think that whether or not that kind of final mechanism, that is of a commission which buys all the eggs and fixes the price and they are sold at that price—is the final result and that is not what is recommended in this report, isn't such a conclusion only to be drawn after full public hearings about the very matters which I have tried to raise before the minister tonight, involving not only the egg producers but the people at the other end of the marketplace, the major supermarkets, chain stores and convenience stores?

And let me ask the minister another question while he is still there. What does the minister think about substituting guarantees of the Province of Ontario to support those poor chartered banks so that they will lend some money to this independent farmer who owns his land and mixes his own feed to allow him to escape subservience to the feed companies?

Is the Province of Ontario going to work out some method of guarantee, or is it going to meet with the chartered banks and perhaps suggest to them it is about time they got into this short-term financing business? What are the credit arrangements which the government is going to give to the farmer to restore the much-vaunted independence that the member for Algoma (Mr. Gilbertson) spoke about earlier today, and which has been eroded and eroded by the government of this particular minister?

Is the minister going to comment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well of course these are all matters that are under consideration. We got the report last Friday, we tabled it, and he comes in here tonight and says, "Have you got all these things resolved?"

Mr. Stokes: Obviously he is the only one who has read the report.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The abysmal ignorance of my hon. friend from Riverdale in the marketing of farm products—

Mr. Renwick: I ask you to think about it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —is phenomenal in the extreme. I have to say that. I really have to say that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, that is why I engaged in the debate tonight. I knew the time would come when, if you question the minister about the price of food in the Province of Ontario, his only reply is to attack one of the people who buys it. The person who buys food—

Mr. Eaton: That is a big joke.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Renwick: The person who buys food, to this minister, knows nothing about it.

Mr. Stokes: He's getting to the minister.

Mr. Renwick: Wait till we get to the Warble Fly Control Act. We will deal with that.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: What is the Warble Fly Control Act?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I wondered how far I would have to go tonight, you see, because he was stuck with Judge Ross, and Judge Ross isn't a farmer and doesn't know anything about farming. But it didn't take him long to react –

Mr. Stokes: He knows a lot about eggs.

Mr. Renwick: – to my abysmal ignorance. And I assume a little bit of that abysmal ignorance runs off on Judge Ross, that Judge Ross perhaps hasn't quite got the answer either and the minister is now going to shelve the basic ingredient of the report and do nothing about egg prices to the consumer which will be good for the consumer and good for the farmer and will deal with the people in the middle. Or is he going to play the old con game of playing the consumer off against the farmer? What is he going to do? It's the old shell game.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend will have to wait and see, Mr. Chairman, when the report comes in.

Mr. Deans: Well could the minister explain, following up on what was said, why it is that the minister so rejects out of hand the proposition that the people who are most concerned in the industry, the farmers who are in fact involved in the production of eggs, are to be neglected at this point?

Mr. Eaton: What happened to the last two agriculture critics over there?

Mr. Deans: Considering the recommendations that have been made, why is it that their views are no longer to be sought in terms of what the alternatives are as they see them, and what in fact their views are?

What is it about the five days a week that the Legislature sits that is so long that this government cannot afford to give the farmers of Ontario an opportunity, over five days, to express their views about what is contained in this report?

It is what they have been asking for year after year in the Ontario Federation of Agriculture brief. They have consistently said they have been denied the opportunity of access to the government in those things that are most meaningful.

Mr. Eaton: Oh come on!

Mr. Gisborn: Let's hear from the member for Middlesex South.

Mr. Eaton: You will.

Mr. Deans: To say now that it would take too long –

Mr. Gisborn: He seems to have much to say.

Mr. Deans: – that the minister is going to ask the experts to draft the plan, well, surely to goodness the people whose very livelihoods are concerned are entitled to some input into this. The experts have had an opportunity. As the minister says, he has had the board. The board hasn't produced; that is the reason for the study. If there had been some form of recommendation come forward in the last year or year and a half that could have been implemented, then I can understand the minister saying he would be trusting to the representatives' views. But in this instance nothing has happened, and the minister had to appoint such a study.

But surely now, since it has been completed, we can afford a week and say to those people whose total life may well be affected by everything that happens, by whatever is recommended, that they be given the opportunity to appear and that this committee be charged with the responsibility of reporting to the minister on whatever it is that is considered to be appropriate by the people most involved.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak on the egg industry; there has been a considerable amount said about it.

Before the dinner hour the minister, in replying to the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) and the hon. member for Wentworth in regard to their remarks as critics for the Department of Agriculture for each party, said he was quite disappointed that they didn't have something to offer to improve the income for agriculture in this province. I would like to bring to the minister –

Mr. Gisborn: He wants the opposition to do his job for him; that's what he wants.

Mr. Deans: Yes, that's what he wants.

Mr. Spence: I want to bring to the minister a suggestion that I think would benefit

the agricultural industry, in southwestern Ontario anyway. A few weeks ago we had a delegation go to Ottawa to discuss the sugar industry with the federal government. In southwestern Ontario, the Canada and Dominion Sugar processing plant in the city of Chatham closed down in 1968, a severe loss to those in agriculture in southwestern Ontario, and in the minister's county of Middlesex. Anyway there was quite a debate in this House.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister played quite a leading role.

Mr. Spence: That's right. There was quite a debate that took place in this Legislature that we shouldn't keep this industry going.

I think now, that we have reached a high point of production in many fields. There are many products—corn, hogs, poultry and many other products—but I think the time has arrived that I would like to see the sugar beet industry revived in the Province of Ontario. This is maybe not all the minister's problem nor responsibility, but this is in the Province of Ontario, and I would like to see him make a great effort to impress the federal government that we should revive the sugar beet industry in the Province of Ontario.

The sugar beet industry not only helped the agriculture industry, but the processing of beets helped the labour industry in Ontario. It was a great benefit to the machinery companies and also it helped the trucking industry in the Province of Ontario. With the overproduction of many crops, such as corn, where the price is now below the cost of production, we should have an alternative, something else to take up or to use up some of this productive land to produce a product that is consumed and used by the people of this Province of Ontario.

Just a short time ago the price of sugar increased from six cents to 16 cents. I was one who was sorry or disappointed that the sugar beet industry went out of production in Ontario. I would like the minister to make his good office available to reviving the sugar beet industry in the Province of Ontario. I think it would benefit many segments of our economy. When net return from agriculture is at a saturation point, or a most disappointing point to me, I think the minister, should make every effort to put his weight on the federal government that this sugar beet industry should be revived here in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Minister, I hope you make every effort. I think the county in which you live would benefit greatly from the sugar beet industry. Those who produce sugar beets received a fair return and were quite happy. I hope, Mr. Minister, you give this consideration. And this is a suggestion which will help and improve, I would say, the income of those who are in the agricultural industry.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Middlesex South.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: What about the possibility for that, Mr. Minister? Is there any possibility?

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, speaking from—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, just before we go into another topic which perhaps the hon. member for Middlesex South is introducing—

Mr. Eaton: I am still on eggs. I am not going into another topic.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —if the minister would reply to the hon. member who just spoke about the sugar beet industry—if there is a prospect.

Mr. Chairman: Order please, does the hon. minister wish to reply to this comment? Yes, the hon. minister and then we'll get to the member for Middlesex South.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well the point my friend from Kent raises is a valid point. We're all disappointed the sugar beet industry disappeared from the Province of Ontario, but the circumstances at the time dictated that there didn't seem to be any alternative.

There was only one company in Ontario and the company decided to close its doors. The federal government and our own government did everything that, I think, it was humanly possible to do to keep the company going, or to keep the doors of that plant open.

The federal government offered to continue their subsidy We certainly wanted the plant kept open, but it was a decision that was made, not in Canada, but in London, England; that the plant be closed. The plant has been closed. I understand the equipment has been dismantled and the plant—some parts of it at least—is being used for other purposes today.

Now my hon. friend refers to the rapid increase in the price of sugar. Certainly that escalation in price was phenomenal, to say

the least. I think it was quite unexpected, but I believe it was due largely to the incredible losses that were caused by the weather conditions in the Caribbean islands, one of the chief sources of the world's sugar. The hurricane damage that pertained there virtually ruined a good deal of the crop. The sugar dealers, the brokers, the world handlers, recognizing that there appeared to be an abnormal shortage of sugar, certainly escalated the price.

Now is this a flash in the pan for this year? Many people who have given a great deal of study to the situation feel that it is—that if weather conditions are normal in the Caribbean islands and in other sugar-producing areas of the world, that sugar will be back in normal supply and that Canada will probably be buying sugar at the surplus world market price again.

This was really what happened before. We weren't buying on the international sugar agreement in those days; we were buying surplus sugar on the world sugar exchange at prices that were far below the regular world price, or the agreed-upon price of sugar. I think that today Canada does participate to some degree in the international sugar price agreements, but there appears to be a wait-and-see attitude on the part of people who are knowledgeable about what generated the price hike and what can happen next year.

Mr. Deans: May I ask the minister, just in this regard: He makes the statement that the problem arose because of conditions in the Caribbean. This is exactly the same argument that I made last year and the year before, and perhaps, even the year before, in regard to the fruit industry.

It's the whole argument that one makes year after year in regard to the farming community. That each time that we allow a sector of our farming community to become eliminated entirely, we are potentially at the mercy of economic forces and others in nations over which we have absolutely no control.

It worries me when I see the government sit idly by, and I use the phrase advisedly now—at one point perhaps without justification, but now with some justification, to see the government sit idly by and see sector after sector, segment after segment of the farm community being allowed to deteriorate to the point where it no longer is viable, and we then become at the mercy of the importer.

It is a very, very serious problem. It is much more serious than perhaps many of the things that we have spoken about, because every time this happens the whole economic fibre of the nation becomes in jeopardy. Every time we permit one of the staples, one of the basic necessities, to be removed from our control, we have an erosion, and a very severe erosion, of all of the opportunities for reasonable and sensible economic planning. And I worry when the minister says there was no alternative.

It is a small matter, it is not a matter that concerns a great many people, but if you want to isolate everything off, if you want to take each commodity operation and isolate it one from the other, each one in its own right is a very small concern and each one can be let go, and I worry, I really worry at the overall view; the overview of this government toward the concern that the remainder of society feels for this continuous erosion of import matter into the Province of Ontario.

I asked the minister—two years ago, three years ago, last year, ever since I have been in the House—what kinds of positive action are being taken to ensure that those things which are most vulnerable—the fruit industry is one—are being protected. It is not only a matter of protecting the farmers, it is not only a matter of protecting the industry itself, it is the whole matter of protecting the entire consumer market; that what you might get for 50 cents in any quantity today, given that we don't have the home-grown product, the inevitable fact is that we will eventually be paying two or three times that much to buy the imported product. And I worry.

I see no evidence in this government, I see no evidence in this department, of any genuine concern. I can never at any time in the nearly 4½ years that I have been here, recall seeing any positive move by this government to protect any sector against the erosion, against the influence and the influx of the foreign-produced product.

In fact, to the contrary. I suggest that in fact this government is more concerned about the industrialization of Ontario and is little concerned about the protection of the farming industry as it now is; that in fact it wouldn't care, provided we produced sufficient dollars to buy it, it doesn't matter to the government, from its action or inaction, what the cost is to the consumer market.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I have to take some exception to this.

Mr. Deans: I thought you might.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I am sure that is why you said it, because obviously you didn't know what you were talking about. Had you known –

Mr. Deans: No, I said it because I have believed it for years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Had you known anything about the constitution, you would know that the province cannot interfere with the interprovincial or international movement of commodities in or out.

Mr. Stokes: What about iron ore?

Mr. Deans: I said nothing about that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes you did, oh yes you did. That is what you were talking about.

Mr. Deans: I was not talking about that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well this is what I heard you to say, anyway. Now there is the problem, because you see when you talk about the various segments of the industry disappearing, what other segments of the industry but sugar beets have disappeared? What are they?

Mr. Deans: I see erosion of the total industry.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, let's see it. What do you mean by erosion of the total industry? Let us see your figures. Give me an illustration of what has eroded in the total industry. I would be interested to hear it. I sure would.

Mr. Deans: Let me say to the minister, in the lead-off that I made I referred to the declining incomes of the farm community –

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes sure, declining incomes; but give me an illustration.

Mr. Deans: The declining incomes of the farm community are a direct reflection of their inability to sell their commodity.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Like all over the world. Did you know that?

Mr. Deans: That is not all over the world.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: That is absolutely correct. Your argument is weak.

Mr. Deans: There are other nations in the world that are taking the place of Ontario.

Mr. Renwick: It is the government's problem in Ontario. Deal with it here. It is your responsibility.

Mr. Deans: I say to the minister that the declining incomes of the farm community are a clear indication of its inability or its problems in producing sufficient in the way of produce to meet the need; that there must be a decline in the produce produced or the purchase of the produce in order to produce such a significant decline in the total income, while at the same time a reflection of that income is in the amount of imported goods that come into the country. Unless this government is prepared to take some positive action to ensure that we maintain this industry—recognizing the failure of the federal government, recognizing that failure—unless this government is prepared to act in the best interests of the people of the Province of Ontario to ensure –

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What do you want to do? You are talking out of both sides of your mouth. You want to protect the consumer and you want to protect the producer too.

Mr. Deans: – to ensure the industry will remain viable it will be gradually eroded. There will be a gradual chipping away until such time as it will be reduced to a point where it will no longer be viable and that's the problem. It isn't a great hefty sweep. You don't see it reduced by a half or by a quarter at any one time. But you see it gradually being eroded; year after year you see the net income of farmers being reduced –

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Where do you want the money to come from? You tell me.

Mr. Deans: – in 1969 to $442 million, 1970 to $387 million, 1972 to $296 million, 1972 to $274 million—and what I am saying to you is that it is a gradual erosion, it is a gradual chipping away of the entire fibre of the farming community.

Mr. Renwick: That's right.

Mr. Deans: That's a reflection of the farming community and that's a reflection of their ability to compete in the marketplace. And it's a result of this government's inability or incapacity to move forward and to produce meaningful programmes that will ensure that in the year 1982 we won't be down to $50 million and the remainder of the needs being met by foreign enterprises. And that's what I am saying to you.

And when you said today there was nothing concrete offered, I am suggesting to you that the purpose of your department—not my job, your job—is to produce the kinds of

policies that will shore up the industry. And it is time you realized it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: My hon. friend has used noise instead of facts.

Mr. Renwick: That is not correct.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He tells us that we are not producing enough to meet the demands.

Mr. Deans: I said you are not protecting the industry. I didn't say you weren't producing enough.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In the remarks you made –

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well now Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor or do I not? I listened to what my hon. friend said, and he said among other things that our farmers were not producing to meet the needs of the industry, to meet the needs of the people.

Mr. Deans: I didn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh yes, you did say that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Let's listen to Middlesex South.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now to my way of thinking, it is about time we recognized there are some tremendous increases in production, and that one of the great problems that faces Ontario agriculture is our ability to produce far beyond what we can sell at a price that will provide a decent standard of living to the people.

Mr. Renwick: Because you won't do anything about how the prices are fixed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In the situation as far as dairy products are concerned we have been able to do something. We have really been able to do something to stabilize that market, by the producers themselves taking hold of the commodity and dealing with it and with the Canadian Dairy Commission providing–

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): Taking hold of the product? In the dairy industry? There is a bad phrase if you ever heard one. That should be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: –providing a situation that will control the imports coming into this country. That really is the crux of the whole thing. I see that in the fruit industry and the vegetable industry certainly there are imports, there is no question about it.

We have protested this to Ottawa. We are greatly concerned about it; but in the face of all the things that have happened, when you look at the actual production figures over the last 30 years in the Province of Ontario, in say the Niagara Peninsula and the total province, there has been a phenomenal increase in total tonnage of food produced.

It's there, there is no question about it, it's there. But how can we compete with products that are dumped in here from South Africa, from Australia, from California? These are produced and dumped into our market here at prices that–perhaps dumping is not the right term to use–

Mr. Bullbrook: I guess not. Do you know anything about the anti-dumping legislation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: –they are shipped in here.

Yes I know something about the anti-dumping legislation and I venture to suggest that I know a lot more about it than you do. I suggest that dumping was not the right word.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well then, you should not use that phrase.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I must confess to my hon. friend, the lawyer from Sarnia, who is knowledgeable in all things and everything–

Mr. Bullbrook: I know nothing about fooling the public.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: –that we recognize that the word "dumping" probably wasn't the right word.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He was not using any technical stuff.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: But there are too many imports coming in and–

Mr. Deans: That is the mistake I make from time to time.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I protested this to our friends at Ottawa and I hope that through the Canadian Horticultural Council we may be able to do something about it. I hope we can. I've often felt that our fruit industry in this province was being used as a trade-off–

Mr. Deans: It certainly is and we will lose it:

Hon. Mr. Stewart: –for the export of many Canadian products because our government

—we are a trading country We export about 40 per cent of our total production and so I—

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you in control now? Are you in control of yourself now?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —think we have to recognize the fact that there are problems in international trade and my job is to try to protect Ontario's producers insofar as it is possible to do so.

Mr. Deans: Let me just say to the minister, before we close off on this subject, that for years the department has impressed upon the farmers that what they have to do is learn how to be more economical. They have got to produce more; they have got to produce more on fewer acres; that has been the war cry for years.

Okay, so they learned a lesson; that wasn't the lesson that should have been learned. That wasn't what was needed. At some point, we are going to find out that there will be a stopping point where we won't produce any more. We won't be able to produce any more per acre. The unfortunate part—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Nonsense!

Mr. Deans: That's true! Okay! There will come a point, I suggest to you, where the yield per acre will even out. I say to you that there will be a point where the yield per acre will even out; that we will have achieved an optimum. There is an optimum in everything even in the growing of produce—

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Utter garbage.

Mr. Deans: —whether you believe it or not. I suggest to you that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is not a maximum.

Mr. Deans: —when we reach that point we have to be sure that there are still sufficient numbers of people involved in the industry and there are still sufficient viable farming communities that they will be able to produce to meet the needs of the people who are still being bred in this country.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Okay.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Middlesex South.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Gee it to 'em.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate a bit to enter this discussion or whatever you might call it. Usually a good discussion has some basic information on both sides of it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is the way it seems.

Mr. Eaton: Speaking from a little experience in farm marketing and a basic background in several marketing plans, probably that little experience is more than all those members on the other side have combined.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Plus far more.

Mr. Deans: I agree.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Plus.

Mr. Eaton: I have some major experience in—

Mr. Foulds: What kind of experience are you talking about?

Mr. Eaton: —one marketing plan that is one of the more successful ones in this province.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That was the one the minister straightened out? Is that the white bean one?

Mr Eaton: He straightened it out afterward, too, when we had a different situation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister walked in and seized the books. That is not when you were running it.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You have used that once already.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is the truth.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: And it worked.

Mr. Eaton: Just for the record; the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, after my speech seconding the Speech from the Throne, that I was there at the time that situation happened. I wasn't; I came afterward

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Good for you.

Mr. Bullbrook: You look like an honest man.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Part of the cleanup?

Mr. Eaton: That's right and we straightened it up pretty well.

Mr. Bullbrook: High forehead.

Mr. Eaton: I would like to make some references to the things that the member for Riverdale was mentioning regarding mar-

keting plans. He kept zeroing in on one particular case regarding the setting of price.

An agency marketing plan, when given the proper consideration it will be given by the people organizing it, takes into consideration all the things involved in setting the price in many different situations, not the situation in one particular market. Given this information, these particular situations can be taken care of from day-to-day in the pricing of the product to ensure a proper return for the producers of that particular product.

Mr. Renwick: And price to the consumer!

Mr. Eaton: I suggest that if you really want to have something to say about these plans you visit some of the marketing boards and see how they actually do function and get some proper information on them before you make these statements.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): That is a good idea.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, you have come to accept that the marketing agency is God almighty in this province.

Mr. Eaton: I also would like to make a remark regarding the diminishing –

Mr. Gisborn: We don't accept that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You don't believe that marketing boards are in the interests of the farmer?

Mr. Shulman: Surely not in the interests of the consumer.

Mr. Gisborn: Not completely, no.

Mr. Eaton: Does the member for Hamilton East not believe that marketing boards are in the interests of the farmers of this province?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, let the member for Hamilton East –

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, I would also like to make some reference to the markets that the member for Wentworth was talking about.

Mr. Deans: I cannot hear you.

Mr. Eaton: I would like to make some reference to the markets that you were talking about and point out that our export markets in Ontario agricultural products have expanded every year. I know, in the case of our particular board, we are exporting over half of our products now. This has increased steadily over the past 10 years due to an aggressive market approach by marketing boards and the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Deans: I didn't say a word that was detrimental to that at all.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Oh, yes, you did.

Mr. Eaton: That is what it sounded like from here. Get your words straight.

Mr. M. Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): And the net income has been going down every year.

An hon. member: You wouldn't know the difference, a steel farmer from Hamilton.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No wonder you guys lost all the seats.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, what I really want to do is make a couple of references to the egg marketing report, one in particular that my friend from Huron-Bruce mentioned last night with regard to marketing quotas and the value on marketing quotas. I know it has been quite a common opinion about the agricultural community that they should not have a value to them. The member mentioned that last night, but I think he hesitated to offer a solution to that problem. I would suggest that, if a marketing quota is any good at all, it does have some value to it. He mentioned a need of a young farmer putting capital out to get a marketing quota. I suggest that that capital is well spent. If it assures him a place in that marketplace –

Mr. Carruthers: One farmer to another.

Mr. Eaton: – and a good return for his product, it is just as good an investment as the buildings or equipment that he uses in his programme. So I think that I have to take some serious exception to the Ross report in the fact that he declares we should not put a value to marketing quotas, because I believe they do have a value to them. Other than that, I think the report is good.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are squirming over there.

Mr. Eaton: I would point out, in reply to the criticism of the member for Riverdale of the egg marketing board, they have made many of these suggestions. The only reason they didn't come about sooner was the situa-

tion that I pointed out last night in my resolution on those who could vote on a marketing plan. I would suggest that, had they been given this opportunity without the interference that came about from such people who ran around passing out the half a dozen hens—and I would suggest maybe some of them were the type that supported the member for Riverdale's party in this past election —

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Eaton: — that this plan would have taken effect much sooner, I think there is a lot of basic information already in the hands of the marketing board which will see this plan proceed rather quickly with the co-operation of the Department of Agriculture. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): The little red hen.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to the topic that was raised by my colleague from Kent in relation to the possibilities of renewing the sugar beet industry in our area. I think when the member for Wentworth was speaking he didn't realize the total implications of this particular matter. The minister did touch on it when he indicated that Canada wasn't part of the international agreement on sugar.

I think this is the whole crux of the matter. This is where the minister and his officials and we in our party should be hammering at those fellows in Ottawa to join in in this international agreement on sugar, to stabilize the sugar price and quit bleeding our friends in the Caribbean whom we have been living off for so long with this one particular commodity. If this was stabilized, then possibly those private industries or maybe governments could take a look at the sugar beet industry for a possible reintroduction into the Province of Ontario, just as it has been introduced into the provinces to the west and it has been been done successfully. So I would hope that when the minister's people are in Ottawa tomorrow, they might just pass this on to the federal officials.

I am sure that we in our party are going to pass this on to some of our federal colleagues to try and get this thought moving, to open the door for a stabilization of the price of sugar in our province and country, and open up the possibility of the reintroduction of the sugar-beet industry in Ontario. Because, as my colleague has pointed out, it certainly helped the farm labour situation in our area, it levelled out production, and I am sure, Mr. Minister, that the farmers in the Essex and Kent area, and in Middlesex, would grow the 20,000 or 25,000 acres of sugar beets if given the opportunity again.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401. The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, the discussion this evening has been filled with heat rather than light, and there is one specific matter that I would like some enlightenment on. If you recall, on Friday I raised the matter originally with the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Carton), who fielded it to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence). I tried to refer it to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, but at that point the Speaker ruled this out of order as a supplementary.

It has to do with the federal government's recent reduction of feed grain subsidies to the northwestern Ontario region. And I think that as a matter of policy your government should make strong representations to Ottawa to reinstate that subsidy to its full capacity. The livestock industry—and particularly the milk producers—in northwestern Ontario, I think is a marginal industry that is coming into its own. It is beginning to develop and this subsidy has been of some significance and great help to them.

I would like to pass on to you that they are deeply concerned that the freight rate of livestock feed will be increased to them by $4.20 per ton, effective April 1 just passed. They are afraid that that increase will create undue hardships for those producers of livestock.

As your department is probably aware, and I am sure that you are, in 1967 they were originally granted a subsidy of $8 per ton, so as to make it possible for beef and dairy herds in Thunder Bay district to be competitive with the other areas. In December, 1969, the subsidy was reduced to $7.40 per ton, a reduction of 60 cents; I think, in fact, they could still make a living.

However, on April 1, 1972, the subsidy was reduced to $3.20 per ton, a reduction of $4.20 per ton. In other words, the subsidy granted in 1967 of $8 per ton will, in 1972 be only $3.20 per ton. And the milk producers and the livestock industry people generally, in Thunder Bay district, are very much afraid that their industry will gradually

go down the drain—a phrase that was used earlier—that one of those erosions will take place.

Although this livestock industry in northwestern Ontario is not one of the great areas of agriculture, it is one of those areas in which a number of people make a marginal living and wish to work at this kind of activity. And I would hope, Mr. Minister, that your department would make the strongest possible representations to Ottawa to ensure that that subsidy is reintroduced.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I rise as a representative of consumers only. As there are no farmers in High Park I confess, to start with, that my knowledge of farm problems is very minute. However, there is no question in my mind—I speak now as a representative of consumers, and I direct my remarks to the member for Middlesex South as well as the minister—that marketing boards in general are completely inimical to the interests of the consumer. If we're going to be honest, we must admit this. They are obviously of benefit to the farmers. They are obviously of benefit to the middleman.

Mr. Eaton: The member eats the least expensive food in the world.

Mr. Shulman: Give me a moment. I listened to you in peace. We, as consumers, are prepared to have marketing boards and to put up with the higher prices that we must pay as a result of marketing boards in order to give the farmers a decent living, in an effort to improve their standard of living.

However, the reason I have risen is because of the remarks made in relation to the sugar beet industry. This is where we have reasonable concessions going to unreasonable concessions. This is one subject I happen to know something about.

Mr. F. S. Miller (Muskoka): That's a change.

Mr. Shulman: I have done a study of sugar prices over the past 25 years in this country and on the world market and it would be absolute insanity, from the viewpoint of the consumer and from the viewpoint of the cost of living, for Canada to join the international agreement on sugar.

If we look back on the cost of sugar in this country since the Second World War, the average prices run between two and three cents a pound while the protected price, the international price, was two or three times that. There have only been two occasions in the last 20 years—both of those were extremely brief and lasted for a matter of weeks—where the agreement price was lower than the world price.

Now to have our consumers pay more money for this commodity just doesn't make sense. It is producing a featherbed industry that can't pay its way in competition—

Mr. Paterson: Has the member seen the poverty in Jamaica?

Mr. Eaton: One of his members was just suggesting that we protect it.

Mr. Shulman: If he is suggesting it, and I don't think he is, then I disagree with him. It makes no sense whatsoever to pay two or three times what we pay now for a commodity in order to set up a featherbed industry.

Sure, there is good reason to protect the egg industry. This is an established commodity where we don't have to double or triple the price; we can raise it enough to give the farmer a margin. But to bring in a sugar industry here makes no financial sense whatsoever, to the consumer or to the cost of living. You're just shoving the cost of living up for no reason whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401. The member for Essex-Kent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the member for Wentworth want to reply to that?

Mr. Deans: No. We are on exactly the same wavelength.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): There have been a number of remarks made and I don't think I will repeat them, although I had thought of bringing them up.

I would like to ask the minister—I suppose we could bring this under this vote, Mr. Chairman—about the auditor's report on section 4 of the Agriculture Representatives Act, where a county council pays $500 a year into a bank toward the agriculture representative. Is he giving any consideration to having this taken out of the books because apparently the auditor feels that it is not an account that is classed as income? This is on page 35 of the auditor's report.

It seems to me that the day has passed when county councils should be paying $500 in a bank account toward an agriculture representative for the county. I was wondering if the minister had given any consideration to having that taken out of the books and that Act rescinded?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, we have not. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I rather welcome and appreciate the relationship between the county council and the agricultural representative. While the $500 may not seem like a large amount, my hon. friend, I think it is a bond of relationship that does exist and I would like to see it continue to exist. The money is put to good use, put to good purpose, and I think I would hesitate very much to accept my hon. friend's suggestion that the Act be repealed.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Chairman, the auditor himself said that "since these funds are not part of the consolidated revenue fund, the receipts, disbursements and balances have not been subject to audit by this office." He said that as of March 31, 1971, there were balances totalling $29,838 in some 43 bank accounts. Mind you, that is not a lot of money to the Treasurer of Ontario, but it seems to me that it's something that could be done away with.

I don't think we have to worry about bonds of friendship or co-operation with county councils for $500. I don't think that a $500 payment from the treasurer of the county to the government of Ontario is going to assist in the county representation. I can say that in my own county and in other counties the county ag reps certainly do a good job, and the $500 hasn't got any bearing on the type of work they do for the county. I just can't see that being necessary now, in any way. I certainly would disagree with the minister on that point.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton): You mean Essex should not get it? You do not want Essex county to get that money?

Mr. Ruston: You have set up a corn council in the last few months. What are the general guidelines, Mr. Chairman, through you, for the corn council that was appointed in the last few months?

Mr. Henderson: Do you want Essex county not to get that money?

Mr. Ruston: Yes.

Mr. Henderson: You don't want them to get that money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He said yes, he did not want them to get it!

Mr. Bullbrook: Listen, we have enough trouble taking the minister on.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bullbrook: Friends as we are.

An hon. member: They are bringing up the troops; bringing up the reserves.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the auditing of the books; the accounts which my friend from Essex mentioned are audited by our own staff in the Department of Agriculture and Food.

With regard to the terms of reference of the corn council; the council was set up at the request of the entire industry representatives who met at Ridgetown. The terms of reference really are quite broad and quite general—to explore and look into all possible avenues whereby the corn industry in this country can be strengthened and the price of corn to producers can be raised to a price where they can live and pay their expenses and provide a decent return. I think one of the things they have been able to achieve, and I would like to give them full credit for it, is in the discussions they have had with the federal Department of Agriculture and the federal government in increasing the write-off and depreciation schedules to 25 per cent for the next three years on storage and drying facilities, both on the farm and in country elevator points throughout Ontario.

This to me is a very great incentive to increase storage facilities. Frankly, I think if we could increase storage facilities for corn in the corn-producing areas, we could retain that corn there to be fed out in those areas because I believe that this is really the answer. Eighty per cent of all the corn produced in Ontario is fed between Woodstock and Windsor, in that general area—or I should say used in that area. Why would we want to shove that out or ship it out and then bring back grain at another time? It seems to me that the answer is increased facilities. This is one of the things that our grain corn council are working on and I understand they are having several meetings.

Mr. Paterson: One last question on this first vote, Mr. Chairman, in relation to information services. Unfortunately, in my busy schedule I do not have time to hear radio market information as often as I would like. Could the minister advise the House how that market information system is working? Is it still receiving the broad acceptance that apparently it did a year ago?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, it is and I am indebted to my hon. friend who, you will recall in previous estimates debates, made the suggestion that we introduce this type of

programme. I think we have even gone further than my hon. friend suggested, Mr. Chairman. The programme has been in operation and I think it is doing an extremely good job.

We have a phone-in service from the various radio and news outlets across the country and we have as well the opportunity for producers to contact directly by long distance telephone to get market quotations on, say, beef or hogs or potatoes. We have a very good advisory service on potatoes that is going out on a weekly basis. I would say that the programme is working very well. I am not altogether satisfied that as many news outlets are making use of it as might make use of it. We have been trying to encourage that and we have also been trying to get an even better degree of co-operation between the markets and the news reporting service.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Yes, on 1401. I raised with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and, I think, in a rather peripheral way with the Minister of Agriculture the year before – no, I see I raised it with the Minister of Municipal Affairs last year and I believe with this particular minister two years ago—the matter of acquiring land for the purpose of maintaining farm communities. I was interested in a programme that was promoted by the government of Saskatchewan –

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would that not be more appropriate under 1403 – rural development, ARDA, and what not?

Mr. Deans: Well, in effect, it is on the policy of the department – whether the policy is in the process of change. Up until recently there has been no policy in this matter and I want to press with the minister the need to establish policy.

The government of Saskatchewan has introduced a rather interesting booklet. It is called "The Saskatchewan Land Bank." I have often felt that one of the problems in farming was the need to raise sufficient capital in terms of the sale of farm areas, or in terms of the purchase of new areas. Most people are quite frankly incapable or unable to put up the collateral to raise the money to move into farming as a new enterprise.

It is extremely difficult – a very expensive business and one of the most expensive parts of it is, of course, the land. I want to read to the minister what the government of Saskatchewan has said about its programme, and to get his views on whether or not, even on a test basis, this kind of a programme might be appropriate in certain parts of Ontario, to see whether or not it is a feasible way of dealing with the matter of rapid urbanization of very valuable land. Perhaps an effort might be made to maintain it, if not as a productive enterprise now, at least for some future development.

It says that:

> The land bank in Saskatchewan will provide the retiring farmer with an opportunity to retire with dignity and financial security at a time of his own choosing [which a lot of our farmers have had difficulty doing].
>
> The land bank will create an opportunity for young, capable farmers to lease farm land, thus eliminating the necessity to raise large amounts of capital [which is the problem that I alluded to], and to make commitments to burdensome principal payments over long periods. This will permit young farmers to utilize the capital they would have put into land for investment in livestock, livestock facilities and other productive assets which will become the basis for the growth and development of farms in rural Saskatchewan.

I wonder if this government is giving consideration to a similar kind of programme in Ontario, particularly in those areas of better quality soil that we don't really want to see become the domain of urban development – parking lots and highrise apartments and the likes. I wonder whether the government has given thought to the setting up of a land bank programme within the Ministry of Agriculture for the purpose of leasing land to surrounding farmers and other persons in the farm community.

This would certainly, in my view, and obviously in the view of the government there, give an opportunity for farm endeavour without the kind of capital outlay that they would require in order to purchase. It would also give the farmer who had perhaps decided to retire from farming an opportunity to move into whatever it is that he wants to do. And it would safeguard for future development—whether it be farming or otherwise—the land that is in the vicinity of the most productive farm areas.

Has this been given consideration, and what kind of response has there been?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the idea has many intriguing points about it, I have

to confess. I am interested in the proposal, but the provincial government has not given any active consideration to it at the moment. But I think it is a point that we have to look at.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa Centre was on his feet a moment ago.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I am saving my categorical and comprehensive speech on the state of agriculture in eastern Ontario until next year because I accept some of the criticisms of the members on the other side that there are a few things that some of us urban members have got to learn about agriculture. But I can speak in one area, and I would like to preface it by referring to what the member for Wentworth has already said about the decline in the net income of farmers over the last four or five years.

The minister is very competent and very able in saying that this particular programme is going well, or that particular programme is going well. But I have listened in vain during the consideration of vote 1401 for the minister to explain the essential problems of farmers, which is that their income has been going steadily downwards at a time that the net income of most other citizens in Ontario has been rising at a reasonable or even accelerated rate. The farmers have been caught in a squeeze in which the cost of the materials and supplies and equipment that they buy has been going up and the prices which they are paid for the goods they produce have either been static or perhaps, in some cases, have been going down.

Mr. Henderson: What's going down?

Mr. Cassidy: Going down, okay, the farm.

Mr. W. Hodgson: What product is going down? Tell us about one.

Mr. Cassidy: I'll leave it to the Minister of Agriculture, in fact.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: The point that the hon. members opposite don't realize, though, is that the average income of farmers has been declining and the net income of agriculture –

Mr. W. Hodgson: What's going down? Let's hear what is going down.

Mr. Cassidy: – has declined in Ontario by 38 per cent between 1969 and the projection for 1972. It is a pretty sorry record for a Minister of Agriculture to have to defend.

Mr. Eaton: You are talking about total. Now let's relate that to producers and individuals.

Mr. Deans: The total is made up of the sum of the individuals.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right and the –

Mr. Eaton: Back it up with a bit of facts.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: To accept that kind of argument is ridiculous.

Mr. Cassidy: The hon. member for Lambton couldn't tell me if he tried.

Mr. Henderson: We know. We don't want to tell you. We want you to tell us.

Mr. Cassidy: I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that in fact it is easy for me, it is possible for me, as an urban member representing a downtown riding, just simply to look at the basic statistics and say something is rotten in the state of agriculture in the Province of Ontario. It is the government and that minister who must bear a great share of the responsibility for that.

Mr. Eaton: Relate those figures.

Mr. Cassidy: The figures from the Federation of Agriculture – and who is better qualified to speak than the Federation of Agriculture –

Mr. Henderson: Get away from your books, you don't know anything.

Mr. Cassidy: – show that net farm income, as estimated by the Canada Department of Agriculture, will have declined by 38 per cent over a period of four years during which this government has been in power in the Province of Ontario and the number of farms will have declined over that period by 12 per cent. That means that the net income of the average farmer in Ontario will have declined by 25 per cent.

Mr. W. Hodgson: What do you call an average farmer?

Mr. Henderson: Tell me then.

Mr. Cassidy: The statisticians can tell you that.

Mr. Stokes: Get up and make your own contribution to the debate.

Mr. Cassidy: That is right. You defend the fact that the people you represent in

Lambton county have been losing income and have been forced out of business as farmers. You defend the way in which the Conservative government has presided over the decline of the family farmer in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Henderson: Imagine the big farmers.

Mr. Cassidy: That is up to you to defend and not for us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess I will have to get up and resolve this debate.

Mr. Deans: Tell him about the agricultural farms in the Ministry of Correctional Services.

Mr. S. B. Handleman (Carleton): Fools rush in.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, I have spoken of the general problem. The consumer hasn't felt the impact of the increase in productivity by farmers. Food prices have been rising steadily. The middle man, the processor in the middle, has been profiting from it and the people who supply the farmer have been profiting from it and the farmer certainly hasn't been profiting from it. I just want to ask the minister a question in one specific area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member know what a Charolais cow is?

Mr. Cassidy: The hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick is even less qualified to talk about agriculture than I am.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, no, no. I was for 7½ years the biggest farmer in Ontario.

Mr. Deans: You are still a bit of a farmer to be honest with you.

Mr. Henderson: Expertise.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Chairman, one of the areas in which the government of Ontario could act in order to relieve farmers of undue costs, which are unjustifiable, is in the field of farm machinery. A couple of years ago the federal government sponsored an exhaustive inquiry into the cost of farm machinery. I am sure the minister is aware of it and I am sorry that there has been so little action by this government in order to implement recommendations which are within the purview and responsibility of this government.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What recommendations?

Mr. Cassidy: The federal task force, the federal royal commission, recommended that action should be taken to ensure that Ontario farmers and other Canadian farmers –

Mr. Henderson: What machinery, outside of a tractor?

Mr. W. Hodgson: What machinery are you talking about?

Mr. Cassidy: – should be able to buy farm machinery at a price that was close to the world price, rather than at a profiteering inflated price which is based on the control of the market exerted by a few manufacturers in Canada.

Mr. Deans: Aren't you glad you asked?

Mr. Cassidy: They also recommended –

Mr. Deans: Now that you know that he knows, do you feel better?

Mr. Cassidy: They also recommended that there should be farm machinery testing stations run by the government in various parts of the country, and Ontario, with the largest farming sector of any province, ought to be doing that. They also recommended that government should move in order to standardize spare parts and set up replacement or spare parts depots in order to reduce costs of spare parts and equipment. In order to ensure that farmers, at critical seasons of the year, should be able to get spare parts on a 24-hour basis, rather than being subjected to breakdowns that might interfere –

Mr. Henderson: You mean they can't?

Mr. Deans: Is there any government that's done it, Lorne?

Mr. Henderson: Show me where they can't.

Mr. Cassidy: The Manitoba government has now launched a programme to make repair parts for farm machinery more available. They have done it. The Saskatchewan government has entered into the field of farm machinery testing. The Saskatchewan government has now—I believe it's still considering the question of, in fact, encouraging manufacture of farm machinery within the Province of Saskatchewan, because the figures produced by the task force, among others, indicate that the profiteering that goes on is so incredible that in one market, western Canada, farm machinery can be produced by a new factory and can be produced at a much more reasonable cost than the machinery now available.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): Don't forget the licence fee.

Mr. Cassidy: Farmers in the Province of Ontario –

Mr. Henderson: Those are the small people of Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: Now listen to this. You have a farm riding and you should know.

Mr. Henderson: The little machine agents, you are oposed to them.

Mr. Cassidy: The little what?

Mr. Henderson: The little machine agents, you are opposed to them.

Mr. W. Newman: The man that services the farmer.

Mr. Henderson: You don't even know he exists.

Mr. Cassidy: I would suggest to you that to bleed over the fate of the fellow who sells 10 tractors–

Mr. Henderson: You don't know the machinery agent.

Mr. W. Newman: The machinery is up for nothing then, if that is what you are saying.

Mr. Cassidy: – a year when your farmers are paying three and four thousand dollars more than they should for a tractor suggests a misplaced sense of priorities, if you represent a rural riding.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: I would say to the minister I'm sure that he's aware, and I hope that some of his rural supporters are aware as well, that farmers in this province could now and, in fact have now, been able to buy tractors in the United Kingdom and import them into this country at prices two and three and four thousand dollars cheaper, than–

Mr. Eaton: Get that straight now. I helped with some of those programmes.

Mr. Cassidy: – they can buy them in this country, except that they are prohibited from doing so by the manufacturers –

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Cassidy: – and I am sure that the minister should take that up. He should take action to ensure that either people can import directly from the United Kingdom, or that the prices are brought to a more reasonable level. If the minister would act in order to ensure that farmers had to pay only a fair price for their farm equipment and machinery that would be one step that he could take in order to relieve the pressure of the –

Mr. Henderson: Hay farmer in Ottawa.

Mr. Cassidy: – cost of materials and supplies rising on the one hand and the cut being taken by the middleman, squeezing the farmer on both sides.

Mr. Henderson: Do they grow petunias in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I cannot let those remarks go by without making some comment on them, believe you me. It's just incredible that the like of this should come from the other side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I suppose it is understandable, because –

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Didn't come from your side though.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: – you know, my hon. friends over there in the New Democratic Party last year – it reminds me of the Oct. 21 episode and those days preceding it.

Mr. Cassidy: That's the same old anthem you sing every day.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now just a minute. I listened to you and didn't say a word.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Neither did the minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I heard my hon. friend, the former leader of the New Democratic Party. You know they came up to Middlesex North; they were going to upset me.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Shame.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They sent up the great Donald MacDonald and he was going to come up and he was going to enunciate the programme of the New Democratic Party and they were going to upset Stewart and wipe him out. They were also going to retain the great seat of Middlesex South and my friend from Lambton here –

Mr. W. Hodgson: York North too.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: – they thought they were going to do things to his riding too.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Deans: You think you feel badly about it, think how we feel!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: MacDonald came in. He enunciated the programme as far as farm machinery was concerned. A Crown corporation; do what they did in Manitoba.

Well, what did they do in Manitoba? I got up and enunciated the various things.

Mr. Cassidy: Perhaps the minister could answer the questions, eh?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The result was that I got the biggest majority in Middlesex North I ever got if my memory serves me rightly. The agricultural critic that you had in the House here for the last few years, the member for Middlesex South, lost his seat completely—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What a revolting development.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and my friend from Lambton is back here with the biggest majority he ever had.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What happened?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: What happened?

Mr. Henderson: Petunia farmer from Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You lost every blessed seat in which you had a farmer, save one, and that's the member for Wentworth.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's a farmer?

Mr. Deans: I am sorry. What was that? I didn't hear your last comment.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You lost every seat in which you had a farmer, except the member for Wentworth, and I believe, the member for Thunder Bay.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He's only a quarter farmer, isn't he?

Mr. Deans: I doubled my majority, thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there you are. You fellows talk about doing these kinds of things. You don't really realize just how little appreciation the farm people have for those crazy ideas that you enunciate. That's just about the simple fact of the matter. When you talk about our government—

Mr. Cassidy: The NDP vote in rural eastern Ontario doubled in every riding.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —his party is not even dry behind the ears yet about running things around this country, that's for sure. He stands up here and tells us about what happens in the Province of Manitoba where they have a New Democratic Party government. What have they done about reducing the price of machinery in that province? Not a single thing. They brought in a machinery Act and they appointed a board that is exactly the same type of a board and structure as we have in this province right now. As a matter of fact, they sent their people down here to see how I had set it up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What do you know about that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's what they have done. They brought in a machinery Act in Manitoba and what does it do? It says that there has to be machine parts delivered within a 48-hour period, providing the farmer lists it as an emergency. But to do that there is an automatic $10 extra charge assessed against the farmer—not against the machinery company but the farmer. On top of that, where there is a downed machine or there is a tractor stopped, most of the farm machinery dealers in this province of ours, men who are conscientiously serving the farm people, provide a usable tractor to go out and use while they are fixing that machine.

Mr. Sargent: Oh come on.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, they do, and they have done all kinds of it right here. In Manitoba they say in the legislation that the farmer has to pay at least half the cost of providing that tractor for the farm purposes—and here it is free.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: A socialist government?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, the socialist government in Manitoba. And the member stands here and tells me that is what we should do for our farmers. It's no wonder that the farm people of this province rejected his party out of hand—and they'll do it again and they'll do it forever.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister still hasn't answered the question.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the minister is

pretty cocky over there. The only reason he is in there is he had up to $8 million to spend on election campaigning. That's the reason he's there—and by the looks of things he is going to have it again, I guess.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401.

Mr. Sargent: This is the first vote we have in the estimates so far, Mr. Chairman, and it has always been my contention that no one can do a meaningful study of the estimates unless he has something current to balance against what the minister wants to spend. I tried to get an accounts book—I got this one from the member for Essex-Kent—but there are no more in captivity; you've got to order one.

This is ridiculous. This book is the accounts for 1971, the expenditures of 1970, I guess—I don't know what the hell it is—

Mr. W. Hodgson: Is that the right book?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I know you'll be bugging me about what I am talking about here; it's the first vote.

To start all over again here, we have an item that appears in every vote—transportation and communications. For the next four or five months we are going to see the same old jazz here. In the estimates there's an item under the minister's department of $1.2 million for travelling expenses. Why don't you tell us the truth, that you have a lot of booze and a lot of entertainment in there too but you don't show it—you call it travelling expenses.

I think if there is one department where there is a minimum of hanky-panky in this field it might be this department, but we have $1.2 million for travelling expenses and communications. There is nothing for entertainment or parties or what have you, unless it is under the $1 million in here for items under $2,500. You could have a pretty good party for $2,500 and not even show it here!

The only point I am making is that for the next four months we are going to be doing these estimates and we'll have the same item come up—transportation and communications. You may have in this overall deal in Ontario about $1 million overall for parties, booze, what have you, that we can't find out about—and that makes us pretty mad over here because you are spending it and probably guzzling it all—I don't know.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that what someone should do once in a while is get these accounts in an orderly fashion so that you can study them, because this is just a joke insofar as the amount of money that you want to run your department is concerned. You are going to get it anyway but why don't you let's see what you really spend the money on?

I am asking you then. In this first vote you have $275,000 in the main office—you'll get it anyway—for communications and transportation. Now how much of that bill is for parties and what have you?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: None that I know of.

Mr. Sargent: There you go! He doesn't spend a cent—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: You know if they had television in this place it would be a real circus. Let the people know exactly what is going on. He doesn't know if they have any booze parties in his department and he's the minister.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Carried, let her go.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401. The member for High Park.

Mr. Shulman: I want to go back to the marketing board just for a moment if I may. Inasmuch as you are going, presumably, to set up some form of an egg marketing board, I'd like to have some explanation, if not assurance, that if you set up a minimum price it will be a minimum price paid to the farmer, and not the way that you have done in other areas of a minimum price that the retailer must pay. That makes no sense to me at all.

In effect all you are doing is guaranteeing the profits of the middleman. I am referring of course to the Apple Marketing Board; the minister and I have had some discussion of this in the past. It makes no sense to me at all that you should set up your minimum price at the retail level. Now if the minister can explain to me why he can't set up the minimum price at the farmers' level I would be very grateful.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I was going to say we are talking about apples and oranges here! In effect we are; we are talking about apples and eggs and they are two different commodities and two different pricing structures. As far as most of the commodities are concerned they are priced at producer level

and I would certainly assume that the egg marketing plan will reflect the same characteristics.

Mr. Shulman: Why don't you do that with all commodities?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The only other commodity that I know of that isn't dealt with in that regard is apples, by the Apple Marketing Commission.

Mr. Shulman: All right. Why don't you do it with apples?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's a good question. My hon. friend was invited to go to the Apple Marketing Commission and discuss that with them. I am sure he probably got a good answer when he went there, if he has gone.

Mr. Shulman: I have already been to the Apple Marketing Commission and I have had some lengthy discussions with them. I didn't get the answers and that is why I am here asking you. While I am asking you that question I'll ask you another question.

The other question is this: The member for Middlesex South suggested we go to the apple marketing board and I went to this one marketing board. I spent some time looking at this particular problem and I asked the minister was he going to set up a minimum price for various forms of eggs—grades A, B and C—and the same minimum price for all of them as he has done with apples? It doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Eaton: It makes a lot of sense in apples.

Mr. Shulman: All right. I asked the minister why did he have the same minimum price for the various grades of apples and do you know what he replied to me? I haven't got the letter right here; it's upstairs. He replied it was because the packers were cheating. They were packing grade A apples and calling them grade C, they were packing fancy apples and calling them grade C.

That's what your inspectors are for! Surely you can police it? You are able to police the retail level of the prices; why can't you police your packers? You just aren't, to my consumer mind, using logic. Can the minister explain to me why he is able to do policing at the consumer and the retail level and can't do policing of the middlemen, the packers?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that I think has to be taken into consideration. The member has raised a point for which I don't think there is a real good explanation, as far as I am particularly concerned. This is the programme that was evolved by the Apple Marketing Commission and this commission is comprised of producers, packers, wholesalers, retailers, distributors; there is one consumer on that commission.

Mr. Cassidy: One consumer?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The other fellows don't eat!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: To me there is, I would think, a consensus reached. This is a new concept; it has only been in operation for a short while. Perhaps there is a way that they will change their marketing structure but it was left to them to evolve this programme. That's the programme that they have evolved and if it doesn't make sense to my hon. friend, and I am sure he has conveyed that to them, I know they will be giving it consideration.

Mr. Shulman: What bothers me, Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister—there is some responsibility on the minister here also because the consumer is certainly ill-represented on that board; I believe there is one out of 23 members. Some things the board is doing are obviously of very serious damage to the farmer himself. I have now some six apple growers who have come to me; one is from Picton county—I'm sorry the member isn't here who was talking about how happy the apple growers are in Picton county.

I have a letter I would like to show him from one of his growers in Picton county who is very unhappy at the actions of this Apple Marketing Board. He says it just doesn't make sense; all that is happening is we are selling Quebec apples in Ontario because what you've done is set a minimum price for apples at the retail level but that minimum price does not apply to apples that are brought in from outside.

In other words, if you are selling apples at, let's say, $4 for a bag if they are Ontario McIntosh apples that has to be the minimum price paid by the retailer. But if those very same McIntosh apples are grown and packed in Quebec, no minimum price applies. Naturally, it is just common sense; people wanting to make a buck are taking their trucks across the border to Quebec, buying the apples there, trucking them back here and selling them to stores. Steinbergs, in the Ottawa area, is now using Quebec apples entirely.

In the guise of helping the farmer, you are

actually driving him out of business. I tell the minister it isn't enough for him to get up and say "The Apple Marketing Board has made up those plans and if you don't like them, you let them know and maybe they'll change them". That isn't good enough. You are hurting the farmers and I don't have confidence in you, if this is what is done in one commodity, that you won't do the same thing in another commodity. You have a responsibility here, too.

Mr. Eaton: Tell me some producers who haven't been able to sell their apples in Ontario.

Mr. Shulman: I can tell you a lot of producers are juicing their apples because they can't sell them properly and I'll give you their names. I'll be glad to. Now I ask the minister to answer.

Mr. J. H. Jessiman (Fort William): Tell us about the bad apples in High Park.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member knows full well it was decided in Supreme Court last fall that there was no way you can interfere with the movement of products coming across provincial lines. Why is he suggesting we should do something about it? He knows full well it can't be done.

Mr. Shulman: I am not suggesting—

Mr. Spence: That is what he said.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. Are you suggesting that we wipe out the marketing commission?

Mr. Shulman: No, I am suggesting you run it more intelligently.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you suggesting we wipe out the marketing commission and what they are attempting to do?

Mr. Eaton: You are suggesting we take a low price for all of them.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He doesn't know what happened before the marketing commission came in. He doesn't compare those days of marketing with what we have today. I have to say to him that there will be a vote on the Apple Marketing Commission this summer and if the producers don't like what's going on they can vote it out. I think, rather than listening to him, we'll listen to what the producers themselves say when the time comes to vote on that plan.

Mr. Shulman: You will recall, Mr. Chairman, the last time the minister and I disagreed on the way the farmers were going to vote I was right and he was wrong but I won't go back to that. Yes, I will be very happy to hear what the farmers say. In the meanwhile, the fact remains that you are doing a disservice to the consumers of this province, you are doing a disservice to the farmers of this province and you are doing a great big favour to the apple packers.

I suggest to you, through the Chairman, that there is a responsibility here not to wipe out the Apple Marketing Board, which is not what I suggested. There is a responsibility on you to run it more intelligently. First of all there should be different minimum prices for various grades of apples.

It is only common sense. You should have inspectors who should be able to inspect properly at that level and make sure that the proper packing takes place.

I went down to the Queensway terminal and saw your inspectors going around picking up apples and examining them.

There is no reason they can't do that work at the packer level and at the grower level rather than at the terminals.

Secondly, the minimum price shouldn't be set up at the retail level; it should be set up at the farmers' level. What you're doing this way is just guaranteeing the profit of the middleman. You're encouraging people to truck the stuff in and go around to the various retailers and say "These are Quebec apples. They look exactly the same, they taste exactly the same, the only difference is they are half the price. Buy them."

I suggest to you, through the Chairman, that you have handled this very badly and it isn't good enough for you to throw up your hands and say "They set it up." You have a responsibility. You're the Minister of Agriculture. You're responsible for the consumer paying twice as much as he should pay for apples in this city. You're responsible for the apple grower being forced to juice many of his apples because we are bringing Quebec apples in and that's because the Apple Marketing Board was set up improperly.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You are suggesting the farmer is getting too much for his apples?

Mr. Shulman: I am suggesting the farmer isn't getting enough for his apples. He is being forced to juice them because they can't be sold, because we are selling Quebec apples here, we are selling New York apples here, and it is because the marketing board was set up badly and is run badly. And I am suggesting it is your responsibility.

Mr. Sargent: On this apple subject, it is a matter of great concern up our way that we are not going to have any apples at all unless we can subsidize the beekeepers insofar as pollination in our area. Many beekeepers are going to go out of business unless we can get a bigger subsidy. I wonder if you have any plans to give bigger subsidies for beekeepers per hive?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, we haven't at the moment. But, Mr. Chairman, let me just speak to this point. The member has raised a valid point and there is no question about it at all. We are concerned. But I believe that if the apple producers are really concerned about having honey bees available for pollination they can very well make arrangements with beekeepers to put the hives in their orchards at the appropriate time.

Mr. Sargent: Well, we do that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: This is being done and a good many beekeepers are deriving a certain amount of revenue from making these hives available. I don't think there is very much likelihood, with the number of hives that we have in Ontario today, that we are going to find ourselves in the place where they are not available. We have looked at this very carefully and there are a great many people that keep a small number of hives. Those that are in the business in a commercial way with a substantial number of hives just haven't got the honey-producing plants in Ontario today. Technology has changed a lot of that. They are moving to the west where there are ample sources of nectar-producing plants. Certainly the honey production in the west far outstrips it here in the Province of Ontario, but there is really nothing we can do about that particular aspect.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Minister, I appreciate that, but many of our apiarists make their major source of revenue moving into the apple orchards and they are charging $5 a hive, but they are disappearing. Each year three or four go out of business and now we only have maybe four or five left in the whole area and they are threatening to not go and the apple growers are very concerned about it so they are asking the $5 a hive subsidy and it is so serious it could kill the apple business. I wish you would take into consideration the need for a subsidy in this market.

An hon. member: Good for you.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401 carried.

Mr. Eaton: Mr. Chairman, particularly for the benefit of the member for High Park—but I see he has done his usual trick. Oh, he's back, good—I just want to point out that the legislation in Ontario for marketing is permissive legislation. The boards that are operated, are run by the producers, and heaven forbid the minister to interfere in their operation to the extent that you say. I would also like to point out on the pricing of apples that the reason for putting the price at the point they do is because there was a grading down of apples. And you can't prevent this. Our standards are minimum standards, not standards of preventing people from putting a better quality product in a lesser grade package. This is the reason for keeping the minimum price on the low grade so that they are receiving the same price for all of them and the only ones that are going into the stores are the fancy grade apples. Any that are graded down in the store are graded down afterwards because of the way they are handled in the stores and the abuse of them. They go out as quality and then they put them down in grades.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to that comment.

Mr. Chairman: We have already carried 1401.

Mr. Shulman: Well, if we carried it how could he make comments and I can't reply to them?

Mr. Chairman: I think perhaps he didn't hear me so I gave him that courtesy.

Mr. Shulman: Well, I didn't hear you either.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, well, you weren't here. Do you wish to reply?

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask why it is possible that your legislation does not allow you to pass regulations which allow you to grade the apples—not just minimum standards but maximum standards. If you are going to have various prices for various types of apples or any other commodity, and it is obvious that you should have, you can't have the same price for all size eggs, grades A, B, and C. It wouldn't make sense. If you are going to have different minimum prices why in the world can't you set up standards for your grading of the commodity? There is nothing to stop you.

And that has nothing to do with the marketing board; that is done by the government.

Vote 1401 agreed to.

On vote 1402:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402, the agricultural production programme. Just look at that for a moment. It seems to be divided into seven rather easily definable items. Perhaps we should study this item by item. Is there anything on item 1 in vote 1402? The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I wonder if the minister would tell us if the capital grants are included in this vote exclusively? Looking at the estimates, it appears there is a reduction of some $4,500,000. Is this associated with a reduction in the capital grants because of so many grants being made already, that the minister or his advisers feel there is going to be a reduced number of applications?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, we have had an enormous increase in capital grants this year. The figure is put in here at $8 million and we are hopeful that it will do the job. If it won't we will have to go back for more. We hope it will do the job.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: How does that figure compare with what was voted last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, $6 million and something last year. Yes, the supplementary estimate last year of $6 million in December, making it $12 million; you will recall we had that supplementary.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Will there be a falling off in the number of applications, do you expect?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would think so. I can't imagine that it can continue at anything like the rate it has been going.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: To what do you attribute the reduction in the administration cost there of $4.5 million?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is, first of all the capital grants programme, $4 million. We had $12 million last fall; it's reduced to $8 million, so that's $4 million. There was an interest on guaranteed bank loans—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Excuse me, is that supplementary estimate we passed in December included in the 1971-1972 estimate, which is $32.8 million?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's included?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. So that's $4 million; there was a quarter of a million on interest on guaranteed bank loans that are reducing; there's a farm tax reduction programme, $200,000; the farm workers' housing improvement project, $45,000, there's a decrease there, so that it comes to a total of about $4.5 million decrease.

Mr. Deans: May I ask the minister, in regard to capital grants, whether in fact all of the moneys that were made available were applied for in the year 1971-1972? Were all of the moneys under the capital grants programme that were available applied for and used that you know of? All the $12 million?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: In 1970-1971? Well, I think you are asking for 1970-1971.

Mr. Deans: No. I was looking for the $12 million, with the increase of the $4 million that we had in the—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, that was all used up. You see we budgeted last year at this time for $6 million. We got another six in December. We went back to the Treasury Board orders for at least $10 million more, so the total amount that I mentioned this afternoon was $22 million some hundred thousand.

Mr. Deans: Well, the minister says he does not feel that there will be a calling for that kind of capital grant allotment in the current year. What is it that makes him believe that in fact there will be a falling off of the applications?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, there is really a maximum you see. There is a $3,000 maximum per farmer. Previously it was $1,000 dollars for buildings and drainage. Many of those farmers had reached that maximum, then when the increase came last April 1 to 40 per cent with an increase to $3,000 on that particular aspect, they reapplied. We had total applications this year of 33,266. Many of those farmers will have reached a maximum now and are unlikely to apply, so that in my opinion there will not be the demand on the capital grant programme. But it is extremely difficult because no one knows what farmers are planning to do in the way of capital improvements this coming year.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, just one final point in that regard. Would the minister be of the opinion that were there to be a request for capital grants in excess of the amount made available, that in fact he would go for

additional supplementary estimates? The alternative, of course, is that the farmer would have to seek the money in the marketplace.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. no. The farmer has to seek the money first of all; he has to pay for the building and he has to submit the receipts. Then we process the application and send back his capital grant. But in the case that the $8 million is not sufficient, then we have no alternative but to come for supplementary estimates or go to Treasury Board for a Treasury Board order to meet the commitment. It is an open-end programme and has to be met.

Mr. Deans: Yes, then we can assure them of the money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1402?

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Chairman, in the area of the farm tax reduction programme, we all are aware that this was a bow in the direction of the pleas made by farmers, principally through the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, year after year, about having some reduction and relief from school tax on farm property.

The explanation given at the time of the passage of the farm tax reduction programme —actually it wasn't a passage of legislation, it was done under regulations under the Agriculture and Food Act—was that it was hurriedly drawn up and it was decided that a quarter of the farm tax being remitted was an indication that half the assessment was for property, half was for buildings and then half of that would represent the school tax; so, in effect, a nice neat 25 per cent farm tax is being given back to the farmers.

We all remember the great difficulties there were in administering the Act the first year, in that many problems had to be sorted out as to the coding on the assessment, and delays, especially in areas where farmers' properties were in two or three different jurisdictions, some of which were registered as residential.

I would like to ask the minister if he has given any consideration to refining the manner in which education tax relief is given to the farmer. Personally, I feel that the way it has been done is a token gesture to relieve farmers of education costs with very little, if any, relationship to the actual burden that is faced by the farmers themselves.

We all know there are many instances of properties getting 25 per cent rebate that haven't grown five cents' worth of agricultural products in the last 100 years. People are getting their tax back on these properties. There are many instances of people building large homes in rural areas on sufficient acreage of land to qualify for farm tax reduction.

I ask the minister one of several questions. Firstly, is he going to continue to have the farm tax rebated this year in the fall of the year, even though there isn't an election this fall? Secondly, is he going to continue in the present manner or is someone in his department or in the assessment department working on some refinements to this project to bring a little bit of equity—

Mr. Sargent: Badly needed.

Mr. Good: —into the relief that farmers rightly deserve for educational tax?

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, before the minister answers this question, I wonder if I could ask the minister another question.

Mr. Sargent: Hit him again.

Mr. Spence: We understand that about eight townships across the Province of Ontario—whether this is right or not, I don't know—have not received the farm tax rebate. I wonder if the minister could tell me if the farmers in all municipalities have received their farm tax rebate for the last year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, answering the last speaker first, Mr. Chairman, I have to say I don't know.

Mr. Deans: The minister doesn't know?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I don't know whether they have all received them or not. As far as I know they have, but to make a categorical statement, yes or no, I am not in a position to do that.

With regard to the suggestion made by my friend from Waterloo North, I would have to say that while he made that remark about there being no election this fall, and asking if we are going to pay it out this fall, I would remind him that we paid it out the year before and there was no election then.

Mr. Good: Not in the fall of the year. It was in the spring.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We paid it out as soon as we could get the programme into operation. And his snide remarks—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Snide? It was a political operation, and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it wasn't.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Certainly it was.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Of course not. Not at all. Is the member suggesting that we should have waited until after the New Year to pay it to the farmers?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why didn't the government do it the same time the year before? Cheques arrived a week before the election.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Because we didn't have the programme in effect and we didn't have the figures.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East) The minister is going to have a heart attack.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The cheques arrived a week before the election.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Are you apologizing for that? Are you saying that it was the wrong thing to do? Surely not, surely not. We are going to continue. As my friend the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said the other day, we are going to continue to send out the cheques this year. It will be continued. With regard to refinement and revision of programmes, we are doing this all the time in all of our programmes, so my hon. friend's complaint will be given every consideration.

Mr. Deans: How are you revising your programme?

Mr. Good: A third question, about paying it on unproductive land, are you going to continue that?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the comments my hon. friend made are always under revision and those things will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: I raised with the minister last year, if you recall, during the time that we were discussing the bill on the farm rebate, a problem which has arisen in my riding with regard to assuring that the rebate was indeed passed down to those farmers who were renting property. I now have reason to believe, in fact, I am now positive, that in the instances I was raising with the minister, this did not occur. I would like to ask if he would take some time or ask someone in the department to take a look at the programme to see whether it might be possible to amend the Act to ensure that the renter of land for farm purposes receives the benefit of the rebate.

Mr. Eaton: Why? He is not paying the taxes.

Mr. Deans: Oh, of course he is paying the taxes. That is the kind of idiocy that I object to in this House. When a man rents, he pays an equivalent amount in the rent to cover the taxes. So for goodness sakes, think think. Use your head—

Mr. Eaton: He doesn't pay taxes. If they are less he is going to pay less for the property he rents.

Mr. Deans: —for a change instead of your mouth. All I ask is for the minister to consider that and see whether it might be able to be done.

Mr. Chairman: Item No. 1, then. Carried. Item No. 2, agriculture and horticulture societies. Carried?

Mr. Stokes: No, it is not.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry. The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: With regard to the administration of the programme which assists the building of community centres through the agricultural and horticultural societies branch, is this not the community centres? Is that out of this estimate this year?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Department of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Chairman: Horticultural societies then. Carried? Not yet. The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: On horticultural societies, I wonder what is the minister doing to promote and generate a better interest in the number of racing days that is allowed at some of our small fair grounds across southern Ontario that are run by agricultural societies.

Many of these societies find that they are limited in their number of racing days for the class B tracks and the small tracks. The help which is given to them through the department is very, very minimal. It seems that most of the track proceeds which are rebated to the tracks go to the larger tracks. Many small communities, and I think of some in my area, two in particular, have had difficulty getting sufficient number of racing days to make it a real money-making process, so that they can increase their facilities, improve their facilities, and bring racing

back to some of the smaller communities where it originated, in many instances, 25 and 50 years ago. Does the minister have any programme in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the matter of racing days for the smaller tracks comes under the jurisdiction of the production branch of the Canada Department of Agriculture. We are interested of course, from the standpoint of the fall fairs in Ontario, but that is the regulatory body for any racing days for these fall fairs. We have been assured by the federal officials that they will provide the services, if requested by the fall fairs. That is the proper approach and we are advising fall fairs that have contacted us already as to whom they contact in Ottawa to get these matters straightened out so that they can enjoy the services that are available and that will be provided, we are assured by the Canada Department of Agriculture production division.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I want the minister to clarify something for me.

On the agricultural and horticultural societies vote, there is an item for $495,025. It is my recollection that Mr. Starr wrote to somebody who made application. It was the agricultural society of Upsala that asked for a grant and, if my memory serves me correctly, he did indicate that there would be a 25 per cent grant to the agricultural society of Upsala who were building a fair building for exhibits for the farmers in the area and for junior farmers. Is there still the 25 per cent grant for that purpose?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: There is?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Stokes: And could you tell me as briefly as you can the criteria for that 25 per cent subsidy?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: They have to submit the plans and the costs of the building, the receipts, and they are eligible then for 25 per cent of the cost. But I believe it is to a maximum, for a C fair, of $25,000. The maximum, for a C fair, is $25,000.

Mr. Stokes: Could you tell me what a C fair is as opposed to a—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: C?

Mr. Sargent: It is a B fair.

Mr. Stokes: A, B, C?

Mr. Deans: It is some kind of—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is one that pays out less than $3,000 in prize money.

Mr. Stokes: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: One that pays out less than $3,000 in prize money.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this vote. On this matter of harness racing at fall fairs; is there any change in the regulation that would make it more difficult for fall fairs this coming year to have the services of previously approved legal bookmakers for short meets—one-day or two-day meets?

I hope I have not used the wrong name! These guys, anyway, take legal bets at the fair. I know the minister has been contacted by the Paris Agricultural Society, as have I, about some difficulties in this connection, and if he is not aware of it, then we will let it go to be settled by correspondence.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: You're not talking about bookies, are you, Bob?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, that's the word I did not want to use.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2, then, is carried.

The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I wanted to ask something on the drainage section.

Mr. Chairman: We have already passed that.

Mr. Paterson: Has that vote been carried in my absence.

Mr. Chairman: We have really passed that on item 1. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Mr. Paterson: Well, I would just like to ask—

Mr. Chairman: If you have a quick question the minister might answer, just before we close.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I have a question in relation to this. The farm tax reduction programme; is it the intention of the minister to carry this on until our total tax structure is revamped? And secondly, the same with the capital grants. Is this going to continue for the foreseeable future? I know there has been a tremendous buildup in the last several months on this because of certain other

government departments cutting back, and I assume that the farmers are trying to get in while this is still in force. Is there anything on the horizon that is going to change this situation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the capital grants programme was introduced in 1967 for a 12-year period and we have no intention of withdrawing that at all. With regard to the farm tax reduction programme—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It was improved in 1971 and it will be improved again in 1975.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, that is not a bad idea.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I am sure it occurred to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will continue the farm tax reduction programme, as I understand it, until the provincial assessments have been completed and reviewed—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In 1981.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —and a new tax structure is put in. But the principle will be continued even beyond that time.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 2, then, carried?

Carried.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

An hon. member: You're first on Thursday, Eddie.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in The Chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I made a commitment earlier today that I would report to the House regarding estimates as they will be heard in the House. We are now on the Minister of Agriculture and Food; following that, not really necessarily in this order, but to the best of my knowledge, there will be the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Government Services, the Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, the Ministry of Revenue, the Prime Minister, and the Ministry of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, as I announced earlier in the week, on Thursday we will deal with tax bills as they appear on the order paper today, No. 11 through to No. 20. To the best of my knowledge at the moment we will continue with these on Friday unless further notice is given.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Just one moment, Mr. Speaker, with your permission. About the estimates committee; is that going to start later this week?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I thought we had had it out earlier today, but to answer the question, I will expect that the organizational meeting of the committee on estimates will be held tomorrow or on Thursday. That committee will stand ready to hear the Ministry of the Environment at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): One final rather tiny question. Am I correct in assuming that, notwithstanding the fact the minister can't tell us the exact order, the Ministry of Health will follow the Ministry of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes, that is my understanding.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): It ain't necessarily so.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:33 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, April 11, 1972

Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued 1103

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1135

No. 30



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 13, 1972

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1972

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We have many guests with us again today. In the Speaker's gallery we are favoured with the presence of the Hon. Waldo McTavish Skillings, who is the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce for the Province of British Columbia.

In the east gallery, there are students from Madonna High School of Downsview; and in the west gallery, students from Mt. Mary Academy of Ancaster.

Statements by the ministry.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of the House will be aware that some concern has been expressed by this government regarding the access to the securities market by mining and oil and gas companies for the purpose of financing their ventures. I am pleased to advise that the Ontario Securities Commission has now approved a new proposal under which it will be possible for mining companies to distribute their securities through the facilities of the Toronto Stock Exchange.

This system, involving an open market distribution by the company with a minimum guarantee provided by a registered underwriter, provides some additional incentive for the underwriter guarantors for financing mining companies. The safeguards against market manipulation are still maintained.

As a result of the same discussions, the commission has also approved the maximum offering prices for underwriting option agreements found in the exchanges' circular No. 5, and has amended its policy 302 regarding price spreads so that it only applies to unlisted trading. This will also provide further incentive to underwriters wishing to finance listed mining companies through distribution of their securities through the facilities of the exchange.

Details concerning the new open market distribution plan will be found in a press release of today's date by the Toronto Stock Exchange, a copy of which is filed for the information of the members of the House.

Hon. J. A. Auld (Ministry of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I'd like to make a statement concerning noise control in Ontario.

For a number of years it has become increasingly evident there can be detrimental effects from the growing noise levels in our communities. The physiological effects of prolonged exposure to excessive noise are well established. Emotional and psychological effects, while more difficult to measure, are a real consideration.

Provision was made in drafting the Environmental Protection Act, 1971, to treat noise as a contaminant capable of polluting the air, just as undesirable solids, liquids and gases can contaminate the atmosphere.

The Ministry of the Environment's air quality branch is working with the Ministries of Intergovernmental Affairs and Transportation and Communications to prepare draft anti-noise regulations. They are also co-operating with the federal government to establish noise emission levels for vehicles, including snowmobiles.

Measuring and controlling community noise levels is a complex and technical problem. We are studying requirements in other jurisdictions and investigating specific noise problems in Ontario to ensure that our regulations will be effective.

At the present time, we foresee a combined municipal and provincial effort to provide a comprehensive control programme. The routine programmes, I expect, will be dealt with by municipalities and the more complex problems, such as multi-source industrial operations, would be handled by the province.

Background studies of noise levels and their effects on the environment are necessary to establish the magnitude of the problem and provide an effective control programme.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): The member for Sandwich-Riverside (Mr. Burr) has already done that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Studies are under way in Toronto and Hamilton—

An hon. member: I wish we could eliminate the noise pollution here!

Hon. Mr. Auld: So does the Speaker!

I would like to announce that the ministry has commissioned a study by the University of Western Ontario of existing noise levels and their effects in London and Woodstock.

The province is financing the $45,000 study in these two communities. We expect the total undertaking will be complete in about 14 months, but data will be made available before completion so that regulations can be developed on a progressive basis.

University personnel, eight investigators co-ordinated by Professor J. E. K. Foreman of the mechanical engineering faculty, will be working with the ministry and people from London and Woodstock on the study. They will investigate noise in industrial, commercial and residential surroundings, to establish not only sound levels but also their effects on people. The study includes vehicular noise from road, rail and air traffic, as well as miscellaneous sources such as chain saws, snow-blowers, lawn-mowers and rock bands.

One of the more important aspects of the study will be the legal expertise provided by the faculty of law of the University of Western Ontario in relation to drafting a bylaw that is enforceable. Although the drafting of a definitive bylaw on noise pollution is the prime purpose of the study, the administration of the bylaw in order to successfully prosecute is also a priority.

Before concluding, I want to mention the valuable assistance rendered to the establishment of this study by the hon. member for London North (Mr. Walker), the hon. member for London South (Mr. White)—

Mr. Stokes: Sandwich-Riverside!

Hon. Mr. Auld: —and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Parrott); and in addition, Alderman J. P. Roman and O. C. Zamprogna of London, whom I'd like to commend for their work in bringing the study proposal to the ministry.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Did the minister mention London South?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I said London South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): It's tough when the minister gets heckled by his own side.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would like to assure the Speaker and the members of the House that we're concerned about noise pollution not only in our cities but also in rural residential areas.

I would also like to assure members that these problems will be dealt with as soon as they can be handled decisively and effectively.

Hon. R. T. Potter (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, today I am tabling the response of the Ontario government to the treatment section of the federal government's LeDain Commission report on the non-medical use of drugs.

The members of the committee formed to deal with the observations and recommendations made in the report were drawn from the Department of Health and the Alcoholism and Drug Addiction Research Foundation, with the assistance of representatives from the private sector as specialist consultants.

This province welcomes the decision of the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare not—may I repeat—not to proceed with the use of heroin in the treatment of addicts, Mr. Speaker. The rapid rise in the use of methadone in the treatment of opiate dependence will certainly have to be closely monitored as well.

We also feel that the report is limited in its examination of selected therapeutic communities. It is our impression that the commission may not have looked at a broad enough range of treatment programmes. There are other types of therapeutic communities, including the stable home and family, to be considered.

The LeDain report on treatment is somewhat a disappointing document, Mr. Speaker, although it contains much that is practical and useful.

In many ways, the report reflects undue pessimism in the whole area of treatment and rehabilitation of these people. Drug abuse is a relatively new phenomenon in Canada, and a wide range of services and research will be required to provide the help people need.

Hon. G. A. Kerr (Minister of Colleges and Universities): Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to report to the House the results of extensive consultations between myself and the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), and other colleagues concerning Ontario scholarships for the current school year.

It has been pointed out to me by a great number of educators that students who had worked hard this year in order to achieve the status of Ontario scholar, and had already completed their Easter examinations, were disappointed that the monetary portion was being discontinued.

Many of these young people were counting on the $150 as part of the financial support they would require to enable them to enter a post-secondary institution in the fall.

Because of this, and upon reflection that implementation of other changes affecting student assistance would not come into effect until this fall for the 1972-73 school year, the government has decided that the monetary portion of the Ontario scholarships will be awarded this year to those students who achieve a standing of 80 per cent in the honours secondary school graduation diploma programme. The policy of discontinuing the monetary portion of this award will, therefore, not become effective until the 1972-73 school year.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Necessary, but not necessarily!

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

USE OF GOVERNMENT PLANES

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development if on April 10, Monday of this week, he had one of the Lands and Forests' planes fly to Ottawa so that he and his colleague, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Handleman), could conveniently return to Toronto from a Progressive Conservative nomination held in the Ottawa area?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): No, Mr. Speaker. I was in Ottawa on Monday and I asked my deputy minister to join me in Ottawa for meetings that I had been invited to attend with the Hon. Mitchell Sharp, the Hon. Bud Olsen, and the Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin. My deputy came up in the Otter, I having been in Ottawa over the weekend. We went back Tuesday evening, following Tuesday's meetings, and that is the occurrence.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that the city of Ottawa is served by 20 flights between that city and this city every day? And that the fare for the minister's return would have been $25 rather than the $300 that he spent in order that he and his colleague from the Carleton riding were able to attend Mr. Baker's nomination, which is obviously the use to which the plane was put?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Baker's nomination was on Monday night. The meeting that Dr. Reynolds and I had with Mr. Pepin was Tuesday morning.

Mr. Singer: It just happened that the two of them were there.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: We finished our meeting with Mr. Pepin around 11 o'clock, and in order to be back in the House Tuesday we found that the best way of returning.

HYDRO TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further question of the same minister: Can he make clear to the House what was meant by his recent statement that the government was reconsidering the building of high-tension lines in the power corridor linking Nanticoke with Pickering; and that these were immediate reconsiderations, leading perhaps to putting certain lengths of the transmission lines underground in populated areas?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: I didn't say the latter part of that quotation, but my recollection is that I advised the House, as I think the Premier (Mr. Davis) has recently, that this question is under consideration by the government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A supplementary: As the policy minister, could he explain to the House, and the many people in the province who are concerned with the building of these new high-tension lines, what the alternatives are? Is it an alternative simply in location, or is there alternative technology that would replace the need for this wide-corridor linkage?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: There is alternative technology, Mr. Speaker, and I think in simplest terms the question boils down to one of cost. At some cost technology is available to provide alternative means of transmission.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A further supplementary: Is the alternative the elimination of the lines in their present form, or is it simply

a relocation of similar types of high tension tower lines?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The eventual solution can be a blend of both. Location, and from the technical point of view the means of transmission, can both be changed.

REVIEW OF SCHOOL BOARDS' ECONOMIES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Education: Now that the Metropolitan Toronto board has decided to fire 123 teachers as an economy measure, dictated by the ceilings that come from the Department of Education, is the minister going to review, from the ministerial level, the effectiveness of the means of economizing taken by the Metro board or other boards that might be considering their lead in laying off staff rather than finding means to save money alternative to simply increasing the pupil-teacher ratio?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): the hon. leader of the Opposition used the word "fire" 123 teachers. I think that the way it is indicated is that the staff requirement will be for 123 fewer teachers than they have now.

There has been no determination that people will necessarily be fired; attrition itself may take care of this reduction. This I don't know. This is a matter for the board; it's in their jurisdiction.

But certainly, as I indicated in the House the other day, these are matters for the boards to consider. It's within their autonomy to consider how they come within the ceilings that we have. That is what the Metro Toronto board has done, and I think that is what they are expected to do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Supplementary: Since it is not in the area of their autonomy to set the ceiling—this is a matter of the minister's autonomy and responsibility—did he envisage any alternative rather than to increase the student-teacher ratio when he set the ceiling for the Metropolitan area? Did his experts indicate to him there would be some alternatives having to do with the costs of administration and other areas of costs which might in fact have been available, rather than simply dealing with the student-teacher ratio?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes Mr. Speaker, certainly there were other alternatives available when the whole idea of ceilings were considered. There were various alternatives available, the main point of the exercise being to limit the rate of increase in educational costs, the board itself taking the jurisdiction to find where any fat could be cut out.

We assume there are many places where this could be done. An adjustment in the pupil-teacher ratio—which is I might point out a very arbitrary figure, the number of teachers in a system as against the number of pupils—a slight increase in that is not necessarily bad. I think we recognize that it may have to occur in some jurisdictions and we don't see this as a particularly disastrous thing.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

Mr. E. J. Bounsall (Windsor West): On the question of ceilings, did the minister consult with the Windsor Board of Education?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question is hardly supplementary. The question was specifically about the Metro board.

Mr. Bounsall: I thought it mentioned other ceilings, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The question was about the Metro board, I believe.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: As a matter of information, are the 123 teachers less based on a lower enrolment in the school system, or is there going to be the same number or an increased number of students in that system?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the specific information in regard to the enrolments and the actual number of teachers that the Metro board has cut. I have only read the newspaper reports, as the hon. members have. I would be surprised, since we are talking about the secondary school panel, if it included a decreased enrolment. There would probably be either the same or more in that panel.

Mr. Foulds: So in fact the system is going to have to cope with less teaching personnel for either a static number of students or an increased number of students, is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Again I'm recalling from memory the articles I read in the paper and I have had no formal communication about what the board has done, but I think I read somewhere that it was about a 0.5 increase in the pupil-teacher ratio that was used in the references to Metropolitan Toronto for secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

UNIVERSITY TUITION FEES

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Just one, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: In his consultations with the Minister of Education, and we would presume the policy minister for education, was there a further review of the decision to increase tuition at the university level, which is affecting the same young people, whom he very properly reconsidered in his statement earlier today when he indicated that the payments for Ontario scholarships would continue for one more year?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the whole area of change for university tuition and scholarships was discussed, when we were discussing the Ontario scholarship programme. We realized the scholarship programme situation is really unique and different and not similar to the overall change in the budget. For the reasons I have set out in my statement, the only change that is contemplated at this time for this school year is the change I have just announced.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The hon. the deputy leader of the NDP.

HAMILTON HARBOUR LANDFILL

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. What action does he contemplate taking in view of the statement today by Mr. Hickey, the chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission, that he does not intend to abide by the landfill regulations of the Province of Ontario, that he considers them not to be acceptable and that he doesn't intend to abide by the direction of Mr. Jack Davis, the federal Minister of Environment, to cease landfill operations in the Hamilton harbour?

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I informed the House a day or two ago, this matter is under very active discussion within my department. I can elaborate a little further to say that we have had a number of meetings on this particular subject. Meetings will continue both tomorrow morning and on Monday. I hope at that time to meet with Hon. Jack Davis here in Toronto and to get further clarification as to his statement. I can assure the House that I am moving as quickly as I can to resolve this impasse.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Is the minister prepared to make it plain to Mr. Hickey that, as a citizen of the Province of Ontario, he will abide by the laws of this province?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think the laws of the province must be adhered to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Whether he likes them or not.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Whether he likes them or not, I guess is true, until those laws are changed. I will have to make this very plain to him.

PAYMENT TO OHSIP DESIGNATED AGENTS

Mr. Deans: Can I assume the government is going to change them?

A question of the Minister of Health. Now that the designated agents have been phased out of OHSIP, will the minister tell us the total amount of money that has been paid to them for administration costs in the fiscal year 1971-1972?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I will put it on the order paper, Mr. Speaker.

COMMISSION ON ROLE OF PRIVATE MEMBER

Mr. Deans: Fair enough!

A question of the Premier. Can the Premier indicate to the House when he intends to set up the commission that will study the role of the private member, keeping in mind that the role is becoming increasingly more difficult to fulfil?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Well Mr. Speaker, without commenting on the editorial content of the latter part of the question, except to observe that the role of everyone is becoming more difficult, I would say that the commission will be appointed very shortly.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: I understand my leader has discussed this a number of times with the Premier, and the same answer was forthcoming. What is very, very shortly in the Premier's view? Within the next month?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess the hon. member can interpret very, very shortly in whatever way he likes. I have discussed it with his leader on one or two occasions and I have discussed it with the Leader of the Opposition on one or two occasions; and as I have said it will be very shortly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: The Premier is getting to be more of a politician every day.

Mr. Stokes: That was very, very informative.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should get out the Oxford dictionary and assess it for himself.

ONTARIO AIR ROUTE APPLICATION

Mr. Deans: I have tried it, it doesn't work with this government. It depends how eager they are to sort it out.

An hon. member: I would like to know which dictionary the Premier uses.

Mr. Deans: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Has a decision been made regarding the possibility of Ontario intervening in favour of the application by Air Ontario to assume some of the seven, I believe, routes that are presently under Air Canada, and to set up as a regional carrier in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. G. R. Carton (Minister of Transportation and Communications): Mr. Speaker, we have not made a decision to intervene on behalf of Air Ontario. I will be making a statement on this whole matter next week, I would imagine.

Mr. Deans: A final question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of—

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): May I ask, through you Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to make a statement on air policy for the entire province in regard to third level carriers, or will it be just on this particular application?

Hon. Mr. Carton: Inasmuch as this particular statement will pertain to certain parts of the province, yes. It relates specifically to the question raised by the hon. House leader for the NDP, but it will involve certain matters relating to the whole of the province.

Mr. Deans: And that, too, will come very, very shortly.

Hon. Mr. Carton: Next week.

DISCUSSIONS ON COST OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. Deans: One final question of the Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs: Is it the intention of the government to institute meetings with the automobile manufacturers to discuss the reasons why they are unable to bring down the cost of automobiles in Canada, and particularly Ontario, to a level comparable to that charged in the United States; considering that, first, most of the manufacturing takes place in the Province of Ontario; and secondly, that it has been apparently proven that the costs of actual manufacture are no higher in Canada than in the United States?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): No.

Mr. Deans: Well will the minister then undertake to consider such a move?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the minister we know, yes sir!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): That has been their attitude to the auto pact right from the beginning. They couldn't care less.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of the Environment has the answer to a question previously asked.

MICHIGAN POWER STATION

Hon. Mr. Auld: On Tuesday, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) asked me questions about a proposed new generating station to be built in Detroit by the Detroit Edison Co. He also mentioned that he had had correspondence with the Prime Minister of the day, the hon. Mr. Robarts. First I thought I would, just to clear the record, read the correspondence he had from Mr. Robarts. He had a letter dated Sept. 28, 1970, which says:

Dear Mr. Bullbrook:

I have your letter concerning a rumour which leads you to believe that Detroit Edison may be contemplating the con-

struction of a large nuclear power facility in Michigan. I know nothing of this matter but have instigated some inquiries.

On Oct. 14, the member for Sarnia replied to the Prime Minister saying:

> Thank you for your letter. I am most anxious, as I am sure you are, to know about the validity or otherwise of the rumours that I brought to your attention.

On October 16–

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): That was a nice letter!

Hon. Mr. Auld: –there was a letter from the then secretary to the cabinet, Dr. Reynolds, to the member for Sarnia, saying:

> I hope the attached will be helpful to you vis-à-vis your inquiry to the Prime Minister.

And attached was a letter from the chairman of Ontario Hydro saying that he had called, the president I think it was, of Detroit Edison, who said that they were not contemplating a nuclear plant at that time; they were contemplating, I think, a steam-fired plant.

In answer to the first part of the hon. member's question, I understand that the construction and operation of nuclear-powered generating stations in the United States are regulated by the US Atomic Energy Commission. I also understand that comprehensive reviews of environmental impacts are carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission to ensure that environmental impact associated with the operation of such stations is within acceptable limits.

Based on available information on the proposed plant the hon. member refers to, it is understood that the best available technology will be built into the plant to ensure that thermal discharges and radioactivity releases will be minimized.

With regard to the hon. member's questions concerning liaison between the states and the provinces in connection with control of water quality in the lower Great Lakes, constant unofficial liaison is maintained between my staff and that of the various states in matters of environmental concern. However, meetings of the International Joint Commission advisory boards have been held at regular intervals to discuss these matters on an official basis and to bring them to the attention of the International Joint Commission.

The hon. member suggested annual meetings between this province and some of the states. Two meetings between the governors of some of the various states bordering on the great Lakes and their advisers, have been held with ministers with both the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. At present, there are no plans to hold additional meetings on an annual basis.

The signing of the Canada-US agreement, which is to take place on Saturday, should do much to effect future fruitful discussions on matters affecting the lower Great Lakes.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I, by way of supplementary, express my gratitude for the tabling of the correspondence which supported the position I had taken originally; that is we were informed that Detroit Edison had no intention of building the facility.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Question!

Mr. Bullbrook: The question being–and I appreciate that interjection–the question being, by way of supplementary, do I understand then that the minister's department is content to rely on the attitudes of the Atomic Energy Commission of the United States government and the International Joint Commission in protecting the rights of the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows perfectly well that we have no jurisdiction in the state of Michigan. The hon. member also knows, because I am sure he is quite interested, that one of the purposes of the agreement which is to be signed between Canada and the United States this weekend, is to have close and effective liaison on these various subjects.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, and by way of one last supplementary, recognizing that the government has no jurisdiction in the state of Michigan, does the minister not have great influence–I would hope he has–with the International Joint Commission and with his colleagues in the state of Michigan who have like responsibility to him? We would like to know if the minister exercises that influence?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No.

Mr. Bullbrook: It's a fact, is it not, that the minister–

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bullbrook: –didn't even know about this facility being built two days ago?

An hon. member: Right!

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. In fact, as far as the state of Michigan is concerned, my understanding is that they have limited jurisdictional authority and that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States are the bodies that deal with this kind of a project.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The member for Sarnia warned the government about this a year ago.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Treasurer has the answer to questions previously asked.

FARM TAX REBATE

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, on March 28 my friend from Kent asked a question about farm tax rebates:

> Is it true that there are eight townships in the Province of Ontario where the farmers have not received their farm tax rebate yet? If so, when will these cheques be in those farmers' hands?

The answer is: As of April 7 seven municipalities in four school areas had failed to supply the subsidies branch with information and data on some 369 farm properties of 11 acres or more, which would enable the automatic remittance of tax reduction cheques to the owners.

The municipalities involved—and perhaps there are others; so I put these on the record—the names of the municipalities and the school board areas involved are as follows: The village of Millbrook, the village of Caledon East, the village of Watford, the village of Dundalk, the village of Eganville, the township of Joly, the township of Billings, Upsala township school area, Van Horne and Wainwright township school area, Murchison and Lyell township school area, and the Marter township school area. We have followed up in each of these cases requesting the clerks to send us the data so that the reduction cheques can be issued as soon as possible. And until we receive it from the clerks we cannot do so.

GERTLER REPORT

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, also an the 28th I was asked by the member from Waterloo North certain questions about when the government was going to release the part of the Gertler report which, quote: "has been kept secret, and caused a great deal of alarm," etc. I answered that question and undertook to get further information, and I would reply now as follows:

The only specific information not included in the public version of the Gertler report was the map showing the exact boundaries of the areas affected by Gertler's three levels of control; namely, acquisition and selective and regulatory controls. I indicated that in my view it was not in the public interest to divulge such information before the government had finalized the acquisition programme for the escarpment.

The staff of the former Department of Natural Resources has recently completed a report recommending such an acquisition programme, and sections of the map showing the areas suggested for purchase have been released to the Bruce Peninsula Planning Board and the Grey County Planning Board.

In addition, the staff of the plans administration branch are engaged currently in delineating on maps included in official plans submitted for my approval, the total area proposed for acquisition and control in the Gertler report, and the Department of Natural Resources' recommendations. Therefore, in the light of the foregoing, I think it seems safe to state that the government's specific acquisition proposals for the escarpment are gradually being made public, continuously keeping in mind the need to safeguard the public interest.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN ONTARIO

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Finally Mr. Speaker, the leader of the New Democratic Party on Tuesday asked me a question about the unemployment figures which had been released that morning. I had not yet seen the Statistics Canada figures at the time I entered the House, having been otherwise engaged. I have now seen them. I would just like to add this further comment to what I may have said, or to what may have been said by others on Tuesday.

It is true that the seasonally-adjusted level of unemployment rose from a percentage of 4.5 to 4.7 from March over February, compared of course with 4.9 a year ago. The actual figures—and frankly we are tending to put more faith in the so-called actual figures than in the seasonally-adjusted figures—actually showed a decline from February to March of from 5.7 to 5.6, as compared with 6.1 a year ago in March.

But I think the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker—and I touched on this in the budget,

and it has been discussed since—the interesting thing is that whether you look at the actual figures or the seasonally-adjusted figures, there are presently either 164,000 or 176,000 more people in the labour force than there were one year ago—an enormous growth in the labour force.

The other interesting thing, Mr. Speaker—and we have seen this trend now for two or three months, despite the month-to-month fluctuations—is that whether you use the actual figures or the seasonally-adjusted figures, there are something between 170,000 and 176,000 more people working in Ontario today than there were one year ago; and we are very proud of that fact on this side of the House.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: May I ask the minister if his pride carries over to show us where they intend to produce the new jobs for the growing population of the province of Ontario that are still unemployed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Well Mr. Speaker, the fact that the positive action of the government of the Hon. William G. Davis taken in the last 12 months has produced those 170,000; I have faith we will go on to do the job completely.

Mr. Deans: The minister's projections are useless. He is unable to meet the needs.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary. The hon. member for York Centre with a supplementary.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): In connection with the farm tax rebate, was the town of Markham among those the minister read? I couldn't hear.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Deacon: So that any person who has not received his tax rebate in those other municipalities not read out, should check up on the accounting procedures?

Mr. Speaker: A further supplementary?

Mr. Deacon: No.

Mr. Speaker: If not, the hon. Attorney General has the answer to a question as well.

ARTIFACTS STOLEN FROM MEMORIAL

Hon. D. A. Bales (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, on March 10 the hon. member for York-Forest Hill (Mr. Givens) asked me if I would take steps to assist in the recovery of certain items stolen from the Sir Casimir Gzowski Memorial on Lakeshore Rd. in Etobicoke.

I appreciate his interest in reference to that matter, which of course we share. I contacted the Metropolitan Toronto Police Commission chairman and found that the police had been pursuing the matter. They had to obtain some information on the particulars and issued a Canada-wide circular.

I am pleased to advise the members of the House, and particularly the member for York-Forest Hill, that yesterday they recovered the stolen items.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kent was on his feet previously.

COMMERCIAL FISHING IN LAKES ST. CLAIR AND ERIE

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources on his trip to southwestern Ontario on the weekend. Has he anything to report in regard to the commercial fishing industry in Lake St. Clair commercial fishermen on the outlook for their industry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I might say that my trip to Wheatley last weekend, accompanied by the Minister of Economics, was a very enjoyable experience for me. It gave me an opportunity to meet with the producers in that particular area, and some of the commercial fishermen.

I was most impressed when I was informed that three trawlers came in that morning from Lake Erie with a total of 57 tons of smelts, which my officials tell me is a very encouraging sign, because it does appear that smelt fishing and perch fishing are on the increase and are coming back in Lake Erie. Further to this, the fishermen inform me that the presence of algae in Lake Erie is disappearing; and they too are confident that the commercial fishing industry in Lake Erie looks very promising.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

DIVERSION OF WATER TO FLUSH GREAT LAKES

Mr. Stokes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Can the minister assure this House, and the people of the province of Ontario,

that no ministry or no agency of this government will conduct a mass diversion of water for purposes of flushing out the Great Lakes, or any mass diversion for whatever reason, without prior consultation with everybody in the province and an opportunity for everybody in the province to assess the merits or effects of this before any decision in that regard is taken.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the leader of the preceding government, when asked a similar question several years ago, indicated that before there was any diversion of stream flows in northwestern Ontario, which is what, I think, the hon. member is concerned with and to where he is referring, there would be ample public discussion.

I may say that I know of no plan to undertake this. I do know that various agencies, such as the government of Canada, are doing studies in that area. We are associated with them in stream flow studies, but not diversion studies. I believe that the US Army Corps of Engineers, on behalf of the IJC, is doing similar studies.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary then: Is the minister in a position to advise the members of this House the results of the joint surveys that have been going on for a number of years by the federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, which I now believe is the Department of the Environment? Since these studies have been going on for five years, is the minister in a position to report on their findings or what they plan to do with the knowledge that they have gained?

Hon. Mr. Auld: No Mr. Speaker, because I don't know that we know what their findings are, if in fact they have come to any conclusions as yet. I can give the hon. member the results of the stream flow studies that we take every year. But I don't think that they would be very significant.

Mr. Stokes: Well, will the minister make available to the member of this House copies of the interim reports that come out twice a year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Our reports?

Mr. Stokes: The minister's interim reports.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I don't think there is any point in tabling them. If the hon. member wants any information, I would be delighted to get it for him.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River had a supplementary.

Mr. Reid: It's been covered, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South had a supplementary.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): No, a new question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland South.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' STRIKE IN TORONTO

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Thank you Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Labour: In view of the obvious health hazards being created as a result of Metro Toronto's striking sanitary employees, will the Minister of Labour undertake to use all the resources readily available to his office to provide for continuous round-the-clock bargaining between the officials of Local 43, Canadian Union of Public Employees, and officials of Metro Toronto government? These are essential services.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: In answer to the hon. member for Welland South, I should like to inform him that here we are dealing with a very delicate and very difficult situation.

As he will recall, last week our people met almost continually from Thursday until 9:30 Sunday night with the representatives of Local 43, at which time the negotiations broke down. Since then we have been in touch with both sides, not only on a daily basis, but I would say almost on an hourly basis. I am advised by very expert opinion that the process of collective bargaining will be served better at this time by not scheduling a meeting.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich Riverside.

ACTION ON MERCURY-BASED PRODUCTS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of the Environment regarding the action about two weeks ago of the United States Environmental Protection Agency in banning over 750—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would ask the question instead of making a statement first.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): Boy oh boy; I wish he would apply that to everyone!

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Especially to the member!

Mr. Foulds: Especially when the members of the Liberal Party are praising the Conservative government in their preamble.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will direct his question please.

Mr. Burr: There are over 750 mercury-based products banned in the U.S. The question is, what similar action has the minister taken in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I hate to say this but I wonder if the hon. member would repeat his question; because of the interruption I didn't get the gist of it.

Mr. Burr: With the permission of the Speaker; regarding the action about two weeks ago of the United States Environmental Protection Agency in banning over 750 mercury-based products, what similar action has the minister taken in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that we are in what I guess one would call pretty well constant discussion with our federal colleagues in matters of this kind. Generally speaking any action that has been taken and will be taken will be done by the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

POLICY ON ACQUIRING COTTAGE PROPERTIES

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): A question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Is the minister contemplating a change in the policy of the parks division to have better public relations with people whose cottages are wanted for public park purposes, so that they will not be confronted by the Department of Public Works asking to get in and evaluate their properties, this being the first knowledge they have that there is some development going on in their area? This is a result of three complaints in one week—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Good: In widely—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Good: —dispersed part of the province.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't contemplate any change of policy. The policy that my department operates under is one of acquiring lands that are offered for sale by the homeowner.

Mr. Good: Right or wrong, that is the policy?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: If there is a specific case that he would like investigated I would be only too pleased to do so. Our policy now, as I said, is to acquire those lands that come up for sale by the individual owner.

Mr. Good: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister not think that a policy should be developed so that people know what is going on in their area before someone from Public Works comes along and wants to evaluate and make a deal with them?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, we certainly are doing this in the Bruce Peninsula, as the Minister of Economics pointed out. We have been very closely connected with and working with the planning areas, and with the township boards and the councils in those areas, outlining to them what our plans are. As I said, I'd be glad to look into it for him in a few of the specific areas.

Mr. Speaker: No supplementaries? The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

COMMISSION ON FRENCH LANGUAGE SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. F. Laughren (Nickel Belt): A question of the Minister of Education: Would the minister please explain why none of the five appointees to the commission on French language secondary education is from northern Ontario, considering that such a very significant number of Franco-Ontarians live in the north?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, one of the appointees has had considerable experience in Northern Ontario. He happens at the present time to be a superintendent of French language schools, for the Niagara South Board I think it is. But I think that's a very valid point the hon. member has raised and I'll be glad to consider it in further appointments to that council.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor Walkerville.

DEFINITION OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENT

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the minister of Education. Will the Minister explain why the definition of the elementary school student now is in terms of credits or courses rather than the year?

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the definition in the grant regulations that the hon. member is referring to is in terms of credits, because the secondary school system is now basically organized on a credit basis and it is very difficult to differentiate in terms of years. As the hon. member is aware, the grants paid to former grades nine and ten of the separate school system were elementary school grants; and because of this change to credit system it was necessary to somehow define in the regulations who were eligible for these grants. The new definitions according to credits is an attempt to do that.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware that according to this definition, the under-average and above-average students are being penalized when they attend a separate school, because they may be in grade 10 and not get sufficient credits to pass, but get sufficient to put them, in the eyes of the department, in grade 11 as far as grants are concerned? And likewise, the student who accelerates himself by summer courses may get sufficient credits so that even though he may be in grade 10, is considered to be in grade 11 for grant purposes?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the present definition creates the inequities which the hon. member has outlined. I have, however, and I will tell him this, had discussions with various members of the Separate School Trustees Association about this. I asked them to show me how they thought it could be done in a more equitable way, accepting the fact that we had to have a new definition, and they've agreed to come back and attempt to show us this. But I do not feel that our present definition does what he has stated.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Windsor West.

EDUCATION GRANT CEILINGS

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker: Did the minister specifically have discussions with the Windsor Board of Education, with respect to the restrictions on the board regarding the ceilings on grants, which led yesterday to the disbandment of the shop and home economics programmes in grade seven for the coming year?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't believe I had any discussions with the Windsor Board of Education, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

LIMITS ON FINANCING

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: What is the rationale behind setting limits on financing under the new mining, oil and gas companies in terms of shares rather than dollar amounts—so that on high priced shares, for example, they could raise $10 million and low priced shares only half a million dollars? Also, why would the rate of commission on the high priced shares be only 40 per cent of the rate on the low priced shares?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will examine the schedule—

Mr. Deacon: I have.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well if he will examine it more thoroughly he'll find that the rates as they apply are equitable in regard to the share value of any particular stock at a time when this underwriting is done. And that was the principle involved, giving the underwriter the opportunity of offering the financing for an exploration, a policy which I know he has supported himself; and at the same time putting responsibility for the recovery of the money onto the underwriter, as he supplies the financing immediately to the exploration company.

Mr. Deacon: The minister didn't hear my question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Don Mills.

TREATMENT OF DRUG ADDICTS

Mr. D. R. Timbrell (Don Mills): Sir, my question is of the Minister of Health. It relates to his statement today that a wide range of services and research will be required to provide the help that people need in relation to drug abuse—

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member making a statement or asking a question?

Mr. Timbrell: I am just about to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the question should come first.

Mr. Timbrell: Would the minister please indicate to the House what plans are under way in his department for the development of new programmes to treat drug abuse?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, a request is being made at the present time to establish a committee of senior civil servants in all of the ministries involved in the social development field to act as an advisory committee to bring in recommendations to government on this particular matter.

Mr. Timbrell: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would this involve also the Department of Correctional Services inasmuch as they also have programmes for inmates who have a drug problem?

Hon. Mr. Potter: Yes Mr. Speaker, I anticipate Correctional Services will be involved in this.

Mr. Paterson: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South has a supplementary.

Mr. Paterson: In relation to the minister's statement on the use of methadone, what specific action has the minister taken since the request of the Canadian Medical Association last Dec. 7 that the use of methadone be regulated by the medical profession in our province and in the other provinces?

Hon. Mr. Potter: I haven't taken any action, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the member realizes that I have nothing to do with the other provinces, but in our province I haven't taken any action.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Clement from the standing private bills committee presented the committee's report which was read as follows:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill Pr14, An Act respecting the town of Port Elgin.

Bill Pr21, An Act respecting the town of Arnprior.

Bill Pr22, An Act respecting the city of Oshawa.

Bill Pr23, An Act respecting the county of Prince Edward.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill Pr7, An Act respecting the city of Sault Ste. Marie.

Bill Pr15, An Act respecting the Greater Niagara General Hospital.

Bill Pr17, An Act respecting the city of Brantford.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Before the motion is put, I might just state that I have been informed that Bill Pr21 is not properly reported since it is what is commonly known as a money bill. This particular bill would have to be excluded from the report. Therefore I would put the motion, "Shall the report, with the exception of Bill Pr21, be received and adopted?" Now the hon. member may speak.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, with due respect, that was my point, that the bill was out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, what is the motion? Is the motion to report Bill Pr21 or not to report it? The motion is to report 21. So the only alternative we have, Mr. Speaker, is to vote against the motion, I take it?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am asking the hon. members if the report shall be received and adopted with the exception of Bill Pr21.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well I realize my colleague has directed the government's attention to the impropriety of this bill and they have seen the errors of their ways, but perhaps I am not sufficiently capable to understand this. I understand that the motion was to report Bill Pr21. Then isn't the only alternative—are you adding an amendment to it, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Shulman: He is asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. Bullbrook: Your ruling then—

Mr. Speaker: My ruling would simply be that the motion to receive and adopt the report is out of order. However, I can accept the report if we exclude Bill Pr21.

Mr. Reid: Does not the chairman—

Mr. Bullbrook: Unless an amendment is put before the House I don't know how we are going to accept it.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker in that case, if we are going to be voting on the motion as put by the chairman of the committee, I would move an amendment, if I may, to delete Bill Pr21.

As I pointed out in the committee yesterday at some length, this is a direct vote of supply and I would direct the chairman's attention, and members of the House, to page 19 of the standing orders of the legislative assembly of Ontario, section 86, which reads:

> Any bill, resolution, motion or address, the passage of which would impose a tax or specifically direct the allocation of public funds, may not be passed by the House unless recommended by a message from the Lieutenant Governor and may only be proposed by a minister of the Crown.

My humble submission, Mr. Speaker, is that Bill Pr21, in section 1, directs the direct payment of funds to the Township of Arnprior. I suggest that the bill was out of order and should not have been considered by the committee at all, and I would move its deletion from the report.

Mr. Good: And you better get better control of your backbenchers.

Mr. Speaker: Surely that is exactly what I submitted to the hon. members? Exactly?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Looking after our money; it is all right Pat!

Mr. Speaker: I put the motion to the hon. members that the motion to adopt and receive the report should carry with the exception of Bill Pr21, which is identically the same.

Mr. Reid: On a point of order, is it within your competence to amend the motion put by the chairman of the committee? Does it not either have to be done by amendment or by a resubmission by the chairman of the committee?

Mr. Speaker: I'm not really amending the motion.

Mr. Bullbrook: Speaking to the point of order, sir, it is impossible. I suggest most respectfully that you cannot extricate the learned chairman of the private bills committee or the House—the amendment is accepted?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Sure it is accepted.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then why doesn't the minister convey that through his House leader? He is here for a purpose.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I just did.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Since in the first instance I brought this to the attention of the House, it was brought to my knowledge that the report could not be received and adopted in its form. If the hon. member for Rainy River wants to introduce a motion to amend the report, which he has done, I will accept that.

Shall the amended report be received and adopted?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bullbrook: Nice work!

Mr. Shulman: That is the biggest Liberal victory of the year; and the only one.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We're still one up on the member, and this is important.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. Lane moves first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, the bill removes the requirement that a person be rated or related to a person who is rated on an assessment roll as owner or tenant of land in order to be entitled to be a voter in a municipal election.

Sir, my prime concern in the bill is to make it possible for our young people to participate at the local level.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker this bill is being introduced at the suggestion of certain police officials who point out that, in-

advertently, there had been an omission in the Highway Traffic Act. This bill makes it an offence for the driver of a motor vehicle to fail to stop when given a clear signal to do so by a uniformed constable or police officer driving a plainly marked police vehicle.

PUBLIC AUTHORITIES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. Lawlor moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Authorities Protection Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The short title is PAPA.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): I am sorry. May I hear the question again?

An hon. member: Read that in the Sun next Tuesday.

Mr. Shulman: That is the Solicitor General's best contribution since he came here.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): The bill removes the necessity of commencing an action within six months in case of a person, such as a sheriff, who is acting in the discharge of a public duty and has furnished security on his appointment to office.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Natural Resources has a matter to bring up.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, it is my pleasure to introduce the first publication to be released by the new Ministry of Natural Resources entitled "A Guide to Conservation Areas." Copies of this have been placed on the members' desks. It offers essential information on 207 conservation areas and 32 conservation authorities.

One side of the large folder shows location of the areas and a road map of southern, and parts of northern, Ontario. The other side lists their facilities and features, summer sports, winter sports, boating, fishing, picknicking, camping and nature interpretive programmes. This useful guide, Mr. Speaker, is but one of a number of publications that the Ministry of Natural Resources will produce, and which I hope to have the opportunity of introducing to this House from time to time.

Mr. Ferrier: How come the northeast is left out?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No conservation authorities.

Mr. Deans: Continue what is being done in Hamilton and there won't be any there either.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GASOLINE TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 40, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, in addressing our comments to this bill we will of course, be quite brief. We note that the increase in gasoline tax has now been imposed by this government and we do once again refer to the comments which were made at the time of the budget. We believe that this kind of an increase in taxation is the sort of thing which imposes an unfair burden on average citizens. We think that the revenue to be gained is something which could be gained more easily and more effectively in other areas, some of which were again referred to during my remarks on the budget. As a result, Mr. Speaker, we in this party believe the imposition of this increase in tax is wrong and we will oppose the bill.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, the elimination of the collector's fee involved in this legislation is in line with the Smith committee's proposals. I think that should be mentioned first. As a matter of fact, 30.1 recommends: "The remuneration for collecting fuel taxes paid to collectors under the Gasoline Tax Act and to registrants under the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act be gradually eliminated over the next five years."

At a single stroke, five years having been proved, I suppose in the interior recesses of the government, unnecessary, that tax has been removed. The explanation of the way in which it was collected, the number of people and the terms are contained in paragraph 13 of page 251 of Smith and I won't bother reading it.

We are opposed to this legislation, too, largely on the basis that there must be some degree of correspondence between road charges as such and the levies made upon the taxpaying public by way of a gasoline tax to pay for the provision of and maintenance of

roads in the Province of Ontario. There is a far more important point which is well argued and lengthily argued by Smith at page 274 of his massive tome. Reducing it to a single sentence, it comes to this: To set a range of percentages within which an acceptable share should fall is a much more realistic approach.

On the basis of our own analysis, we feel that current motor vehicle revenue in Ontario should range somewhere between 65 and 75 per cent of average annual road expenditures. If it is found that future expenditures are directed increasingly toward the use of intensive roads such as expressways, this range could be raised. In conclusion, winding up that whole portion of chapter 30, he expresses this particular opinion, pointing out that at the time of this report the figure was about 68 per cent.

We have prepared a schedule over the number of years as to what the percentages have been. Far from there being between 65 and 75 per cent as the legitimate amount extracted in this way for the provision of roads, in 1967-1968 it was 87 per cent; in 1968-1969 it was 101 per cent—that is the highest it has ever reached—101 per cent derived in this particular way to provide for road maintenance. In 1969-1970 it was 89 per cent; 1970-1971 85 per cent. In 1971-1972 the interim was 76, and in the estimates coming before this House this year with this tax involved, it shoots up dramatically to 86 per cent.

We claim that there cannot be justification for this. It is a mulcting tax which therefore falls very heavily upon the average man trying to get to and from work. In terms of the criteria set forth in the Smith report, if the government does not accept them—and it obviously does not, otherwise it wouldn't be imposing the tax today—it is under some obligation to justify its position vis-à-vis the $3 million it spent in order to obtain this report. I would hope that the minister would have at his fingertips a rational and coercive reasoning to back him up in the imposition of the tax which is before us.

I have found in the past, Mr. Speaker, that with the reappointment of new ministers of revenue along the line none of them has ever become sufficiently cognizant of what taxes are all about and what the weight of taxes is in the department. They sit mute, not necessarily out of malice but mute even without malice; they are rather empty over there. This has happened on a number of occasions; in setting forth and justifying their positions they simply sit on their hands and look us straight in the eye and says, "We have the majority and we are going to vote these taxes in. We have come to this conclusion. I personally, as the minister, am wholly unable to make a case in this regard. My department tells me that it is an excellent thing and after all, I am the boy who spends some amount of time in foreign lands and visits the Great Wall of China and therefore not expected to justify increased tax measures in this House."

I say to such a minister, Mr. Speaker, that in all the 10 or 12 tax measures which are going to come before us this afternoon, I want and will seek to extract from him explicit and specific justification all along the line.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): Mr. Speaker, we all know that it is the custom of the Conservative Party to reward the people of Ontario after every election by increasing taxes. But I want to have you turn your mind back, sir, to the last time this occurred, in 1968, at which time several taxes were increased, which was illegal, improper, and unparliamentary, because the increases were brought into effect before the legislation was passed. They have done the same thing again this time.

At that time, sir, if you will recall, we had quite a quarrel here in the House, because they put into effect taxes which they had no right to put into effect because the legislation had not been passed. At the time, sir, they attempted to justify this by saying some of the items were storable—one of them I believe was alcohol—and if people were given advance knowledge of the tax they would go out and store up this particular item, and so it was necessary for the sake of the revenues of the province that there be no notice given.

Obviously, the man who has taken over the Ministry of Revenue has read the debate and completely misunderstood it, as we should expect, because—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): We are working.

Mr. Shulman: We are waiting to hear from the minister. I hope there will be some explanation, although I can't imagine what it is. We now have new taxes on three items—on alcohol, on cigarettes, and on gasoline. By some perverse Mad Hatter's logic there has been a time interval given for the one item that is readily storable, which is alcohol. They say they'll bring that tax in in three weeks.

On the other items, gasoline and cigarettes, which are not readily storable—the one because of bulk, the other because it gets stale—they put in an immediate tax increase.

I suggest to you, sir, that promises were made by this government some four years ago. We don't expect much from their promises. They promised people of Ontario they wouldn't raise taxes. We knew they were lying; the people of Ontario didn't. Perhaps they will remember at a future date.

But we do expect a certain amount of legality from the government, a certain amount of common sense, and we get neither here. The government had no legal right to put this tax increase into effect at the time they did; it hadn't passed the Legislature and even the Conservative caucus didn't know about it.

The government is not a king sitting over there; they don't have the right to do these things; they don't even have a logical reason to explain them.

People can't store up gasoline. There was no tax loss going to take place if the government had waited a few weeks until this could be legally and properly put into effect. They have been perverse, illegal, improper and unparliamentary, and I ask for one last time—we had a promise from the government during the last Legislature, I ask again—let them give us a promise they are not going to put into effect taxes which have not been passed by this Legislature. They have no right to do so.

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): That's telling them!

Mr. Speaker: The member for Cochrane South.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I only want to make a small point. I am opposed to this legislation, speaking as a northern member, because we in the north now have an inordinately high price to pay for gasoline; this is going to add to that price. People in the north have to drive long distances between communities in their travelling, and it's obvious that we are going to use more gas than a lot of the people in the south, and therefore we are going to be hit harder by this increase in the tax. The only justification that I could see for any raise in the tax on gasoline would be some way through the tax structure of equalizing the price of gasoline between the south and the north.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): How about the far south?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: We heard some kind of noises during the election about this going to be done. It's the familiar old refrain, tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow, but it never gets done.

I would hope that sometime the gvernment is going to come to grips with the differential in the price of gasoline between south and north, and, if necessary, use the tax structure in such a way to balance the price some way or other for us in the north. But to put the tax on us all throughout the province and to increase the already heavy, heavy burden that northern residents have to pay because of the high cost of gasoline is unjust, it's unfair, it's discriminatory, and I am wholeheartedly opposed to the way it is being done in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on this bill and here are one or two items in particular I want to mention. One is the increase of gasoline tax to 19 cents per gallon. I understand that this will now be charged for all the motors using this fuel and only 18 cents will be returned for those using it off the road, and so forth. I am think of the rebate. There is no change in any of the Acts I can find yet where the rebate to farmers will be increased the one cent. This means an added cost to farm operations when they are already having serious problems. This certainly should be changed and allowed, because in no way can we continue to increase the cost of operations of our farm people when their prices have been so low. Maybe it's been overlooked on the part of the government so far, but I would certainly hope that it would be changed.

With regard to the tax itself on automobiles, I think that most people maybe do not object to paying a high gasoline tax provided the money is being poured back into highways and so forth, so that they can travel around quite easily. Looking at highway construction in some parts of the province, and I think particularly of Essex county, the way Highway 401 from Windsor to Tilbury was built is a monstrosity. I don't know who laid it out but it was so rough that they have been trying to patch it up since. We have trouble each year when we mention in the highways department estimates about resurfacing it. They say that the cost of rebuilding it is too high and they patch it up a little.

I am wondering if with this one cent increase in tax, they are going to be in any more of a hurry now to have it repaired. Certainly, when you have the largest port of entry of any port in Canada at the Windsor area, and the traffic coming through there, and we have a very, very poor road for a 30-mile stretch, it makes you wonder, and with the increase in tax, certainly one would think that this would be done right away.

It's also a tax that is part of a regressive tax, to some extent too, due to the fact that so many people must use cars for transportation to and from work and they have no way of getting around it. So there again, it is a tax that is going to make it much more difficult for everyone working, or anyone who has to use his car to go to work.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to Bill 40 on the imposition of the one cent increase per gallon of gasoline in our province. I am opposed to this just on the principle of the cost, being of a Scottish nature, but more than that it goes beyond the one cent and the ramifications of the multiplicity of usage of the many millions of gallons of gasoline in our province during the fiscal year.

My colleague from Essex-Kent has spoken about the fact that the farming community, which does enjoy a rebate on the use of gasoline in its tractors when it submits bills, is not going to benefit from this one cent addition, to the best of our knowledge. I think it should behove the minister to bring in a parallel bill to set this up so that they will get the full benefit of the rebate in this regard rather than at the static position that they are at the present time.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): That's right. Don't frown about that. Why is the government insisting they pay that tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to think. I am trying to concentrate on what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. Paterson: I recall back a few years ago when the minister deleted the rebate to those persons who owned pleasurecraft, I thought at that time this wasn't the general tax, it was basically to parallel the money spent on highways and up to that time those persons owning pleasurecraft were entitled to a partial rebate. This was discontinued several years ago. At that time I raised an objection in that I felt the province should move into an area where a portion of this tax might have gone into the development of harbours or refuges, say, on the Great Lakes systems or larger waterways, but there is no such designation. So, here again, we see another loss to the average citizen through the increased cost to his daily living.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, operating a retail business such as I do, the cost of transportation itself is now varying, I would say, between 3 and 10 per cent of the cost of the goods offered for sale in my particular business. The one cent looks very insignificant, but to the transportation companies it is a significant amount. Combined with that and the increases in licence plates on vehicles and the other increases that come along, I feel that the consumer again is going to be hit in another area; not only with the one cent, but through increased costs in transportation for all his goods.

A second principle embodied in Bill 40, of course, is the remuneration paid for the collection is going to be discontinued. Now, it is my understanding that this affects a very limited number of companies.

I know in the county of Essex during this period of the year we have half-load limits on; and these major companies and their area distributors impose, I believe, an extra one-cent-per-gallon cost for the distribution of the commodity in the area because of the half-load system.

But it is very interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that it is the large corporation that is keeping that cent; it is not even the distributor who owns and actually distributes the fuel in the area who gets the benefit of this. And here again, it has increased the cost of the agricultural products in our area. I just joint this out as a sideline that all these ramifications are adding up to greater input cost to the farming community which I represent, and throughout the Province of Ontario. For this reason and the reasons I have mentioned, I am going to oppose this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sandwich-Riverside.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. I should like to oppose the bill for a reason that has not yet been mentioned. The price of gasoline is going to go higher, of course. This is going to drive motorists to the discount dealers who represent some of the large oil companies. For example, we have Simpson's-Sears in Windsor pumping I think it is 100,000 gallons per month, at

least; while small operators are pumping 1,000. It is doing a hundred times the business of the small garage. As I say, the new tax is going to drive more people to the discount dealers and work a greater hardship on the small garage owner who has his own pumps.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to address this bill? The hon. minister?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just one point.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The minister perhaps misled me a bit when I thought that the frown on his countenance indicated that the argument about tax rebates for farmers had no truth or strength to it.

It seems strange that the use of gasoline in off-the-road farm implements has always been considered non-taxable. And then about four years ago, it was decided that part of it would be non-taxable and that the remaining, I believe, four cents a gallon would be taxable. Now, with this increase, it means that an additional cent for every gallon is paid by the farmers and it is understood and it is checked and it is verified, that the farm machinery does not use the road.

So, if you are going to stick with the kind of justification for the tax that the government has used down through the years, and that is essentially that it is to pay for the cost of building and maintaining the highway system, then really the rebate for the farmers ought to be complete.

If, on the other hand, you are prepared to reject that rationale and say, "Well, we are just taxing this commodity because we figure that it is what the traffic can bear," then surely you should contemplate a tax on hydro, on electricity and other sources of energy.

There is a basic inconsistency here that at least two of my colleagues and others have brought to the minister's attention and I probably misread the minister's face when it looked to me as if he felt the argument was an unreasonable one. It is not an unreasonable one. I can't see how the government can justify the imposition of this very large revenue-producing tax by saying it is to build roads and maintain them when it keeps putting on the tax and raising it on the use of the commodity which has got nothing whatsoever to do with the roads or their use or their misuse.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to look at another aspect of this tax, Mr. Speaker. I had some consequent conversations with the minister's predecessor about exemptions from this tax, and I want to know if the present minister has undertaken to provide the necessary information to Indians in northern communities who, in fact, are exempt from this tax.

As I mentioned earlier I had some conversation with his predecessor. After I was advised that they were, indeed, exempt from this tax I found out that about 90 per cent of the people living on Indian reserves in the province weren't aware that they were, in fact, exempt, and had to make application on their own. I am wondering why the minister charges the tax and then leaves the onus upon the purchaser to make application for the rebate. As a result of this increase, is he going to advise people who are, in fact, exempt, such as farmers, commercial fishermen and natives living on reserves where there is no road structure at all? Is he going to make every effort to advise these people that they can get a rebate from this particular tax?

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak to this bill before the minister sums up? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting to find the hon. members getting up and saying in advance that it's not good enough for the minister to say he doesn't know anything about it, before he has even got up on his feet. I could—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We know from past experience!

Mr. Ruston: We should have colour TV.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is to help charge up the members a bit when they look at me.

Mr. Speaker, I could of course repeat what the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said in the budget speech about—

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Almost anyone could repeat that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —tax policy being his responsibility, which, of course, it is. Actually I should only be required to discuss those matters dealing with the administration of those taxes, the methods employed and whether they are fair and equitable and so on.

However, I have no objections to attempting to learn my work the hard way and I will do what I can in the absence of the Treasurer to answer some of the questions which have been raised.

Mr. Lawlor: That is fine; it is an improvement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: One of the hon. members—I think it was the hon. member for High Park—I presume in order to recruit some of the dissatisfaction of everyone with the increase in taxes—particularly the members of this House and, of course the members on our side as well, because who is happy about the increase in taxes—in order to recruit perhaps their sympathy, suggested that it wasn't even discussed in caucus. I don't know how he came to that bright conclusion, but it wasn't—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He's got spies everywhere.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —very difficult because taxes are never discussed in caucus. Indeed, the Minister of Revenue didn't know what the taxes were going to be until he heard the budget speech. Now, this is—

An hon. member: Oh, come off it!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I don't lie to this House.

Mr. Ferrier: We see democracy at work in the cabinet!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the tradition—

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): That's right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —on which the British parliamentary system and our parliamentary system are based.

Mr. Ferrier: The cabinet never even discussed the budget?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm not too sure that I agree with it. I'm certainly not happy getting up here as the Minister of Revenue and attempting to defend bills with which I was not familiar before the budget debate. I'm not too sure about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the minister resign?

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: You are trying to shame—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have already been discussing this with my colleague, the Treasurer, and I am going to discuss it again with my other colleagues because I think, quite frankly, there is some logic in the argument that some of these things don't have to be kept that secret. I think, by and large, most of the taxes that the province imposes today can't really be taken advantage of by anyone in advance. I am not too sure.

I want to modify any impression the members may have that I am completely certain that the system we are employing now is incorrect. I am not too certain, but I just want to tell you that I am not too happy about it at the moment, and it may very well be that I will be convinced that the present system is the best for it may have some implications with which I am not familiar at the moment.

Of course no one likes taxes. The hon. member for Lakeshore, if I understood him correctly, was using the old argument that gasoline taxes should bear some relationship to the cost of roads and the maintenance and so on.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the argument of the royal commission.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not too sure—I try to catch up with this in between questions here—I am not too sure that he made that argument—

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, he clearly made the argument.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and in any case, certainly the hon. member must appreciate that if we want to use that argument that there should be more spent on roads, maintenance, OPP, surveillance of roads and traffic and so on, the cost probably would far exceed the revenue.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No, no!

Mr. Lawlor: Oh no, this has all been computed by the Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: However, I don't want to get involved in that again.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Not fuel taxes and licences combined.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me put it this way: Taxes are for the purpose of getting enough revenue to run all the services of a province. If you are going to use that argument, what justification is there for a tobacco tax? What service do we give to the smokers?

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): Because it is essentially avoidable.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What taxes do we give to the person who takes a drink? Then we shouldn't have any taxes on alcohol or anything of that nature.

Mr. Lawlor: You made a lot of money that way.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where are you going to get the revenue to run all the other services that a government needs—for instance, health and education, and other services?

Mr. Deans: Why don't you try some kind of progressive tax system?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is essentially, in my view to be quite honest, a method of raising taxes from those sources which appear to be the best from which to get these taxes—

Mr. Ruston: How about the $18 million you paid the breweries?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and the most equitable, having regard for the fact that nobody considers any taxes are equitable.

So I am not going to try and justify that anyway, even if I were responsible for tax policy. I take my collective responsibility with my colleagues as a member of the government for imposing these taxes; I am not trying to say I am not responsible for them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: They are not here to help the minister bear the load very well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's all right. Nobody likes taxes.

The hon. member for Essex-Kent, I think, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition, if I understood them correctly, are concerned about the fact that the farmer may not get the complete exemption from the tax. That is entirely wrong. He will continue to get full exemption from the gasoline tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You don't need to get them elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no change in that at all. If the hon. members will read the bill, there is no reference to it because there is no need to make any reference, because we haven't changed in the amendment anything in respect of the exemptions having to do with the farmers and commercial fishermen.

An hon. member: Give them one cent more rebate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside made some comment about this sending more people to the discount dealers. I am not too sure about the logic of that; there may be some, but it seems to me the differential remains the same. I don't know how that would send any more to the discount dealers, and I am not too sure there is anything wrong with that.

Mr. Deans: Did you ever think of investigating the gasoline prices?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member for Thunder Bay has raised the question about those people, the Indians for example, who don't know, as he puts it, that they are entitled to these exemptions, and whether perhaps some more could be done by way of informing them. I can assure the hon. member I will look into that and anything that can be done to advise those people who are entitled to the exemptions and aren't familiar with the procedure, will be done. Everything possible will be done to make sure that help will be given to those who need help in respect of applying for any exemptions to which they are entitled.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, on this point, is the minister informing us that farmers now get full rebate of 18 cents on gasoline tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course.

Mr. Good: And they now will be getting 19 cents?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: In the interests of efficiency and as we are dealing with a group of bills arising out of the budget, I wonder if it would be possible, with the unanimous consent of the House, to stack the votes on these bills?

Mr. Speaker: At this point we don't know whether there will be a vote, but we'll cover that when we come to it.

The motion is for second reading of Bill 40.

Those in favour will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

The suggestion has been made that because there are a number of Acts dealing with similar principles we might stack any votes which are requested. There is no provision for such action in the orders. However, with the unanimous consent of the House, there would appear no reason why it could not be done. Any discussion on that?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Mr. Speaker, from the government point of view, I think the suggestion of the member for Riverdale is a very wise one inasmuch as they're all tax bills, and there are some 12. We are certainly prepared to accept that proposal. Thank you.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, the only problem is that we're going to go down a list of tax bills and the votes may just not be identical in each one. But I suppose we can have sort of different piles of stacking and work it out that way.

Mr. Speaker: Actually the votes can be called separately if the necessity becomes apparent, because I can see where one opposition party might be against some bills, but not against all of them.

Do we have the unanimous consent of the House to stack these votes? All right.

LAND TRANSFER TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 42, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Mr. Lawlor: Why don't you go up to 41? Why jump to 42?

Mr. Speaker: It is 42 then, is it? We are dealing with Bill 42. The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Lawlor: You confuse me. I am terribly confused at the moment.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, in this bill, it is interesting to note the government's intention to obtain additional revenue from the use of the land transfer tax.

As hon. members are probably well aware, the average citizen who purchased a home for $20,000 had, up until this bill was introduced, to pay a land transfer tax amount of $40. If, for example, he purchased a home valued at $60,000 the land transfer tax break was against him, and the tax that he would have paid would be $190 for that home. I think that it has been a reasonable approach on the part of the government to increase the breakeven point, shall we say, from $25,000 to $35,000 as there are, of course, many homes that fall within this category. Especially in times of inflation and as prices of property are increasing, it would seem to me reasonable to set this new position at $35,000 where the rate of tax changes. If we take our two examples of the $20,000 and $60,000 property, under the new rulings we would see that the $20,000 home would now attract a land transfer tax of $60 and, I believe, if my mathematics are correct, the $60,000 home would attract a land transfer tax of $255.

Mr. Speaker, in developing this form of revenue I think that it can clearly be said that some of these funds, at least, bear reference to the costs of operating registry offices and other facilities which exist throughout the province. There is one area though that I would question and, that is, why do we stop at the six-tenths of one per cent, especially in the very large areas? I believe that where speculators, particularly, are receiving great benefits by the rapid turnover of large blocks of land, the province should have some opportunity of obtaining a cut in that speculation. One way of doing it would be to impose a land transfer tax amount that, perhaps, would be one per cent on certain projects that could possibly be in excess of $250,000 or whatever.

I think some consideration should be given by the minister to the possibility of obtaining revenue in this source. I think that there is much to be said, of course, about giving the average citizen a break, because the home which he purchases is probably going to be his largest investment. The government, I think, has done well to use this figure of $35,000, as I had said earlier. But I think it's most important that the minister give some consideration to amending legislation, if not immediately, at some time in the future, which will allow the province to receive a tax benefit on the transfer of land, especially land which is being used by speculators. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is worthwhile to go along with the government on the imposition of this tax, and I believe that the official opposition will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, we, too, are not going to oppose this legislation. If the hon. minister will recall, the land transfer tax a number of years ago had a much wider girth than it does today. It applied, for instance, to mortgage transactions of all kinds and registrations of mortgages at the same rate as in

real estate transactions today. When that was removed I think a substantial source of revenue was lost to the province. I suppose the reason that that was taken off was that the trust and insurance companies developed the tax back upon the head of the purchaser. For the purchaser, already having to pay the tax on the registration of his deed, to have to pay the tax on the mortgage on top of this—well, there must have been some considerable outcry. If the minister could have prevented the transfer of the liability there, then I would have thought that the tax had great validity as it had previously existed, and he might have worked on that basis.

Smith has a very penetrating analysis of this tax, its base, etc.—and he's opposed to it. At 31.4 the recommendation is that the land transfer tax be abolished and that commissions charged for services by real estate agents be made subject to the retail sales tax.

The select committee sitting on this matter rejected Smith's proposition in the following words:

> We reject the first part of the recommendation abolishing the land transfer tax. Some tax should apply to all real estate transactions. The Smith report argued that there would be no loss of revenue under this plan. We do not agree because by no means are all real estate transactions effected through brokers. The retail sales tax on commissions has been dealt with under recommendation 29.9; we consider real estate agents' services to be in this category.

If in this bill and in the security transfer tax bill which will be coming on shortly, the government is looking for new possible sources of revenue, I would direct its attention into this area, which Smith was fairly conclusive ought to be within the gamut of the retail sales tax—that is, the commission aspect—but about which our committee said: "Don't abolish this tax; it has validity in its own right."

Over and above that, the government should give some consideration to the taxation of commissions. There would be considerable revenue, considering that the size of the commission is five per cent and with the average real estate transaction in the Metropolitan Toronto area being in the region of $30,000. If there was even a small tax on that, the amount of money that would garner for the province would be very considerable indeed.

I just want to mention the income derivable from this. There was $6.7 million from this tax in 1966, and in our estimates of this current year it goes to $22 million. It is a burgeoning source of revenue to the province; over a very short period of time it has almost quadrupled. This is a tax which is easily extracted and should be maintained in force.

One thing that bemuses me a bit, Mr. Speaker, is the way in which the government slyly, covertly and backhandedly, as is their wont, decided to set forth in the budget statement by the Treasurer of a few days ago where the weight falls in this tax. They say, at page 35 of the budget statement:

"For instance, on a $35,000 home the increase in the land transfer tax will amount to only $15.

In other words, they select the optimum figure where the impact is the very least. If we take a $30,000 transaction, on the contrary, the tax is not $15, it is $25 more than would previously have been paid. And if we juggle the figures at different amounts we will find that that is where we are hitting the optimum point. Why he should set forth what is beneficial to him and without even nodding his head toward the discrepancies and where the real weight falls, I think, is a matter that should be brought to the attention of this government.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York-Forest Hill.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, this is a singular kind of tax, unlike other taxes we talk about here, where all the usual cliches are pulled out about "nobody likes a tax" and, "how much is enough?" and, "who should it be imposed on?"

This is an unusual sort of tax in which there are certain peculiar circumstances. Selling a piece of land and paying land transfer tax on it, incidentally, is probably the easiest way that we know of in the world to collect tax, including the collectability of the income tax. Turning over a piece of land isn't like buying a gallon of gasoline, where it's 52 cents this week, plus tax, and it will be 52 cents a month from now and a year from now—unless, of course, there is a negotiated change in price or something.

It's not like a piece of land. Today A buys a piece of land and pays $50,000; the next month he sells it and he gets $70,000 for it. It's an unusual type of thing.

This isn't the case of a farmer buying a gallon of gasoline on which he has to pay a tax, even though he uses this gasoline to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. The guy who exchanges a piece of land and makes

a big profit isn't earning his bread by the sweat of his brow. And land is in short supply, and there's inflation. Nobody buys gasoline as a hedge against inflation but investors indeed buy land as a hedge against inflation.

Why should we have this parasitic accretion—and that's what it is, because the man who turns over a piece of land is contributing nothing and doing nothing for that land to appreciate. I say that if there was ever an opportunity and a circumstance whereby the government could impose a sizable tax and collect it, because it is collectable, without any qualms of conscience, it is in this particular case.

If the government is going to leave it at $3 per thousand up to $35,000, fine. It may startle the people outside of Metro Toronto to know that in Toronto a house for $35,000 is a lower middle class home, because it is such a hot market for land in this area—because of the great demand. And you are dealing with a commodity which is in short supply.

Indeed, I think the day may come, Mr. Speaker, when my friends to the left here may be right that we are going to have to socialize the ownership of land because it is in short supply.

An hon. member: You had better believe it.

Mr. Givens: You cannot all go up to the Arctic. You cannot go to the Yukon—at least, people ordinarily won't want to live there and send their kids to school there. So you have got to come to the recognition that this is the kind of thing on which a tax should be applied.

Mr. Lawlor: When did we say that? Where did the member get that stuff? I am a private ownership boy. He can't get away with that—talking that fog.

Mr. Givens: Why does the price of land appreciate in value? Generally the person who owns the piece of raw land contributes nothing to it, as I said before. He doesn't earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. But because the municipality or the water resources commission put in a sewer or a water main, or because somebody builds a highway, or because somebody builds a school or develops a park, the land improves in value.

The reason the land appreciates is because some governmental authority—namely, the public, through that governmental authority—is doing something which causes that piece of land to appreciate. Consequently, I think it is incumbent upon the person who makes that profit to pay at least the one per cent tax on that. I don't see for the life of me why the government shouldn't impose at least a one per cent tax when the person buys the land.

If a man buys several acres of land—let's say a concession lot of 200 acres—and he develops it and he puts in services and he parcels it up into lots for the construction of homes, well then if the person who buys the home buys it for $35,000 or thereabouts he will be paying the $3 per thousand.

On the other hand, if this person is in the nature of a speculator who buys a concession lot and, for the reason that I have heretofore indicated, waits until this appreciates, then he is getting what I call a parasitic accretion on the thing and society isn't benefitting from the fact that he has made a speculative profit.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is unconscionable and that it shouldn't be done. I think that the tax here could very easily be raised to one per cent and not impinge on anybody and not be oppressive on anybody and not hit the little guy in the pocket. This would be a source of revenue the government could use.

Because otherwise, especially now with the capital gains tax and the income tax, he's got to pay it off to Ottawa anyway. I think that because of the nature of the kind of changes which cause land to appreciate, this tax should be payable to the provincial authorities and to the municipal authorities who indirectly can benefit from that tax by the other things that the provincial government does for the municipalities as the creatures of the provinces under the constitution of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker; I don't intend necessarily to support what the last speaker had to say about the bill. Our caucus is going to support the tax. I personally have very grave reservations about it and when stacking time comes I may have to vote against it, because I would have liked to see the government exempt the person who buys his home and who is in the middle class and lower middle class socio-economic scale in this society.

I am delighted to know that the views which I have about the regressive nature of that tax and the undue burden of that tax

are supported very much by Smith in his report, and I want to put on the record my concern about the regressive nature of the tax insofar as persons in the income level basically represented by the constituents in my riding of Riverdale. Smith, at page 296, has this to say:

> It is probable that the portion of the tax paid by individuals is borne by people of some substance. But values of homes in relation to incomes tend to decrease as incomes rise, leading us to assume that the land transfer tax is regressive in relation to income for those who pay it. The higher rates now applicable on the portion of the consideration over $25,000 have undoubtedly mitigated the regressiveness of the tax.

He then goes on to say:

> On grounds of equity it is impossible to justify the land transfer tax. For individuals, the time of purchase of real estate is seldom the time when they have the greatest liquidity or capacity to pay tax. To suggest that the action of buying real estate indicates an ability to pay and that the purchases of this commodity are good measures of such ability, is nonsense. If, as we conclude, the ownership of property is not a particularly accurate index of ability to pay, the act of purchasing property is worse. To the extent that the property is bought by businesses, the concept is entirely inapplicable.

All I'm saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we talk a great deal about stimulating and motivating people to purchase their own homes and we talk very much about the difficulty of accumulating the down payment. Well, if you add to the down payment this tax, plus the portion of the real estate commission which is carried over to him in one way or another, if you add to that lawyers fees, if you add to that the cost of moving, you for practical purposes impose a very serious detriment on the capacity of anyone to produce the number of dollars in cash—oh, and I forgot to mention the cost that has to be borne by the purchaser for the mortgage money which he also raises to go with his down payment. When you add all those items together you impose a very serious deterrent on the ability of the ordinary citizen in the lower Metropolitan Toronto area to purchase a home.

For that reason I specifically feel very strongly against the tax and would recommend to the government that as soon as possible it eliminate the tax on whatever arbitrary figure it wants to assess as being the figure which has to be paid for a home. If that figure be $35,000 then that's where the exemption should lie.

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. members wish to speak on this bill? The member for Sarnia.

Mr. J. E. Bullbrook (Sarnia): I just want to express some degree of sympathy with the position taken by the member for Riverdale. The basic problem with putting in an arbitrary figure of $35,000, or any other arbitrary figure, is the arbitrary quality of it. But also one has to recognize the fact that if you exempt taxation below $35,000 you not only exempt those people who should be exempt—those people for whom that member and other members would express a cause for concern; those people who don't have the ability to pay this regressive type of tax—but you exempt also the slum landlord, you exempt him from any taxation when he buys a property for less than $35,000. Those are the difficulties that Smith has seen and that—

Mr. Renwick: Make it a once-in-a-lifetime exemption.

Mr. Bullbrook: I beg your pardon.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps once or twice in a lifetime.

Mr. Bullbrook: That might well be; the member didn't mention that in his opening remarks and perhaps that is an avenue of approach. I don't want to take the time of the House unduly, but I want to say that I do feel quite a degree of sympathy with the position taken by the member for Riverdale. There is something inherently reprehensible with this type of taxation and this type of elevation of the tax itself. One other thing, that I believe the member for Lakeshore mentioned—at least he did by way of interjection—it has always struck me as a strange tax in that it is paid for by the purchaser. The reason that it is paid for by the purchaser is purely a matter of convenience in collecting.

If you look at this section, it says any person "who tenders a conveyance," and the fact of the matter is that under our system it is the purchaser who tenders the conveyance. From the point of view of the philosophy of the righteousness of this tax, it should be the vendor.

Mr. Lawlor: That is right. He is the boy who is getting the money.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is the fellow who is making the money and, as my colleague from

York-Forest Hill said, this is what we want to see taxed. We, in this party, at least, want to see taxed those people who, without any initiative on their part, on many occasions by nothing but good fortune or the ability to have bequested to themselves a great deal of capital beforehand, are able to acquire tracts of land. Those are the people who should be taxed; so this type of legislation should be amended. I don't propose to put forward any type of an amendment but surely there is a method of ensuring the government that facility of collectability that it wants, and imposing a part of the tax upon the party to the transaction who not only has the ability to pay, but really, in effect, has the moral duty to pay.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support in a measure what has already been said. I think this whole concept which the member for York-Forest Hill has raised, ought to be expanded a bit.

Around the world today there is a feeling, which he has expressed, that speculative value of land should be taxed in a realistic way for the benefit of society; that when a person buys a piece of land and sells it a little later on for twice, three times, or 10 times the value, at least part of that increased value should accrue to the society which created the value. Because as the member for York-Forest Hill has pointed out, the person who holds that land simply sits there. It is the municipality, the province, the society in which that land is situated which creates the increased value. People live in the area, and gradually growth comes closer and closer to that land. It grows in value because of the exertions of other people.

This principle, I think, is becoming more and more accepted in various places. Westminster, the mother of Parliaments, has faced up to this problem in recent years and has said that a very large proportion of this increased value ought to accrue to society. The figure that they have put on it is about 40 per cent. This is much more than the one per cent which the hon. member has proposed, but it is a different basis, because in this case it is 40 per cent of the increased value, rather than one per cent of the total value that was paid. This kind of a concept, Mr. Speaker, ought to be taken into consideration by this government when we think of revenue-producing devices.

I can see that the homeowner, as the hon. member for Riverdale has pointed out, has a problem here. Certainly, in framing legislation of this kind, it has been found that the homeowner can be exempted if that person is going to live in the house, or perhaps a once-in-a-lifetime exemption might be worked out. But slum landlords certainly should be included in the take which the society is going to manipulate here. The person who is buying the house in which he lives perhaps can stand the small amount, but by and large he should be exempted from capital gains of this kind.

Theoretically at least, I suppose when he sells that house later on for a higher price and moves into an apartment, perhaps at that point he is making a capital gain. But ordinarily when he sells his house, he is going to buy another house more suited to his family needs. In the true sense, it is not capital gain that he is getting; it's simply a transfer of living space that he is undertaking at that point. Mr. Speaker, by and large, while this kind of tax is justified and just, the one that is proposed here does bear perhaps a little hard on the homeowner.

I think the proposition that capital gain, in land particularly and in property in general, to the exclusion of the homeowner, ought to be seriously considered. The principle which is here should be expanded into the whole idea of society picking up the capital gain or at least a good proportion of the capital gain which society places upon land.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to speak on this bill? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, of course it's a very interesting discussion here, and it's the sort of discussion that goes on, as the hon. members probably appreciate, when discussing the problems with which OHC struggles, when we are trying to find a way to keep the cost of land and building down, there is a bit of going around in circles on the other side in this.

There is, in the first place, the suggestion that we should increase the tax in some areas. I think the hon. member for Riverdale was making the point that it's going to make it more regressive if we do that. In fact, on the face of it, it does appear to me that the more tax you put on at the level which this transfer tax hits the higher is the cost of land going to be; the higher is the cost of building going to be. We are really not accomplishing anything because that tax can be easily transferred to a purchaser, someone who is trying to buy or build a home.

The fact remains, as I say, the propositions that are put forward are all valid except for one thing. I am not an expert on this and I don't propose to give the impression that I am but it does seem to me when you are talking about capital gains, when you are talking about the profits made on the transaction of land and real estate generally and that some of that should accrue to the public, I think you have to leave that to the income tax and corporations tax collector. That's where the profits should be properly taxed, and they are not that easily passed over to the purchaser of a piece of property.

As I say, some of the things which have been recommended here—I was going to say I am going to ask the Treasurer to take these into consideration, but he has got two different views. He will think about them and come to some conclusion as to what he will recommend to the government.

I am not happy about the land transfer tax myself for the very reasons outlined by the member for Riverdale. I agree with him generally. I suppose, too, we are going to get involved in the same discussion in every one of our revenue bills; we are trying to find a tax which is equitable, and at the same time find a tax which is not going to restrict the expansion of the ecenomy; is not going to create hardship for sime people and in fact negate some other programmes which we are trying to foster. I think the example of the problem which we are struggling with now in order to keep land and building costs down generally and at the same time talking about taxes which aren't going to keep them down—in fact may increase them—is a perfect example of the problems—

Mr. Stokes: Is this the government's rationale of its taxing programmes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well it's very difficult. It's very difficult.

Mr. Stokes: There are so many other options open to the government.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right; that's a matter of opinion too. I don't think there is any tax that is anything but regressive, every tax is really regressive. I know; not in the terms that are employed by the experts—

Mr. Deans: It may be oppressive but not regressive.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: One doesn't like to pay it but that doesn't mean it's regressive.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, one could argue you know—one could argue that the more you tax someone, whether it's income tax or some other tax, the less he has in his control to do those things which would help expand the economy. You know, one could argue the point to that extent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: He wants to make a speech again.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Minister direct this to the committee of the whole House?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why can't it go to third reading? Is there any reason for it to go to committee?

Mr. Lawlor: We could have a nice conversation.

Mr. Speaker: It stands ordered for third reading.

Agreed.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 41, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, the comments that we would have to make with respect to Bill 41 are much akin to those the House has already heard in dealing with Bill 40.

Again I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is a regressive tax which is being imposed, and imposed unfairly on many of the people within this province. Comments were made during the second reading of Bill 40 with respect to the difficulty this would impose on people, especially in the northern part of the province; and of course these same comments are valid here.

I do agree with the position that the government has taken concerning section 3 of this bill; especially as it removes the remuneration to the registrants with effect as of May 1, 1972. In this particular case, the

parties who were receiving remuneration for this collection are, of course, the gasoline and oil companies. I think that they can well forego this additional benefit from the people of Ontario. The approach that has been taken by the government in refusing remuneration in this area is consistent with the approach which we took on the select committee on taxation.

I would ask the minister, in his remarks, to advise us what he proposes to do with respect to the applications for rebates that are set out in section 4. When we were discussing Bill 40 on second reading, the minister commented, especially with respect to Indian and other peoples who might have some confusion about the availability of the refunds, that he would give some consideration to some kind of an advertising programme, or some such, that would make sure the citizens of the province knew about the refunds.

It seems to me that in this circumstance the minister is bringing forward a piece of legislation to cure a problem—that is the abuse of the use of other fuels on the highways—but I am wondering if he is not raising a problem greater than the one he is trying to solve. It seems to me the paperwork and the forms which are going to be required for rebates, and the staff which the minister's own department will have to have in order to process all these rebates, may be a greater expense to the public than the loss of revenue which we are now occasioning because some people are trying to beat the use of this tax.

I think if there is a definite plan by which these rebates may be made available, in an inexpensive fashion, then perhaps the Act will solve the problem which apparently is with us.

I would appreciate hearing from the minister as to what abuse there was that causes a situation, almost of reverse collection, to have to be imposed. In other words, does he have particular examples, or particular knowledge, about the abuse of this programme which causes us to have to go through the whole cycle of a person paying the tax and then claiming it back? If there were particular abuses, I think it would be worthwhile to know about them. Otherwise, as I have said earlier, it may be that the cure is going to be worse than the disease that he hopes to resolve in section 4.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, on this bill the considerations are slightly different from those under the gasoline tax. If I may read into the record the comments of Smith on this:

> Although these fuel taxes are, in general, easy to compute, collect and control, the administrative processes complicate it somewhat by the exemptions and refunds provided for the non-road use of fuel, especially of diesel fuel, only a small portion of which is used in motor vehicles. Instead of taxing all fuel coming under the Motor Vehicles Fuel Tax Act, and then refunding the non-taxable portion as has generally been the approach with gasoline, the government attempts to levy tax on only the diesel and other fuel oil that is used in motor vehicles. This has meant that in an effort to reduce evasion of the tax, an extensive system of reporting has been devised, with penalties set for failure to give accurate information to the province.

In a further attempt to reduce tax evasion the fuel was coloured purple, and I believe that has been discontinued.

Elsewhere in Smith, the business of the administrative process and the difficulties of policing the matter are mentioned under this particular head. I wonder if the minister feels that the benefit to be gained from the tax as weighed against the complications in his department have been cost-estimated; and secondly, whether there is a marginal utility, and just what it is?

In other words, what I am really asking for is the cost of administration in his department over against the revenue gained in this regard. Secondly, what is the precise revenue gaind under this tax? I was unable to find that out as I went through the books.

What is the revenue, first of all, from the increase in the tax from 24 cents to 25 cents; and secondly, in terms of the cutback on remuneration being paid to those people called registrars, who were the ones who collected the tax on the government's behalf? I would like some clear figures on that if the minister is able to give them to us.

I want to say under this head—and perhaps I should have said it in connection with the earlier bill having to do with gasoline—that we fundamentally are in agreement with the cutting out of remuneration to collectors of tax, by and large.

The hon. minister will have taken careful note, I am sure, of the member for York South's (Mr. MacDonald) reasoned amendment appended to a particular bill, namely Bill 48, the Retail Sales Tax bill. But some of the thought in that reasoned amendment is

equally applicable to the Gasoline Tax bill and to the Tobacco Tax Act, which we have before us.

We want to stipulate that applicability now before we get really launched into these tax measures. In other words, the small vendors —the gasoline service operator, the small variety store holder, etc.—ought not to be the ones chiefly victimized and mulcted as a result of the tax from a benefit which they have had previously and which amounts to them, for the time, trouble and expenditure involved in collecting the tax, to some kind of a reward or some kind of repayment for precisely becoming the agents of the government in this regard.

We stipulate that, and wonder whether the minister, in terms of the small businessman, of whom he is so fond on other occasions, at least linguistically, would not consider holding back or pulling back a little. Now I want to argue that proposition at somewhat fair length when we hit the last bill that I suspect we will be dealing with in this series—that is, Bill 48—but I thought it wise at this time to get the matter before you so that the hon. minister can begin his ruminatious. I guess that covers our proposition on this tax.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I should apologize to the minister for the necessity of him having to set me straight on that rebate.

I think he is aware that rebates to farmers for the use of motor vehicle fuel, such as gasoline—and now, if this bill passes, for diesel fuel—will be paid in full, but that there is a gradation downward if there is a time lapse in the application for the repayment. I think that may have been the cause of some of the confusion because from time to time certain farmers do not get that application back in just at the right time.

That is another matter, but it deals indirectly with this bill, because under its provisions diesel fuel will be treated in precisely the same way. Until now—and I believe I am right—the tax was not applied to diesel fuel as described under this particular statute, that was used off the road. Now it will have to be paid; the farmers will have to pay the tax and apply for a rebate, just as they now do for gasoline.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: No? That is not right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If I may correct the hon. member, the plan for diesel fuel is that he will register at his supplier and he will get the fuel tax-free thereafter.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh well, that is great. Now that is a very valuable piece of information, and I can only say that there was a time—

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That is good.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: —when the same regulation applied for gasoline. I suppose that it is easier to cheat with gasoline, which means that the government took the care to move to the position where the farmer would pay the tax and then have to apply in a certified form for the rebate.

I would simply tell the minister that it is very convenient to have a registration which would permit the tax not to be paid in the first instance.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I always worry about the farmers.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well I wish that the minister would worry to the extent that he would apply the method that he described in his interjection a moment ago to gasoline tax as well.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If it is possible, it will be done, but it may not be practical.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Well, I am telling the minister that that would be great.

An hon. member: Put a little colour in the gasoline.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Only if it is possible and practical.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: There is just one other point—excuse me, I didn't quite finish there.

One of the points that concern the dealers is that the cost of the fuel, including the tax that would normally be payable, has to be carried on the dealers' books for a considerable length of time, frequently before those funds are paid off. It does apply to gasoline, now eligible for the tax rebate, over a period of time and, as it might have applied, under this statute as well. But this means that a great deal of credit is carried on the books of some of these dealers and this is one of the concerns that has been expressed to me and I promised to pass it on to the minister. His interjection, however, removes a large part of that difficulty.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I only have a brief comment. The tax base is being widened and there is provision for partial refunds

and provision for persons being denied the benefit of partial refunds. I would hope that, to avoid the bill having to go to committee of the whole House, in making his reply the minister would address himself specifically to the nature of the partial exemptions which may be granted and the reasons for the widening of the tax base in this all-inclusive manner, as set out in the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to enter the debate?

Mr. Good: I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Thank you. I would like to ask the minister to reply. In dealing with the sale of stove oil, which is basically the same as fuel oil, will there be a process there for registration or will the tax be paid and refunded after it is used?

I understand there was a considerable amount of abuse of the system formerly where warehouses and offices were heated with space heaters. It was the opinion of some that a considerable amount of what was sold as stove oil was used as diesel fuel by some transport companies. Has this been one of the reasons why the rebate must be applied for? How extensive was this abuse?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is one of the reasons.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, on the debate at second reading the members may speak to the bill. The minister may reply at the end of the debate.

Are there any other hon. members who wish to enter the debate?

The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank you, sir. With your permission—I don't intend to get into the whole question of the philosophy of the road-user tax. The former Treasurer (Mr. MacNaughton), and if I recall correctly, the then leader of the New Democratic Party, were most effective several years ago in an analysis of the propriety of that system. But I want to relate a story, if I might, as to something that is happening daily in the Province of Ontario that we should attempt to rectify and I don't know how we can rectify it.

During the course of my travels from Sarnia, I normally travel down Highways 7 and 22 and up Highway 81, into the Lambeth area. Near Delaware there is a fine truck stop where I would say at almost any time of the day and night you could find 15 of these huge tractor trailers because of the quality of the food—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): And the goodlooking girls.

Mr. Bullbrook: And perhaps the quality of the service also, I am not sure. But in any event, I recall one time sitting there and talking with several of the Ogden and Moffat Co. drivers out of Michigan, and we got around to the purchase of diesel duel.

I said: "I notice you stop here to eat," and their rejoinder was about the quality of the food.

I said: "Do you ever buy any diesel fuel here?"

They said: "No, none of us ever buys any diesel fuel in the Province of Ontario."

I said: "Well, what do you do?"

They said: "When you get to Detroit and you get to Port Huron, you load up right there and you go all the way through to Buffalo or Fort Erie."

That's what they do. As the Treasurer coming from our area of the province recognizes, there is tremendous traffic coming from the Chicago area, Michigan, to come extent Indiana and Ohio, through and down into the eastern states, and they utilize our facilities. They utilize Highway 401 and the extensions further easterly.

There is something radically wrong there. Not only do we have to build our highways at a cost of, I believe, of nine times what it would normally cost for private motor vehicular traffic, because of the burden of these huge transport trailers, but there is to me something again, not only reprehensible but almost noxious in the concept that these huge tractor trailers are using our facilities day in and day out and paying literally not one cent of tax for them. The response that I got on that occasion, and on inquiries made since then, is that their capacity is quite sufficient to load up at Port Huron and Detroit, go all the way through the Province of Ontario, connect back with the United States using our highways and paying no tax for it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A good point: What is the government going to do about that?

Mr. Speaker: Does the other member wish to enter the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, insofar as the widening of the tax base is concerned,

if I may read a note which may explain it to the hon. member for Riverdale, I think this is what he asked.

> In connection with the widening of the generation of power by means of internal combustion, the definition of "fuel tank" is clarified, "motor vehicle" is redefined to include all motor vehicles (not just those on highways), and "purchaser" is redefined in terms of use of fuel.

That will answer the question of the hon. member for Sarnia as well—

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue with the explanatory note:

> As a result of the redefinition of "purchaser," the definition of "storage tank" has become unnecessary and therefore that definition is repealed.

The purpose of the first part of the explanation is that only those machines which are used off-highway for farming purposes are exempt and not fuel used for combusion engines, for example, in industries which, because of the way the Act is written, presently is exempt.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was saying to the hon. member for Sarnia when he was occupied another way, the term "use" will solve the problem which he has raised, because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Who is going to make them pay the taxes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Subsection 1 of section 2 will now read:

> Every purchaser shall pay to the Treasurer a tax at the rate of 25 cents per imperial gallon on all fuel received or used in Ontario by him to generate power in a motor vehicle.

Heretofore it read: ". . . fuel received by him." This means that there is an arrangement made so that—

Mr. Bullbrook: Oh there is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —it will be whatever he uses on our highways.

Mr. Bullbrook: Very good. May I ask a question? Was it a reciprocal agreement with the bordering states?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, with the provinces.

Mr. Bullbrook: With the provinces?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but there will be not too much problem. They feel that this can be checked. We'll make arrangements with the trucking companies to check their mileages here and, on some formula, decide what fuel has been used in accordance with the mileage, and so on.

Mr. Ruston: You have to buy a permit.

Mr. Bullbrook: Recognizing this isn't the nature of a question-and-answer period on second reading, if you would permit me, though, if it is not purchased here and we don't have any reciprocal agreement with the taxing jurisdiction, how does the Province of Ontario get its money? For example, if they fill up in Port Huron and go all the way through, notwithstanding that fuel is used here, if we don't have any reciprocity with the state of Michigan there's no way the minister has any ability to collect any tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can tell the member I've asked the same question. My staff tells me that this is possible, I think by way of the weighing stations on the highways. They will check the mileage. In any case, they're usually dealing with large trucking companies and they make their arrangements with them.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Are the minister's aides nodding?

Mr. Renwick: I don't see them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, they are nodding. I'm not too sure if it's an enthusiastic nod. Is it an enthusiastic nod? I think they're just as hopeful as I am, let's put it that way. But—

Mr. Renwick: No, I think they are just trying to bail the minister out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —it's a good attempt to get at the problem the hon. member raised.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: Ride through the state of Georgia.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, if we're not going on to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is asking a question about how it's going to be administered—if I may, Mr. Speaker.

On the question of how it will be administered, I obviously can't go into all of those details. My staff says this is the way they

think they can get at this problem. If it turns out that they can't because of the way the powers have been written into the Act or the regulations, then we'll have to come back for more changes. They feel this can be done and this is an attempt to get at that problem, to resolve that problem. I think the hon. members will agree it's a good thing to try.

Mr. Paterson: If they can do it in the United States—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The motion is for second reading of Bill 41.

I understand there were some arrangements or agreements entered into that certain of these bills would be stacked. Do I understand this correctly? Is it the wish of the House that this particular bill be stacked with Bill 40?

Mr. Renwick: We requested it to be stacked, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Will this go to third reading, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It hasn't been passed yet.

Mr. Deans: Oh no, to committee.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I thought normally you would put the bill to the tests of the "ayes" and "nays" and if it did not carry then, instead of having a division that might have been required, we would then stack it.

Mr. Speaker: All right! Of course there is no provision in the standing orders for stacking at second reading; it applies to committee work. However, if there is in fact unanimous consent of the House, that's the manner in which we shall deal with it.

The motion is for second reading of Bill 41. Is it the pleasure of the House the motion carry?

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. Deans: We would want it stacked.

Mr. Speaker: Do the hon. members agree that this bill should then be stacked with Bill 40?

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I thought the member for Riverdale said it would go for third reading.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before you go to the 18th order, we ask that the bill go to committee.

Mr. Renwick: If the explanations had been satisfactory we would have gone to third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Well the stacking provision, of course, is to determine if the House is going to be divided.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: The House is going to be divided—and obviously the House indicated by challenging the decision on the voice vote that there would be a division on Bill 41—therefore, we're stacking it with Bill 40. Is this correct?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, but we want it to go to committee.

Mr. Deans: Just by way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, on Bill 40 we agreed not to go to committee. On Bill 41 we asked to go to committee. Although we want a standing vote on both bills it is our intention to—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Bill 42 has been carried.

Mr. Deans: —ask that this bill go to committee after the standing vote, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: I have my order paper marked that Bill 42 has been ordered for third reading.

Mr. Lawlor: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: That Bill 40 will be stacked —I presume a voice vote was taken on Bill 40—

Mr. Renwick: That's right.

Mr. Speaker: —in the same manner in which a voice vote was taken on Bill 41 and the indication is that the House would be divided.

Mr. Renwick: Right.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, when we complete all of this group of bills, the stacking arrangements will be put to the House by way of motion, then the House will be divided if that's the wish of the members.

Mr. Deans: That's correct.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Agreed.

LOGGING TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 46, An Act to Repeal the Logging Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, it's apparent in looking through the report of the Department of Revenue, at page 17, that this tax is the most costly to collect of the various taxes which are administered by this department. In the earlier discussions with respect to the amendments to the Land Transfer Tax Act, one thing that could have been said was that it is the least expensive, costing only some 33 cents out of $100 of revenue. As the amounts increase through the other taxes that are collected by this department we note, for example, that retail sales tax costs $2.34 per hundred, the motor vehicle fuel tax costs $2.74 per hundred, and by far the largest at $7.72 per hundred dollars of revenue, is the logging tax.

On the basis of ordinary economics it would appear that this kind of a tax is too expensive to collect. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is not sufficient for this government to come before us and suggest a repeal of the Logging Tax Act unless we are given some alternative. I think it most important for this minister to advise us when he brings this bill forward, what the government proposes to do in order to ensure that we are receiving satisfactory tax revenues from the various natural resources of the province.

Mr. Speaker, as I had suggested to you, the collection costs here are very high and that perhaps could be the satisfactory reason to have this tax repealed. The net revenues, at least in 1971, were $1,696,000. This is not a particularly large amount when you look at something like the retail sales tax which brings in $674 million. But the tax may still have a value if it is in effect giving us some revenues from our natural resources.

We in this party believe that these resources must be used to the benefit of the people of this province and the taxes must be collected accordingly. It may well be that the logging tax, as such, is not the form in which we should be receiving revenues; there may be many better ways. I am suggesting to the minister that before we vote on this bill in support of the removal of this tax, that he advise us what he intends to do in order to make sure that we are receiving the kind of benefits we should receive.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, on this one let us refer again to the fact that these forms of taxation, I suppose, only basically come up really about every four years; and such a plenary move as is being made in this case —wiping out a taxation field—ought to be given a fairly thorough perusal. Smith says about this tax, in recommendation 33(4):

> In the negotiations for general federal-provincial fiscal agreements, Ontario offered to repeal the logging Tax Act in return for an additional share of income taxes imposed upon taxpayers engaged in logging that approximates the present net return to Ontario from the existing logging tax arrangements; and pending such repeal the Logging Tax Act be amended by the enactment of a loss carryover provision similar to those included in the federal Income Tax Act and the Corporations Tax Act for Ontario.

Ignoring Smith with a cavalier wave of the hand and without making any provision along the lines of the alternative that he suggests—or finding any way whereby to compensate the government—the minister is, —in effect, wiping out in excess of $1-million-worth of revenue from this source alone. The whole revenue that we get from our forest industries in the minister's estimates of this year in $14.1 million, and the cost to us of running the forests is $25 million; almost twice as much in government expenditure in terms of firefighting, forest protection, and in terms of reforestation costs; almost twice as much of the public treasury in these regards to help the industry involved here. And what does the industry return to the province of Ontario in this regard? I say less than half of what comes out of the public purse.

Surely, on any conceivable basis—and Smith argues at great length, and the Minister of Revenue should peruse this with great acumen and care—something called economic rent is an accessible thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to make notes and at the same time listen to the hon. member. The hon. member suggested that this is only—

Mr. Speaker: Order please!

I should like to determine if any other members wish to participate in the debate before the minister replies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am just asking a question, Mr. Speaker, so I can make some

notes here. Did the hon. member say that this is the only revenue that is received from the loggers?

Mr. Lawlor: No, of course I didn't. Nevertheless if you did read Smith carefully, you'll see that in these extraordinary industries which are benefitting from our natural resources at least the cost of the maintenance of the industry in terms of the expenditure of government in that industry should be recouped by that government. This government, unlike the Province of Quebec, wants to do its own reforestation—there the industry does its reforestation and bears the cost of that. Their costs are somewhat less and their revenue therefore happens to be, in terms of the services rendered by the government to the industry, somewhat commensurate.

In this province not only do we do the whole reforestation programme through provincial coffers, we also give forest fire protection. Surely, whatever corporation taxes they pay, whatever benefit redounds through the payment of wages and salaries back to the income stream—leaving that quite aside—the government ought not to place itself in a position where it can't recoup costs of forest fire protection with airplanes and otherwise and with respect to planting the trees to begin with. The industries are the beneficiaries of an actual growth and the exploiters of that growth—and if we can't see fit to have enough rationality and sense of balance that that kind of money ought to be returnable capital, now what do you do? I say about 50 per cent of the moneys that we expend in this regard flows back into us in order to recompense us for this outlay.

The government is cutting into that again by the abolition of the Logging Tax Act. You know, the Logging Tax Act has all kinds of faults connected with it; the way in which the assessments are made; the internal administration of the thing is onerous and difficult, full of complexities—and that's not the way taxing Acts ought to be. Instead of coming forward with a revamping of the method as to how to tax forest resources, the minister simply wipes it out. It is the most thoughtless, the most hopelessly empty piece of business that we have seen.

The government wipes taxes out without supplanting them from any other source. What needs to be done in this province in this regard—and we in the committee, the Smith committee on taxation spent as much time as we could on the whole of forestry taxation, but it was altogether too late; it was toward the end of our deliberations. I remember spending an evening with Bob Macauley and the former chief of the forest branch, who had retired and who had issued an omnifarious report about 6,000 pages long. He sat with us that evening; we really couldn't get into the matter.

Smith proposed tenure fees in line with what has continued in many other jurisdictions and was being introduced at that time in New Brunswick, supplanting both the Crown dues charges as they presently exist and the logging taxes. In other words he wanted a revamped theory of forest taxation.

We weren't able to assess that. We didn't have enough expertise; we didn't have enough time; we didn't have enough feed-in to the committee by way of logistics and experts to help us. I would suggest the Minister of Revenue set up within his own department a task force in this particular regard—I know it is a policy issue but the Treasurer is surely overburdened with these issues—to settle in the minister's own mind and he is an equitable man, to what extent we can achieve a greater balance between the outgo in this regard and the inflow which is being cut into.

I would think that he should do that in the forest industry. It's long overdue; the thing's a quagmire with the intricate assessments that have to be made with both kinds of dues that are operative. I would not place it within the bounds of the provincial Secretary for Natural Resources. It's a kind of an area set aside to itself which ought to be more deeply interrogated.

Well, we are opposed to this measure, obviously, and precisely because you don't bear out in your own terms or in the terms of the select committee what steps ought to be taken in this particular regard. It is as though that committee never existed. It is as though Smith goes down the drain without having left any impact at all, not even a scratch on the rather hard hides of the ministers over there, and now this minister who has assumed the responsibility in this regard. You don't bleed an inch. You patch up your tiny wound and go away laughing.

But I think that we are doing a grave disservice to the people of Ontario—since you are going to coercively bring this measure into being shortly anyhow—if you don't supplant it with a revamping, a review and a more penetrating analysis of what tax revenues are derivable from the forest industry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh wait a minute, Mr. Speaker, I will if I may—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, you will note that I have on the agenda and in the order paper of today a reasoned amendment under this particular head, which the minister no doubt knows all about.

Mr. Deans: Move it.

Mr. Lawlor: Do I have to move it?

Mr. Deans: Move it.

Mr. Lawlor: I move, seconded by Mr. Stokes, that the motion for second reading—

Mr. Deans: He's not here. Someone else.

Mr. Lawlor: Oh, seconded by Mr. Renwick—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. J. A. Jessiman (Fort William): I don't know whether he agrees with you.

Mr. Lawlor: —by Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Speaker, that the motion for second reading be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and substituting therefor the words:

That this bill be not now read a second time, in order that:

1. The government consider its basic policy with respect to natural resource taxation, and in particular respecting the structure of taxation in the area of forestry resources.

2. With the elimination of the Logging Tax Act, what has been a source of substantial revenue in past years is being abolished without comparable alternative benefits being conferred on the consolidated revenue fund, in a manner set out in the recommendation of the Ontario committee on taxation or otherwise, and any responsible government ought to pause before such a situation.

3. Further consideration be given to expanding the revenue yield form this natural resource, which is in a continual process of decline – that is, the natural resource taxation—by revising the Crown dues concept, or by proceeding on a tenure principle, which will effectively increase the said yield; or, at the very least, place in some balance the expenditures of the provincial government on reforestation and fire protection services against the income derivable from this source.

4. Some profound thought be given to the principle of "economic rent" as outlined cursorily by the said committee and by the select committee on taxation, as the fundament upon which to guide taxation policy in this area of our partially renewable resources.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the short form, is it?

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreeable to accept this motion as it appears on the notice paper?

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make a few comments on the repealing of this Act and I must echo the sentiments already expressed both by the member for Kitchener and the member who just spoke. I think it is rather derelict of the minister actually to come before this House to ask for the repeal of a bill that provides revenue to the Province of Ontario without having studied, or coming before us and giving us an outline of, just where he proposes to make up the revenue so lost, and to deal with the whole matter of taxation of the forest products.

We have other statutes, other tax Acts, the stumpage dues and ground rent payments, and yet the minister has not mentioned these. I trust he will give us some idea before we vote on this bill just what approach the government is going to take in this regard. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Quebec government has repealed the ground rent and stumpage dues on its timber resources to try to stimulate the forest industry in that province. We have been through this debate many times in the Legislature during the estimates of the Department of Lands and Forests and discussion of the poor performance that has been evident by this government in stimulating and expanding the forest industry in Ontario.

I put this forward as a suggestion to the minister. I think that the tax revenues that will be lost by this Logging Tax Act being wiped out and perhaps by doing away with Crown rent and stumpage dues could be made up and perhaps even increased by increasing the tax on corporation income of those firms doing business involving the use of our natural wood resources.

I would hope that the minister has something more to say and to contribute than a defence of this bill and the rescinding of it, because if this is all he is going to do here today, we cannot really support this bill.

Particularly in light of the developments in the industry and the non-developments in

the industry of Ontario, surely the minister and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) should have their heads together to come up with some kind of new tax approach to the renewable resource industry of this province. I would hope the minister will shed some light on that aspect before the vote.

Again I would repeat for his consideration, Mr. Speaker, that he give some time to considering repealing the wide range of other taxes on the forest industry and perhaps consolidating them in one tax that perhaps would be on the income of the companies that make a profit on the renewable resources of this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

Mr. Stokes: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to agree with the remarks made by all previous speakers and to expand somewhat on the possibility of convincing the minister that he is going to have to have some kind of legislation to cover the void left by the repeal of the logging tax.

I want to refer specifically to those people who hold licences on large tracts of timber resources, particularly in northern Ontario, where the minister did have some control over them and the way our forest resources were harvested by section 6(2), wherein:

> Every person, whether or not he is liable to pay tax under this Act for a taxation year and whether or not he has filed a return under subsection 1, shall, upon receipt at any time of demand therefore in writing from the minister, file forthwith with the minister a return of his income for that year containing such information as is required.

Now the tax, as it was imposed, didn't necessarily mean that a person had to be physically engaged in harvesting or cutting the wood. If he held the licence to the timber, he could in many instances farm it out to others who were responsible for filing a return and were subject to the logging tax as a result of those activities.

In the case of people who are sort of dealing at arm's length but who hold the licence to certain tracts of land—that's still going to go on even with the repeal of this Act—I wonder what provisions this minister has made or does he hope to make in order to see that those people pay their fair share for the management, the protection and the wise use of our forest resources.

He is not giving up a large amount of money in the overall scheme of things in the forest industry by forfeiting the right to about $1.6 million annually by way of a tax for the use of our resources, but I suspect that this government is going to come under increasing criticism because of its unwillingness to extract sufficient funds from the users of those resources in order to justify the expenditures that it is making for silviculture, reforestation, fire protection and general forest management purposes.

It seems to me that the Ministry of Natural Resources, and in particular the timber branch, is spending well in excess of the amount of money collected, although the minister is going to say that the Hedlin Menzies report's analysis of the forest products industry's contributions to the general economy sort of counterbalances the amount of money expended by the province.

But we on this side of the House don't feel that he can do that and justify his unwillingness to extract an amount of money from the harvesting of our natural resources which would be commensurate with the amount of money he is putting in in order to make it a viable part of the economy.

I think that the Minister of Revenue and the Treasurer have not only the responsibility but the obligation to see that the people who are responsible for creating that new wealth get something close to that contribution, if not by a logging tax, an increase in stumpage dues, an increase in fire protection charges or an increase in ground rental charges, then by a direct resource tax that would be channelled back to the communities and the people living in those communities who owe their existence and location in those places to the exploitation of a resource that is so important to the economy of this province and particularly the two-thirds of the province that lie north of the French River which contain most of our forest resources.

This minister is going to have to take a much more realistic look at the amount of money that is spent in making the industry viable, as opposed to the amount of money that he extracts from the industry, and make it more equitable with the amount of dollars that accrue to the economy.

I am particularly making an appeal on behalf of the people who work in the forest industry. I would like to draw the minister's attention to a community like Geraldton, which has no ability at all, on its own, to tax the forest industry because the industry is located outside of the jurisdiction. The

government has made some provision, however inadequate, for mining municipalities to share in some of the increased wealth by the mining revenue payments. But it has made no provisions whatsoever for people living in communities that owe their existence to the forest industry and in communities that are the dormitory communities for people who make their livelihood in those industries, but without the ability to tax that industry to provide basic services.

So I think he has the responsibility—and not necessarily through a new tax—to see that some of the present tax, whether it is done by way of stumpage dues or corporation taxes, is returned. I see his colleague, the former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle), looks up from time to time; I think he will agree with me that many of those small communities in his riding, such as Hearst and Calstock, do in fact lack the ability to extract sufficient dollars from the industry in order to pay for basic services that people are demanding today. I am talking about water, sewage, an adequate road structures—all of the things that people in many parts of this province take for granted but which those northern communities lack because of their inability to garner sufficient tax dollars in order to provide those basic services.

So while the government has withdrawn what is a relatively inconsequential amount of dollars, all I am saying is that it should have found an alternative where the amount of dollars would have been much in excess of what it is gaining from the resource industry at the present time, but it would have been much easier to collect. I think the government is going to have to come up with what I would choose to call a resource tax, which will provide necessary tax dollars for people who are creating the new wealth. I think the government is going to have to come up with an alternative. I don't think that it can just say: "It was an insignificant amount so therefore we should forget about it." I agree, it is an insignificant amount, but it should be much larger.

I suggest to this minister that he must act along those lines and I think that if he reads once again the amendment placed by my colleague, he will see that it has a great deal of merit and I hope he will take it into consideration.

Mr. Renwick: The minister will support it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the repeal of the Logging Tax Act does anything—does much—for the coffers of the province, nor does it do much for the forest industry itself. What it does, in effect, is take away from those companies that are showing a profit, a small portion of that profit, because of the tax credits available to them through the agreements with the federal government.

I would think, in light of the fact that the minister and the government are not moving to any other type of tax on the resource, that perhaps an extension of this tax and relief provided through the reduction or the doing away with stumpage taxes and ground rental payments, could provide more funds to the coffers of the province, and at the same time help those industries in the northern part of the province that are in difficulty. If they are in difficulty, a part of the charges that are made against their profits is in the form of ground rental payments and stumpage charges, which are applied inequitably both to those companies that are prospering and those that aren't.

This tax, on the other hand, is at least applied to the profits that companies are making. I would agree with the sentiments that have been expressed by most of the speakers up to this point that the repeal of the Logging Tax Act, with no other alternatives being provided, does nothing for the industry and provides little or no change at all in the income to the province.

I would then suggest that the government, rather than propose this bill, should look at the industry as a whole in order that those parts of the industry that are creating employment in the northern part of the province without profit would be given more incentives, whereas those industries that are reaping larger profits from the natural resources should pay more.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Just one brief comment, Mr. Speaker. I reject the repealing of this tax, not only for the reasons outlined by previous speakers—and particularly my colleague, the hon. member for the riding of Thunder Bay—but also because there is no apparent justification on the government's side in terms of creating jobs in the north.

If the repealing of this tax had led, or the government could demonstrate that the

repealing of this tax would lead to a concrete increase in jobs in the logging industry, I might have been willing to consider agreeing with the government on it. But the government has not put forward such justification; and for all the other inequities that this tax symbolizes, that previous speakers have mentioned, I would like to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Gilbertson (Algoma): There is the logger, right there now.

Mr. Ferrier: There is the maple sugar king over there. I saw him on television the other day.

Mr. Deans: All of the reasons that have been given by the previous speakers are, of course, worthy of support. The reasoned amendment of my colleague lays out succinctly the reasons why we in this party do not find it possible to support the repealing of this tax. But there is more to it than that. I have sat in this House for 4½ years, and I have.—

Mr. Gilbertson: Too long!

Mr. Deans: —seen this government move along the path toward taxing the poor to sustain the corporate rich. And this is just another example in the long path that they have followed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Man the barricades.

Mr. Deans: We have seen in the last 4½ years the diminshing returns from the corporate tax structure. We have seen the government use the machinery tax rebate as a means of putting more money into the pockets of their friends.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): They are the member's friends too.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: We have seen the government use the taxing structure in the last two or three weeks to provide additional revenues for their friends in the brewing and in the distilling industries.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Jessiman: What about the member's friends?

Mr. Deans: We have seen the government in the last two or three weeks use the taxing structures to provide money for their friends in the tobacco manufacturing industry—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ferrier: That's getting to them. That's got them upset.

Mr. Jessiman: They have increased their majority in the last election too.

Mr. Deans: —and this is just another step in the long haul down the road toward removing any sense of the corporate taxpayer paying his share.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: Now you might say with some justification that this is only a million and a half, or a little better than a million and a half, in terms of dollars; but it's not the dollars that are at stake in this thing, it is the principle. And the principle is shameful. The principle is that we are fed up seeing the poor paying to keep the rich going.

We are fed up in this party, seeing this government increase the cost of entry to provincial parks, putting an additional burden on the poorer sectors of the province. We in this party are fed up seeing the government add to the cost of crossing bridges by increased tolls. We are fed up with seeing this government—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Perhaps the hon. member would speak to this bill.

Mr. Deans: Oh, it's very much to the point of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion it is not.

Mr. Deans: We'll find out; we'll find out.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Hamilton East): They don't like the truth over there.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: And what we are saying to them is this. That every single time this government decides it needs to raise money, it turns to that sector of the economy that is most hard pressed. It raises tax after tax after tax while at the same time giving additional handouts to its corporate friends.

Mr. Renwick: Always. Every time.

Mr. Carruthers: Terrible corporations.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Stokes: Socialism for the rich.

Mr. Deans: And that is the reason we're opposed.

Mr. Renwick: The corporate welfare state.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gilbertson: May God help the logger.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): God help the loggers!

Mr. Stokes: The biggest welfare recipients in this province are the corporations.

Mr. Martel: God help the brewers too.

Mr. Ferrier: Did they raise the wages of the people working in the woods?

Mr. Deans: When we look at the general taxing philosophy—and it's difficult to deal with one individual tax without looking at the overall philosophy of taxation of this government—you can't just simply look and say: "Well, this is only one tax". It's one more by the government at this time in a series of moves; and that series of moves is in the process of creating tremendous hardship for other people in the Province of Ontario, while at the same time relieving the burden on the corporate sector. And we don't happen to like it.

Let me say to the minister, I suspect in the next week or two he is going to be faced by his cabinet colleagues with a bill for $2 million as they go trotting off to France to purchase this executive jet aircraft that the government is going to spend $2 million to buy. And this minister is then going to be wondering where to raise the money.

Well perhaps the priorities again are wrong. Perhaps the government ought not to be buying it at all, but if it is bent on spending the taxpayers' money on frivolous things, then for goodness' sake it should raise the money from the sector which can afford it.

So I say to you—

Mr. Gilbertson: What did the taxpayers decide last October?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Deans: We in this party believe that the resources of this province belong to the people. We believe that it is necessary to have an equitable tax structure that recovers from the sale and use of those resources sufficient money to recompense the people of this province for their loss, and this is not occurring.

I say to this minister that by this tiny move — and it is small — by this tiny move he reinforces all of the things that we have seen occurring in this House, and for that reason we oppose the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? If not, the hon. minister.

An hon. member: What can he say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. member what I can say. I will tell him that he has not done his research, that's what's happened here. The hon. member for Wentworth—

Mr. Deans: We have done our research. We see the pattern develop.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member had done his research he would not have made that kind of statement—and I am very kind to him because I love him—he would not have made the statement that if some of my colleagues want to buy an airplane they would come to the Minister of Revenue for the funds. Because one doesn't come to the Minister of Revenue for funds. The Minister of Revenue raises the funds which are provided for in the budget and nothing else.

Mr. Deans: I say the minister and his cabinet colleagues —

Mr. Renwick: The minister collects the funds but he doesn't pay them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Nothing else. He doesn't. Those are the only funds he deals with.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is a spendthrift.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the recommendations that have been made by the hon. members opposite—

Mr. Renwick: We knew the minister would be too ashamed to reply.

Mr. Deans: I can understand the minister's embarrassment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In respect to some other tax which they think should take the place of the logging tax which we are asking to be repealed. This comes in the field of general tax policy. And it is the first time since I got up with these bills that I am going to have to resort to what I was hoping I wouldn't have to resort to, and say that because they come within the purview of

general tax policy, this would have to be taken up with the Treasury, because I really don't have anything to do with that as Minister of Revenue exclusively.

Mr. Renwick: We give the minister credit for being embarrassed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now the question then Mr. Speaker, comes down to this. Is this a good tax? Is it a proper tax? Does it accomplish anything? And if it does, we should continue it; if it doesn't we should drop it. I'll tell you what this—

Mr. Deans: It is better than no tax at all.

Mr. Renwick: It is better than none.

Mr. Deans: It is better than no tax at all.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll tell you what this tax accomplishes. It accomplishes nothing but a nuisance for citizens across this province and—

Mr. Foulds: Not for citizens, but for corporate institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —for the government.

Now, let me tell you what the facts are now. The logging tax revenue collected for the government in the fiscal year just passed was $636,000.

Mr. Deans: That is a shame. That is shameful.

Mr. Renwick: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are talking about the Logging Tax Act as it exists today and whether we should continue it or repeal it.

Mr. Deans: Then the minister should have been here asking for a new bill.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, if the hon. member will wait, I'll explain the facts to him and perhaps he will change his mind, withdraw the amendment and vote for the bill.

Mr. Renwick: No.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Allowing for departmental costs to collect the logging tax revenue and allowing for the reduction of one-third of the logging tax credit against Ontario corporations' income tax, the net revenue works out as follows:

The logging tax revenue, as I have mentioned, is $636,215—

Mr. Stokes: Shame!

Mr. Deans: It is a shameful admission that the minister would come into this House and say that is all the government is getting.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —less one-third! Well does the hon. member want to hear this, or does he not?

Mr. Deans: I have got all night.

An hon. member: Obviously he doesn't.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well all right! Give me all night. Less one-third of the Ontario logging tax credit which is $212,072 for a figure of $424,143. It now costs about $150,000 to collect that, which gives us a net of $274,143. Now, let's find out what we have to do to get that money.

There are in excess of 500 individuals who are required by law to file logging tax returns.

Mr. Deans: What an explanation; what an explanation!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because of the exemption of the first $10,000 of logging tax income, the majority of the individuals are non-taxable. Nevertheless, a great deal of administrative work has to be done to determine whether or not an individual is liable for the tax, if and when he can be located; which means a constant harassment of the potential taxpayers only to discover that in most cases no tax is due.

Mr. Deans: It doesn't bother the minister that we get no revenue from this resource.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are 192 individuals and 324 corporations on the active tax roll, which at one time or another paid logging taxes depending on their activities during any particular year. Of this total, 150 paid logging tax in the last five years. That is, of 192 individuals and 324 corporations in the last five years, only 150 paid logging tax; and this was reduced to 75 for the year ending March 31, 1972.

Mr. Renwick: Shocking, shocking!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now, I appeal to the hon. members—

Mr. Martel: With a shotgun no less.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —whether they think that for this amount of money we should harass about 500-odd people; chase them all over the province; make them file returns; check their books to get this kind of money—a tax which produces so little.

Mr. Foulds: Why does the government always have such concern for companies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Now if the hon. members think there should be some other tax to replace this, that is another ballgame.

Mr. Deans: Right!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I pointed that out at the outset of my remarks. This is in the field of general tax policy. They should discuss this when they are speaking on the budget debate and bring it to the attention of the Treasurer; and then I suppose he will debate the matter or take it under advisement.

Mr. Stokes: Will this minister do it too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course I will—everything that is being discussed here today. I am sure the hon. Treasurer will be interested in finding out whether I was able to get along without his assistance —

Mr. Reid: Well the minister is not. The minister is not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —having regard for his knowledge of all these bills. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. members to reject the amendment and vote for the bill.

Mr. Martel: The minister had better count heads.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Grossman had moved second reading of Bill 46; Mr. Lawlor had introduced a reasoned amendment that the motion for second reading of Bill 46 intituled, An Act to repeal the Logging Tax Act, be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and substituting therefor the words "this bill not now be read a second time" and certain other words following it.

The question to be decided, of course, is whether or not the bill shall now be read a second time. I therefore put that motion to the House: Shall the bill be now read a second time?

Those in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

This will stand stacked with Bill 40 and Bill 41.

RACE TRACKS TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 47, An Act to amend the Race Tracks Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, only a brief comment with respect to this bill. The whole purpose of remuneration of tax collectors has been something which the select committee on taxation referred to; I am sure the hon. member for Lakeshore will give us the details.

Mr. Renwick: Just speak on the general principles. My friend will fill in the details.

Mr. Breithaupt: There are certain particular areas in which this remuneration should be cancelled, and I do believe this is one of them. The opposition, I believe, will support this bill, and the fact that remuneration is removed from the funds which are collected by the racetrack operators is something I think all members of the House can support.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, we do support the legislation in question here.

There is an interesting thing on it set out in Smith at page 289. He says:

> There is no doubt, however, that wagers or winnings at the track certainly provide a ready source of funds that can be taxed. By insinuating itself into the circulation stream, the province is in a position to draw off its six per cent quickly, quietly and efficiently. The tax is simple, certain, clear and painless. There is almost universal agreement that gambling is a suitable object for taxation. We share that view.

They point out that under the Criminal Code the track can only retain nine per cent of the take; the federal government has a tax of 0.5 per cent—it may be higher now, I don't know—and then the provincial government edges in for its share.

As far as the remuneration concept is concerned, again basically and particularly since this is directed to those corporate enterprises within the stream of the economics of this province that should well be able to bear that, therefore our reservation expressed earlier with respect to the little fellow is not applicable here.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak? If not; the hon. minister.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed to.

SECURITY TRANSFER TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 45, An Act to amend the Security Transfer Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill, my comments would be the same as on the previous bill. I believe that the removal of payments for collection under the Security Transfer Tax Act is a worthwhile piece of legislation. I believe the House should support this bill.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: The revenue yield from this particular tax is going up quite remarkably. In 1969-1970 it was $6.96 million. It went down in the next year, to $6.7 million. The estimate for 1972-1973 is $8 million. So this is a goodly source of tax. The Smith committee again, or Smith himself rather, recommends:

> The security transfer tax be abolished, and commissions charged by security dealers and brokers for their services be taxable under the retail sales tax; and for this purpose, where no commission is charged by a security dealer or broker, a reasonable commission be deemed to have been charged.

Again, as in an earlier statute with respect to the land transfer tax, the theory is basically that the retail sales tax ought to accrue to commissions.

There are some complexities involved in that situation. Smith claims that this is basically a nuisance tax, and that it is perfectly feasible and possible to tax security agents in transferring funds into transfer books of corporations through the stock exchange in a perfectly reasonable way, as he would do to the real estate profession.

If the government is looking for future sources of revenue these two areas very well may be considered. The representations made to us, the select committee, by the members of the Toronto Stock Exchange were so horrendous, so blinding in their ultimate consequences, that we shrivelled up in fear in face of these fellows and said, "Oh, no." They told us about the New York Stock Exchange, how, in face of a similar tax being imposed by Rockefeller, they had threatened to migrate to New Jersey, where they were going to have a haven, and they said that the same thing would happen to us. If we imposed taxation on them in this province on transfers of securities, off they would go to Montreal.

I don't know how many of us were blandished by that. I notice many of the committee with their tails down, running for cover in various directions—mostly Tories—but I can't, again, think that Bob Macaulay was in the least fazed.

He said: "Gentlemen, if you don't want to do your security business in Ontario, then take it elsewhere. We just doubt whether you, like flies around the honey pot, will depart from the area where the dough is." And that must be the theory. When Rockefeller faced them down they stayed in New York, of course, and took the brunt of the tax. It is not all that great. On this particular thing where basically wealthy people are dealing in securities and the bulk of the population never see these things, then there's no reason in the world why the tax ought not to be imposed. So in this particular regard and with respect to the compensations being paid, we would take the Act, as I said.

We want the minister again, at least in considering it in the last few days, not to bow out on the basis of not being a policy policy.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I didn't say that.

Mr. Lawlor: Under the circumstances, to stand up on taxation measures at all is a completely gratuitous undertaking. If—and this was my complaint with all previous revenue ministers—you broke the shell and allowed the yolk to emerge, this would be a good thing. Otherwise, as far as I'm concerned, what are we supposed to do with these taxation bills Are we supposed to stand up and cite some statistics to you? Are we supposed to get behind what they're all about? That's the most ridiculous portfolio, if such is the case.

As far as I'm conceerned, I shall continue to speak of policy and to move into that particular area. Otherwise, our hands are tied

to come to grips with the matter really, because the Treasurer is much too busy a man to talk to us about such insignificant things.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, I share the recommendations made by the previous speaker with regard to this point. The security transfer tax really needs to be changed to where a commission or a sales tax on the commissions are collected. This would avoid the very complicated system that now prevails for the audit of the tax, because there are different rates of tax at different levels. It seems to me that if we adopted the recommendation of the White committee we would be simplifying the procedures.

I am sorry that the government hasn't taken advantage of this recommendation in this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to the bill? The hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have no comment, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

RETAIL SALES TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 48, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, this ties together the other comments on the bills with which we have just dealt.

I think it is unfortunate though, when we look at subsection 2 in this bill, that we have to worry about the implementation of what I think it a most inequitable tax policy, and this of course is the situation. As the notes in the bill say: "It makes it clear that draught beer purchased at a price of less than 21 cents will subject the purchaser to tax."

One of the greatest problems I think we have seen out of this budget is the approach that this government has taken to nickel-and-dime the people of this province, almost doing them to death by fooling around with a cent here and two cents there, and something for five cigarettes and something more for 20. We have given, at least we believe we have given to the people of this province, a view of this government in its callous and worst side. As various taxes are raised by a cent here and there, all of the promises, all of the presumptions, which the average citizen of this province had when they supported this government, are certainly dashed. It wasn't really necessary to tax draft beer. I would like to hear from the minister, if he speaks in this debate, what the proposed revenues will be from this area.

We look at a department that the minister runs—the cash register of the province if you will—and we see all sorts of funds which are being raised here and there from many of the tax statutes which the minister has to control. But when we come down to this particular point, and the point that is set out here, I think the government is really showing a great lack of concern for the average citizens whom it is supposedly in its best interest to take care of.

The tax changes that we have seen have of course been detailed in the budget address which has already been given by the Treasurer, and the replies by both of the opposition parties have set out our great dissatisfaction with this kind of an approach to taxation. I am sure that many other speakers in the budget debate will be adding their comments to this same approach that the government is continuing to follow.

With respect to the second area in this bill, the payment of collectors of retail sales tax is going to cease. I believe that there are certain problems here, Mr. Speaker. We have quite clearly looked at the racetracks, at the gasoline stations, and at the land transfer tax situations, and we find that in the first two cases the remuneration has ceased, and I think it should have ceased. In the land transfer tax situation the cost of collection does not exist, because this is done through the registry offices operated by the province, and that is the most efficient form of tax collection which this province has. But in this situation I think that the government should give some consideration to any expenses to which various members of the public may have been put with respect to the collection of these taxes. I think that there is a good point to be made, especially in the tobacco industry, and I am sure that some of my colleagues will speak on this, with respect to the requirement of

additional purchase of certain items of equipment and office machinery that were, of course, no longer needed now.

I think that some consideration should be given with respect to remuneration of persons who may have had to purchase certain items solely to deal with the tax collection which the province had required of them.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, when this government sees fit to tax draught beer it is really hitting below the belt.

Mr. Breithaupt: You could say it is scraping the bottom of the barrel.

Mr. Lawlor: The sole surcease the working man of the province gets from the weight that is imposed upon his shoulders by this wretched government is to have the odd drink, and he can forget a little bit about how he is scappled and weighed upon and pilloried. But here you come, immediately after having received some of his assurances that he reposes some simulacrum of faith in you fellows, and you hit him right in the solar plexus. And I am sure that if there were an election tomorrow, if anything could remove you fellows from office, this sort of thing is likely to do so. We challenge you, on the next occasion when you are getting ready to take the working man's drink out of his hands, to call an election immediately thereafter. This would be a platform upon which we would be prepared to fight you to the death.

Mr. Gilbertson: The member doesn't mean that.

Mr. Lawlor: I have, Mr. Speaker, on the second area which this bill covers, a reasoned amendment—and this is even more reasonable than the last one; I mean really reasonable—in the absence of Mr. MacDonald, seconded by myself, that the motion for second reading of Bill 48 intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act, be amended by deleting all the words after "that", substituting therefor the words:

> That this bill not be read a second time in order that it may be withdrawn for redrafting in order not to penalize the small retail merchant by imposing upon him statutory obligations, without compensation, involving financial outlays and expenditure of time and energy; and that in order to reduce administrative problems, compensation should be paid on the basis of a flat rate of not less than the average presently received by the small retailer, and that it should be paid to each retail outlet, irrespective of its volume of sales.

I place that before you, as some alleviation must be given to the small retailer, just as I argued earlier that it ought to be given to the gasoline outlet, to the operators of the gasoline stations who, because of shrinkage problems in gasoline and because they are the ones who have to be put through the bookkeeping chores in connection with extracting the tax, ought to be somewhat rewarded or given some cognizance of these tasks to which they have been put. This party, on the basis of that, finds this present legislation unpalatable.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. I personally am going to support the amendment as put forth by the member for Lakeshore. I feel I can't speak too extensively on this bill due to a conflict of interest in this matter. I am a director of the Retail Merchants Association of Canada and a retailer myself. Certainly those remarks pertaining to this area are similar to my own thoughts. As one of my friends has suggested, the taxing policies of this government are enough to drive a man to drink and even that is now being taxed in the final area at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, one member rising to speak on this tax increase has to do it with reservation.

Mr. Lawlor: I knew the member would get around to it.

Mr. Gisborn: He has to make himself feel that he is getting up to speak about nought, because one can hardly understand the thinking of the government in bringing in this tax change, putting a 10 per cent charge on draught beer. I would like to search for the reasons in the minds of the government and what impositions the tavern owners have put upon the government to bring in this change. We have in the province at the present time a gallonage that could have been increased by the government to increase the revenue on the sale of beer in taverns. Why that was not done I don't know.

Not long ago—maybe in the last Legislature—changes were made that took restrictions off the size of the glass they could sell and also took off the price restrictions. They therefore created what I thought was an honest competitive situation in the sale of draught beer in the province. The man who

liked draught beer could pick the spot where he would get a larger glass or a cheaper glass.

But here, for some reason or other, the government has provided an increase for that innkeeper and an excuse for an extra charge. If the rate is 20 cents per glass, that means that there is two cents in tax. It's going to be a quarter; let's not kid ourselves. It's already talked about that they're going to up to 25 cents. So immediately they give him a three-cent-a-glass increase in his beer. It removes the competitive argument because he just puts up a sign saying, "We now have a tax of 10 per cent on your draught beer." If they're now charging 25 cents, it is going to be 2½ cents and likely will go up to 30 cents a glass.

Mr. Renwick: At different times of the day the taxes go up.

Mr. Gisborn: I wish the hon. minister would explain the thinking behind this kind of a mundane approach to this situation—raising money through the sale of draught beer. Why not just increase the gallonage tax as it goes out of his taps and leave the competitive spirit there of the restriction on the size of the glass and his price-setting features?

Mr. H. Edighoffer (Perth): I might just add a comment regarding this amendment. I certainly would be willing to support it because I am certain that section 2 in particular affects many individuals in Ontario. I can think how this section has helped to relieve the hardship of many people who have been collecting this tax, because they have incurred accounting expense, equipment expense, postage expense, storage expense for their records and, of course, added banking charges.

I really feel, Mr. Speaker, having watched this government for the last 4½ years—and of course, this has come after an election—I would like to predict, and this prediction might come true, that we might see this section again returned to the statutes before the next election. I certainly will support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I won't use the word "demagoguery" because it's a little too strong; at the same time, I can't think of another word along those lines. I must say to the hon. members that it's pretty corny trying to suggest that because we're putting a tax on draught beer we're going after a class of people who are drinking a particular kind of beer that they're not drinking now.

Mr. Ferrier: Well it is obvious that is what they are doing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know how—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The people of Grossman Tavern.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —the hon. members can suggest that when you go into a pub and a man sitting at one table and having a bottle of beer is charged 10 per cent, while his friend at the same table, because he orders a jug of beer at $1, is not taxed at all. Surely, we are dealing with the same people; it's just a matter of making it a more equitable tax. I'm not saying that is why the tax was put on.

Mr. Renwick: Come on, they're all drinking draught beer.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Oh, they all drink draught beer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's a matter of applying a tax where someone was getting an exemption that was really unfair. Therefore we are getting extra revenue from people who perhaps should have been taxed before.

Mr. Renwick: They have switched to draught.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have even got away from that 20-cent glass in many instances. What you get is the dollar jug; in fact, I think in some places they will even give you a $2 jug—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Two dollars and twenty-five cents!

Mr. Renwick: It depends on the time of day.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —while a fellow buying a 25-cent bottle of beer is paying a tax, the fellow who is buying a $1 jug wouldn't be paying a tax at all. I am surprised at the hon. member for Hamilton East who suggests, if I understand him correctly, that we don't put a tax on draught beer directly and openly as it is being done here but we do it in a sneaky way! That we increase the gallonage tax—

Mr. Renwick: No, the minister misunderstood.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: If there was a sneaky way, the minister would have done it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —to the pub operators. Does he honestly believe that the publican wouldn't have passed this on? That the hotel man wouldn't have passed this on to the customer?

Mr. Foulds: Absolutely! Free enterprise always absorb the shocks.

Mr. Gisborn: I asked the minister to give me the reasons that he took that position. Why not continue the gallonage charge? What is the purpose?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We haven't decreased the gallonage tax. I don't know why the member brings that in at all. We haven't decreased that—

Mr. Breithaupt: But the government could have.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The member is suggesting we increase the gallonage tax.

Mr. Gisborn: The minister just made an excuse for the—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: The member hasn't done his homework.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am suggesting to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that in fact what he is suggesting is that we put the tax on but in a roundabout way so the man won't know he's paying an extra tax. That's about the size of it.

Mr. Renwick: No, not at all.

Mr. Ruston: The breweries will put more money into the next election campaign!

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): Fie on you!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was some concern about the 22 cents and what is going to happen to the extra three cents. I rather imagine, if he is going to pay a quarter, most of it is going to go to the waiter which is okay, too, because he could use the dough. The hon. member has admitted that when we took the price control off beer this provided a competitive factor in the area and in fact kept prices down and in some cases, gave the customer an opportunity to go somewhere else where he could get his beer cheaper. That, of course, is the controlling factor here too.

If some pub operator is going to increase the price of his beer by three cents because he is taking advantage of a two-cent tax and charging a quarter, his competitor will find it profitable not to do that, and he is going to start losing his customers—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Two glasses at 45 cents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because the very factor of the elimination of the price control accomplished it before and it will continue to do that.

Mr. Gisborn: Show me the one who will charge 22.5 cents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as the amendment is concerned, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. A. F. Lawrence: Two glasses for 45 cents.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —with great respect to the hon. member, he is now going to be put in the same position as I am. He is going to have to defend an amendment which he did not have very much to do with because his colleague isn't present, in the same way as I am doing in respect to the revenue bill.

Mr. Renwick: It is a collective decision.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is rather unclear. I don't know what this means — if you read the last few lines—

> —that in order to reduce administrative problems, consideration be given to compensation being paid on the basis of a flat rate of not less than the average presently received by the small retailer, and that it be paid to each retail outlet . . .

Is the intention of this amendment that you describe a small retailer and take the average of all those small retailers? Or is the intention that you take the average of all of the retail sales collectors—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That is better.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and average that out? I don't know; that's not quite right.

Mr. Lawlor: We don't want the small retailer losing his average reimbursement.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I know the hon. member is—we are all in favour of motherhood, we know that. I am asking, Mr. Speaker, surely before we proceed with an amendment—

Mr. Lawlor: Why doesn't the minister do something about it? Why doesn't he give mother a kiss for heaven's sake? Put his arm around her shoulder. But don't boot the poor girl.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —it is proper to ask what the intention of the amendment is.

Mr. Ruston: I don't think he knows.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't think the hon. member does! He is a bit embarrassed; I think he would have written it a little differently. He would have written it as concisely and briefly as his amendment in respect of the other motion, which only took about 80 lines.

Mr. Lawlor: We are not going to tell the minister anything more about it. He will have to find out for himself—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member means—if his colleague meant by this amendment that we should only average the small retailers' collections, he must describe what a small retailer is and he hasn't done this here.

Mr. Renwick: Well, that is not what he intended!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. If he means the other, that we average them all out, what he is going to accomplish is this—let me advise the hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: Give him all 200.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About 40,000 or at least one-third of all the vendors collect less than $80 tax per year. If we averaged out all the tax, it would work out to about $75 remuneration. If we averaged out all the colections we take in and the remuneration paid out—we averaged out the remuneration —those 40,000 would be getting about $75 each. And, of these 40,000, thousands of them don't collect $10. The suggestion is that we go out and pay $75 to every retailer, thousands of whom don't collect $75.

Mr. Stokes: The government forced them to spend $2,000 in order to tabulate it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then if they collect $10, we pay them $75—even if they collect $1. Believe it or not, there are many, many retailers—I don't know if it works out to hundreds – who collect less than $4 tax a year.

Mr. Renwick: Not if you add in the tobacco tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Surely this isn't a very well thought out amendment. With great respect, I am sure the hon. member for Lakeshore doesn't want to be embarrassed. I am sure he would save the embarrassment of his colleagues if he withdrew that amendment –

Mr. Stokes: Not on your life.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —because it doesn't really make sense.

Mr. Deans: I have got to say we appreciate your concern for our embarrassment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It really doesn't make sense. Perhaps the statistics would be helpful in convincing the hon. members just what is being done here, and just whom is being affected by it. There are a thousand vendors –

Mr. Renwick: We have obviously got to him. He is spending this much time.

Mr. Stokes: You are going to say that six major retailers collect over 80 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That's right, and that's where all the remuneration is going.

Mr. Renwick: If you are trying to persuade us that you are for the small retailer, you are doing a very poor job.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Some 65,000 vendors average $4 a year in remuneration –

Mr. Renwick: Not if you add in the tobacco tax.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: – and 32,000 average $22 a year. So, out of 120,000 vendors, you have 97,000 who are getting less than $22 a year now, and of those, 65,000 get $4 and less. So, it really is not as bleak and as bad as the hon. members suggest. I suggest to the hon. members that if the hon. member for Lakeshore isn't going to withdraw the amendment, that they defeat it.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Grossman had moved second reading of Bill 48, and, in the absence of Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Lawlor had moved a reasoned amendment –

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker: – that the motion for second reading of Bill 48 intituled, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act be amended by deleting all the words after "that" and substituting therefore the words "that the bill be not now read a second time," etc.

The first matter to be disposed of, of course, is whether or not the bill shall now be read a second time. Those in favour of the bill now being read a second time will please say "aye". Those opposed, will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Is it agreeable to the members that this bill be stacked with the others?

Agreed.

TOBACCO TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moved second reading of Bill 43, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, according to the budget that we have received from the hon. Treasurer, the government intends to obtain approximately $12 million extra in revenue from this change in the Tobacco Tax Act. It has been, I think, clearly set out, not only in the press but in the comments made within this House that, as in the liquor situation, so in the tobacco situation. In other words, the manufacturers, the tobacco companies in this case, are receiving an unnecessary benefit, just as the vintners and the distillers and brewers will receive an unnecessary benefit from the changes in the prices of alcoholic beverages within the province.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this increase again shows a rather callous disregard for the interests of the average citizen of the province. Just as we are increasing taxation and the costs of living within the province in an approximate amount, I suppose, of $100 or $150 per family, so we are attempting now to pay off some of the election promises which this party apparently had to make—that is, the government party had to make—in order to be returned.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the imposition of these taxes is even worse when there are obviously some people in the province who believe that by increasing this kind of tax we are going to control the problems of illness which have been linked to the consumption of tobacco products.

Of course, that is not the case. This government has no more interest in controlling those problems than it has in controlling the alcoholic problems by the increase of prices on alcoholic beverages. The government is content, it would appear, to use both alcohol and tobacco solely as sources of revenue. It is prepared to use these sources of revenue in order to benefit various other areas of activities within the operation of the provincial government but, more importantly, it is prepared to do so without any particular thought, as I have said, of the control of the problems that result from these increases.

Consumption, obviously, is going to be increased no matter what the price is going to be. As a result, the government has chosen to take advantage of that economic fact and, in spite of the comments about avoidability, I believe that this government is solely interested in the revenue from these items.

The problem, of course, is that not all the revenue is going to go to the public coffers as prices are increased. The points that were made in our discussion of the last bill with respect to the increase in the price of draught beer are going to be repeated in the increase of the price of cigarettes.

The benefits are going to go to the manufacturers, to the brewers, to the hotel operators who, perhaps, have some greater need certainly than the brewers, and vintners and distillers. I think, in this case, we must be sure that these taxes are simply going to be an excuse to raise the prices of these products. These taxes are going to be, as a result, an increasing burden on the citizens of Ontario because of the greater eventual cost which those who use tobacco products are going to have to submit to.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Treasurer of the province was in his best form, for him, when he suggested these costs were avoidable ones. Indeed, one doesn't have to drive or drink or smoke or use any of these other facilities that are being taxed. But we must look back, I think, to the taxing programme which was, at least, enunciated by the government party during the election campaign. We were told taxes would not be raised and, of course, we immediately see that the government is intent upon raising these sources of revenues and scrambling for every possible source in order to obtain a few million dollars here and a few million dollars there.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the imposition of this increased tax is an unfair one. I belive that the burden which it is placing on the average citizen is an unfair one, and I think that this government is solely interested in the raising of revenues, not only to support itself but also to support its friends.

An hon. member: Well put!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, there is one feature about this bill that introduces a new concept into the discussion of the tax measures before us today. That is the area of smuggling, both with respect to the increased liquor leverages and with respect to this tobacco tax. I think we are coming very close to the point of marginal inutility with respect to the tax.

I would like to refer you to Smith again. He says:

> Experience has shown that great disparities in the price of cigarettes among

neighbouring jurisdictions lead to smuggling on a rather grand scale. It is important to look at the rates of tax on tobacco in other provinces, particularly in Quebec and Manitoba, as well as in the neighbouring states. In this connection, it is important to recall the effects of the short-lived federal tax increases of 1951-1953 that were mainly responsible for cigarette prices rising from 36 cents to 42 cents, a leap of 16⅔ per cent. Before the war, the tax was reduced. It was estimated that nearly 10 per cent of the domestic Canadian market was supplied by cigarettes imported illegally from the United States. Since the removal of the tax, it went down.

There have been substantial increases in tobacco taxation. At the time of the Smith report, which was 1968, one-tenth of one cent per cigarette was charged. The government went from there up to four-tenths or two-fifths of a cent per cigarette and now it is practically doubling to 2.3 for five cigarettes. As far as cigars are concerned, at the time of Smith there was two-tenths of one cent for any five cents worth of cigar. Now, the government has gone from two-tenths—one-fifth to one-half in previous years—up to one cent for every seven cents under this present legislation.

So there is a doubling and tripling and, as my friend from Kitchener has indicated to the minister, it certainly cannot be based upon the fact that he is conferring a health or therapeutic benefit upon the community by way of taxing tobacco so that people will be taxed out of smoking the stuff. Because the statistics show—and as the Smith report indicates later on in the thing—it is generally agreed that the demand for tobacco is price inelastic, and consumption does not decline in proportion to increases in prices.

This is not the way in which the minister is going to achieve that end, if he would platitudinously or hypocritically pretend that was his chief intent in this particular area of taxation. Therefore, the doubling and tripling of tobacco taxes cannot be justified on that kind of ground. So, if it tries to move over, the only way that the government can possibly do it—it couldn't justify it on equity grounds, because those who smoke are, by and large, proportionately spread over the population, and it hits the little guy that much harder again. So that on hardly any grounds that one can think of, ability to pay or any other thing, the taxes as they presently stand cannot be justified.

Again, we were concerned about the remuneration concept and the benefit to the small retailers. Sure, there are 200 or so collecting agencies in the province, but it finally devolves upon the head of the small retailer or the general retailer. And it's mostly done, as we all know, through the little retailers who previously were getting some recompense for their time, trouble and services, and are being mulcted in their work, and the same concepts that applied on the reasoned amendment previously apply here.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Speaker, I was so surprised on the night of the budget, when the Treasurer was struggling to get additional revenues, that he would have decided on a miniscule increase in tobacco tax and such a major increase in the student fees and a little bit larger increase on alcoholic beverages.

I just do not understand why we have to go through the procedure of amendments to a Tobacco Tax Act that is completely out of line with the other increases and costs that the Treasurer is imposing upon the people of Ontario. As he mentioned, this is an unavoidable type of tax. It is also on a commodity which has been proved to be damaging to people's health, and so it is not something that is really necessary for people we are taxing.

I am most upset by the fact under the circumstances a miniscule increase of two per cent is introduced under this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to participate? Perhaps the hon. member would wait in view of the hour.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: In view of the hour I am prepared to wait –

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): For another hour.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: – for 8 o'clock.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 13, 1972

Stock exchange distribution of mining securities, statement by Mr. Winkler 1139

Anti-noise regulations study, statement by Mr. Auld 1139

Government response to section of LeDain Commission report on drugs, statement by Mr. Potter 1140

Monetary assistance for students, statement by Mr. Kerr 1140

Use of government planes by cabinet ministers, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon 1141

Hydro transmission corridor, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. R. F. Nixon 1141

Review of school boards' economies, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. R. F. Nixon, Mr. Foulds 1142

University tuition fees, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. R. F. Nixon 1143

Hamilton Harbour landfill, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Deans 1143

Payment to OHSIP-designated agents, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Deans 1143

Commission on role of private member, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 1143

Ontario air route application, questions of Mr. Carton: Mr. Deans, Mr. Reid 1144

Discussion on cost of automobiles, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans 1144

Michigan power station, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Bullbrook 1144

Farm tax rebate, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Spence, Mr. Deacon 1146

Gertler report, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Good 1146

Unemployment in Ontario, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Deans 1146

Artifacts stolen from memorial, question of Mr. Bales: Mr. Givens 1147

Commercial fishing in lakes St. Clair and Erie, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Spence 1147

Diversion of water to flush Great Lakes, questions of Mr. Auld: Mr. Stokes 1147

Public employees' strike in Toronto, question of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Haggerty 1148

Action on mercury-based products, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Burr 1148

Policy on acquiring cottage properties, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Good 1149

Commission on French-language secondary education, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Laughren 1149

Definition of elementary school student, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. B. Newman 1150

Education grant ceilings, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Bounsall 1150

Limits on financing by natural resources companies, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Deacon 1150

Treatment of drug addicts, questions of Mr. Potter: Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Paterson 1150

Presenting report, standing private bills committee, Mr. Clement 1151

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Lane, first reading 1152

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading 1152

Public Authorities Protection Act, bill to amend, Mr. Lawlor, first reading 1153
Gasoline Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1153
Land Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1160
Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1165
Logging Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1171
Race Tracks Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1179
Security Transfer Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1180
Retail Sales Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1181
Tobacco Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, on second reading 1186
Recess, 6 o'clock 1187

Legislature of Ontario Debates

No. 31



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Thursday, April 13, 1972

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972



Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 1972

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 43.

TOBACCO TAX ACT
(*continued*)

Mr. Speaker: When the House rose at 6 o'clock, I believe we were continuing the debate on second reading of Bill 43. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there were a number of arguments incontrovertible, powerful arguments, put to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Grossman) this afternoon before the dinner hour which should really convince him to withdraw from the application of this increased tax.

We're not here to argue about whether smoking is a good thing. I don't smoke. I don't know whether the minister does or not. He's got no bad habits, he tells us from time to time. But I'll tell him in the presence of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), and I'm glad he's here tonight, that this tax is going to do some substantial damage to the tobacco industry. There may be those here tonight who are prepared to say, "hear, hear," and yet we know that the tobacco industry returns a substantial chunk of tax revenue to the province and to the country. Also it happens to be, at last count, the most profitable individual aspect of farming.

The minister knows that the policies of the government of Canada, as well as, to a lesser extent, the policies of this government, have been tending toward the reduction of the use of tobacco in this province and in this country. Whatever the tendency of these policies, I believe the Minister of Agriculture could tell us that the use of tobacco is, in fact, continuing to increase, even though advertising is controlled and so on. But there have been aspects to the tobacco market that have improved the situation over the last few years as far as the tobacco growers are concerned, and these aspects are rapidly disappearing.

The minister knows that, because of the Rhodesian situation, tobacco from Africa was not available or not saleable in England and in certain other countries of the Commonwealth, but this is rapidly changing. He knows that the United Kingdom was prepared to buy, and did buy, large amounts of tobacco from Ontario, but now that it is entering the Common Market, we are led to believe that that market will go down as well. The thing is that the tobacco industry is going to face a real recession and the imposition of this extra tax is going to simply make that recession more difficult to cope with than it otherwise would be.

The Minister of Agriculture can tell the Minister of Revenue the difficulties that have been experienced in the past in the province and the efforts that he and other members in the House have taken in order to improve the tobacco market and improve this aspect of the agricultural industry, or, at least, to stave off some of the substantial financial problems that are looming more and more important as the problems increase.

Mr. Speaker, when one of the high-ranking officials in the Tobacco Marketing Board —in fact, the chairman himself—read about the increased taxes that were being levied by this government, he said that it should increase the imposition even more and use the extra revenue to assist the Tobacco Marketing Board in finding new markets outside the country where tobacco is gaining in use even faster than it is here. Obviously the tobacco is going to come from some source and if it can be from a Canadian market, it would be to our benefit.

This tax seriously interferes with the tobacco market as the growers and the industry itself face increasing problems. It has already been brought to public attention and mentioned in this debate that the increase in tax, in fact, increases the revenues for the cigarette production companies but it has no effect other than a bad effect on the farmers concerned.

I am not prepared to say that this particular increase is any worse than the increases in taxes levied before. I am simply here to say that it is another reason why levying

the tax at this time is difficult to understand. The industry is already in an economic situation which is going to grow worse and worse. This tax certainly will speed the deterioration of the market.

We are not here, in my view, to argue whether the use of tobacco is a good thing; we have had that debate on other occasions. We are here talking about the effect of a tax and I wanted to bring to the minister's attention something that perhaps he had not seriously considered. It is simply another reason why we feel that we cannot support this tax and that, in fact, it is poorly conceived in its effects on the industry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! Just before we continue—I hadn't noticed my book here, nor the gallery. I think the House would like to pay a welcome to our visitors in the west gallery tonight. We have with us the 9th Downsview Scout group from Downsview and 2nd Dixie Cub group from Mississauga. We welcome them.

The hon. member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my objections to the increase in this tax. I must say that it seems that every time this government needs revenue it strikes at the tobacco industry.

The tobacco industry has been one of the greatest revenue producing industries and has been of so great a benefit to so many areas in this Province of Ontario. It gives a great deal of work in the labour force; it helps the implement industry tremendously. I must say, Mr. Speaker, the revenue the government has derived from it over the last number of years has been of great benefit to the economy of this province.

The minister is adding to this tax at this time, one of the crucial times for the industry when the acreage has been reduced over the last number of years and, of course, the situation is improving in Rhodesia, as my leader has said. I must say to the minister that with the discussions and the articles in the papers in regard to the health aspect of the product, the tobacco industry is fighting quite a battle to continue.

I would say to the minister it is unusual that the tobacco industries or the processors of the tobacco are going to benefit by this tax. It is just unbelievable that this tax would be used this way. I would like to voice my opinion and objections against the increase in taxes at this time on this industry that has served the Province of Ontario in a great many ways over the last number of years.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members to speak on this bill before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): Mr. Speaker, as one goes through these tax bills, of course, there is a good reason presented by the opposition—I suppose anyone could present a good reason—why the tax should not be imposed in every case. When one is looking for a rationalization I think I could give just as good a rationalization as the members of the opposition do in opposing the tax.

There is somewhat of a contradiction in the arguments. First we hear from some members of the opposition, "Stop kidding the public. This is not going to reduce the consumption of tobacco. It won't change anybody's habits at all; everybody is going to be smoking as much as they ever did."

On the other hand, we hear from the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Kent and some others that this will speed the deterioration of the market. Now that can only mean one thing, that they really believe the imposition of this tax will mean there will be fewer smokers. I'm not too sure that isn't a good thing.

Aside from that, there is also the argument that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Why doesn't the minister let the tobacco farmers work it out, instead of starving them?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Because the consumption is up. We're not starving anybody out.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There's also the argument that the manufacturers will increase the price of their cigarettes because of the amount of the tax percentage increase.

There's no evidence of that. Competition has shown in the past that it will keep the price down and they will only be able to charge whatever the market will bear—and with the highly competitive market in tobacco, I doubt very much whether that will happen.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That's the way the minister levies his tax.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am only answering the arguments that were presented by the members in their opposition to this bill. I don't think there is anything else that I can add. If we are looking for taxes from some place, we've got to suggest where else we

could get the revenue. If we want to keep our educational system going and to look after our health and other social services we've got to get our taxes from some place.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Wouldn't the minister like a resource tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously it is a matter of judgement as to where these taxes could most properly be applied and are better applied. I certainly think that in respect of liquor and tobacco, at least in those two fields, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is quite correct. These are things that if one wanted to, with a great deal of will-power one could do without paying those taxes by not using those things.

An hon. member: And he'll live longer too.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of Bill 43 will please say "aye".

All opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Mr. Speaker: We will stack this along with the others which are already stacked.

GIFT TAX ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. J. R. Breithaupt (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I don't think this bill requires a particular amount of comment. It is interesting to note that the government has now chosen to bring before us in the form of legislation the model Act which other provinces are being called upon to implement. I believe that this kind of approach, which allows various provinces to combine with the federal government in imposing a common standard of gift tax legislation across the country, is most worthwhile.

In this Act we have noticed, of course, that the time during which gifts would be taxable has been substantially reduced from the original legislation that was brought before us. I think that this present five-year term is going to be quite satisfactory and certainly the passage of gifts between citizens of Ontario should properly be dealt with here in the same manner as it is dealt with in other provinces.

I believe that the changes which have been suggested are worthwhile and I do commend the government for bringing this bill forward so that we can see whether a model piece of legislation wil be of value across the country in attempting to solve the problems of gifts.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, with the withdrawal of the federal government from the field of succession duties or estate taxes and from the field of gift taxes, there was a dereliction devoutly to be scouted and damned. The federal government withdrew from those fields, wherein a certain type of uniformity would be necessary to the overall tax structure, the wealth taxes being a crucial element in the pot-pourri of tax. You know, there are a lot of people with a lot of money who have very little income. They see to it that they have very little income. The perpetuation of wealth down through the centuries, descending from father to children, is a highly detrimental thing to an economy however you may look at it. For Tories, for socialists alike, the concentration of power that is connoted by the possession of great wealth is a thing to be severely looked at in a democracy.

It was a devastating thing, at the renaissance and in the later middle ages, when the devolutions of property fell into the hands of the church or churches. They had to pass special laws, mortmain acts, to break up that concentration of power. More and more rivulets were coming into single pools. It became so devastating a thing it was half the cause of the Protestant reformation. That is what, in its financial roots, it was all about, and taking over the monasteries was precisely part of the process. Members who know anything about history –

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We know what the member means.

Mr. Deans: See what he has done?

Mr. Lawlor: –I don't know so much about the groaning Leader of the Opposition–or have any particular insight into the role of the Cecils in England in this regard, etc. While I have often spoken yearningly and bleatingly of the departure of the monasteries, at the same time this is what happened in the world and, on a Marxist interpretation of history, deservedly happened.

What do we do? We perpetuate the same thing in secular hands in our day. This is part of the overall ethos. Somehow, some of us argue that it is a very fine thing in a

democratic country to have large concentrations of capital in single hands. Somehow, by some mysterious economic sense, it is supposed to be the source of our investment. Yet when you look into it from any economic point of view, I put it to you that it is not true. Less than eight per cent of investment in this country is derived from sources where inherited wealth is reinvested in the economy by way of the stock market or even in terms of bonds. This does not make good economic sense.

Before getting into the real principle of the Act I would like to deal with the superficial facts. That is what facts normally are because they're subject always to a little colouring and interpretation in order to make sense at all. To deal with the hard bedrock of this legislation, the government is introducing this new legislation to which we accede, at least this far, that no one can possibly deny the necessity of the Gift Tax Act.

The fact is that even the Tory government came to this belated view, because it was niggling about it all the time in the last sessions, particularly with the contemporary Treasurer of Ontario. He is very fond of concentrations of wealth, and has a kind of gudging admiration even for the tawdry economic aristoi. There are other aristocracies which would be far better to breed if one can possibly manage to do so in this province.

In any event the gift tax had to come into being. When the federal government abdicated its responsibilities in this country, every province got together and mutatis mutandis, as the Latins used to say to one another as they approachd the forum, there were changes made. The changes made in Manitoba are not precisely the same changes that, for instance, were made in Ontario, as put before us tonight. As a matter of fact, there is quite a diversity between the two types of legislation in some respects.

The federal government, after Oct. 23, 1969, removed outright, in both its succession duty legislation and in its gift tax legislation, all gifts passing between spouses. Now, we in the New Democratic Party take exception to that. We believe that in terms of succession duty, and we acceded to it in this House in the previous session of the Legislature.

As I say, $200,000 or a quarter of a million dollars going to a spouse is excellent and fine, but in excess of that the public weal has something to say about it. The money was made on a social venture. It is part of the social whole. The people do not any longer, however they may think so, act by themselves.

Wealth is a social thing. No matter what a self-made man may think, he has ridden on the shoulders of others and usually on their faces. With that particular position well-borne in mind, then all moneys ought not pass between the spouses, particularly from husband to wife.

We are terribly afraid of what is going to happen now with this kind of a passage of moneys. The wife, in many instances, will simply pack up as the insurance policies are cashed in, sell off the property, and disappear off to some fabulous southern clime where she may spend the rest of the days in some clement weather and pay absolutely nothing back into the funds of this province. And this is happening increasingly. We have opened the door to that. We have given it our blessing and this is part of the contemporary scene. As far as—

Mr. J. F. Foulds (Port Arthur): Especially if they take Lands and Forests planes down to their tax-free havens.

Mr. Lawlor: In Manitoba they delimited it, Mr. Speaker, if it may singularly help to give the minister a course in advanced social thinking. Or he might even go over to the night school at the University of Toronto. I think it is the first grade in terms of the public finances.

They delimited the gift to the wife to $5,000 in any single year. This is a gift now—this is just gift. It has nothing to do with wills. The amounts of money being able to be transferred to the wife and to dependent children are in the hundreds of thousands; but we are talking about any single year.

But this government doesn't. It has excluded the spouses. A husband may pass to his wife in any year any amount of money as far as he sees fit; and whatever happens to it is none of our business apparently. That is a purblind form of social thinking and it is to be condemned. I suggest that the Manitoba legislation is superior to this government's in this particular respect.

The federal government used to allow an annual exemption in the aggregate of $4,000. Manitoba is allowing $15,000 and Ontario is allowing $10,000. If I may say, I think that even Manitoba, believe it or not, may be wrong in this particular instance. I think that allowance is much too great.

You know, returning again to Smith—after all, we have paid $3 million to have him tell

us what he thought about these matters. He is the authority on this subject in this province and will be for a number of years to come. He says at 205:

> We believe [and the exemption that he is talking about is $4,000] that the exemption from the present federal gift tax is too high. We know that this generous exemption in an aggressive estate plan allows a large amount of property to be given away over a period years and can seriously erode the basis of succession duties.
>
> We are unable to find any justification whatever for the optional exemption of one-half of the taxpayer's income of the previous year after deducting the amount of tax paid thereon. We recognize that the tax is not intended to bring into its ambit casual gifts of unimportant amounts that are made between members of a family throughout the year, that an exemption should be provided to reflect this intention.

But that's it. The casual passage of gifts between members of a family as is done at Christmas and other times of the year certainly should not be taxed. It is a form of amity and a form of humanity that the tax system ought not to impinge upon. But when you get in excess of that, then the real questions arise.

As the federal gift tax took its eclipse on Jan. 1 of this year, they were permitting individual gifts, without tax, up to $2,000. Manitoba has carried that over; Ontario is doing the same under section 11 of this legislation. Again, I am of the opinion personally that $2,000 is too large a sum; $1,000 is adequate. In the passage this is to strangers—to anybody for that matter—and the wisdom of the legislation in permitting this particular form of undermining or erosion of the succession duty base cannot be called anything but questionable.

This legislation before us is integrated, as we shall see in a few moments, with the Succession Duty Act and that's all to the good. Under the Succession Duty Act, if you give a gift within five years prior to your death, that gift is brought back into your estate for totalling within the succession duties; anything beyond the five years would fall from year to year under the Gift Tax Act provisions.

Now this government, through its Treasurer and through the Chairman of its Management Board (Mr. MacNaughton) has expressed time after time its discontent and resentment with succession duties, and gift tax too, saying, since they are so intimately tied together one imports the other, that its intention is to phase this thing out – to get rid of it over a period of years.

For some reason that is not too mysterious to me, but at the same time is never expressed by those over there, the important things we should talk about in this House are never discussed; we talk about a lot of other things. But the true motives as to why governments do things, why they introduce legislation, never emerge; it's always some secondary and superficial motivation. The real reason is to protect the fortresses of the wealthy, because you happen, ultimately speaking, to believe that in some way this is sacrosanct, that this is something that must not be touched, it has descended to us. And that is the greatest fallacy that we could possibly want.

Now I want to review for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, a marvellous article, marvellous not only in the fact of what it contains but in the fact of where it's found – in the 1971 conference report of the Canadian Tax Foundation.

It is written by a man who is not, as far as I know, aligned with my political party, but who happens to think as I think and is pretty well all for us. His name is Richard M. Bird, of the Institute for Policy Analysis, University of Toronto; one of those damn egg-heads, so to speak, who knows what's going on, and one of those people who, assessing our commonwealth, is able to make shrewd judgements about what is just and unjust inside it, and half of the mythologies that we engender for ourselves for reasons of self interest and self protection. And even that's stupid – even that's purblind.

He cites first of all the case for taxing personal wealth – it's the first of the seminar series, it's the first lecture, let us call it, or the first piece of writing, in this 1971 text. And I don't think I have to be so patrician or so avuncular that I have to look over at the minister, Mr. Speaker, and tell him if he is going to be Minister of Revenue, then by George, he had better get hold of the reports of the Canadian Tax Foundation because that is what his office is all about. The analysis of tax policies basically in the field of revenue, pretty well occupies every one of their reports.

I think the minister will subscribe with me to the non-partisan nature of the thing. This is an objective, scientific as much as may be, analysis of what the tax situations in this country are. These men have an objectivity and a rapport, and an ability to speak together, whatever their political stripe may

be, because they live in that particular atmosphere. We are far more acerb people here, far more divided. In any event, he –

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): He has lost the article after that great introduction.

Mr. Lawlor: I haven't lost anything.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Lawlor: My only problem, I say to the dear member for Downsview, is whether to read –

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Lawlor: – read the whole article into the record or just a part of it, and what part, because it's all so good.

An hon. member: Don't bother.

Mr. Foulds: Read the whole thing.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Taken as read.

Mr. Lawlor: I think we would be throwing out babies with baths and baths with babies if we –

Mr. C. E. McIlveen (Oshawa): Take it as read!

An hon. member: We'll take them.

Mr. Lawlor: We'll get started on it anyhow.

Mr. Foulds: We'll read the whole thing.

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

> Many writers on public finance have long argued there was a strong equity case for taxing wealth and that the economic effects of doing so are at worst innocuous, and perhaps even on balance helpful. On the other hand, that rather select sector of public opinion, which is normally most heard on tax matters, appears to consider the taxing of wealth to be close on the ultimate sin; robbing the deserving rich –

Mr. McIlveen: Is that Marx?

Mr. Lawlor: –"taking away the rewards needed to spur entrepreneurship" – the member wouldn't know the difference!

Mr. McIlveen: Does the member for Lakeshore feel better now?

Mr. Lawlor: – "and the capital needed to foster it."

Everybody talks about Marx, yet I hardly met anybody who ever bothered reading him. The same with Darwin. The two most talked-about people in the English-speaking world and nobody ever spends five minutes trying to find out what they were talking about.

Mr. Foulds: It would be time well spent on his lunch hour.

Mr. Lawlor: It is all borrowed, second hand, from George Bain, early in the morning.

"Robbing the citizens –

Mr. Breithaupt: George Bain?

Mr. Lawlor: What a fine article he had about Pauline Jewett this morning; wasn't that something! It shows there's an enormous amount of hope, particularly over there. Dear Pauline; the perils of –

I was talking about the ultimate sin, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Right! I knew the member was.

Mr. Lawlor: We may have to do a little preaching tonight.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Can't we keep sex out of this thing?

Mr. Foulds: That is not a sin.

Mr. Lawlor: They will be bathed in the blood of the minister.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): Why is the Minister of Revenue such a killjoy?

Mr. McIlveen: He should start with hellfire and damnation tonight.

Mr. Lawlor: I think the government is getting off rather lightly with these tax bills on the whole; the speed with which we put those through severely disappointed me. I thought it would be at least a week.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: We didn't think it was too fast.

Mr. Lawlor: I wanted at least a week to give the thing the scappling it deserves, so we can indulge ourselves for a few minutes, can't we, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I think that is an excellent article. I think the Minister of Revenue should listen.

Mr. Lawlor: To continue:

> On the other hand, that rather select sector of public opinion which is normally

most heard on tax matters appears to consider the taxing of wealth to be close to the ultimate sin.

I like that. I think I'll read it again.

"Robbing the deserving rich—

Mr. Ferrier: Hurrah!

Mr. Lawlor: There's more:

—taking away the reward needed to spur entrepreneurship, and the capital needed to foster it, destroying family businesses, fostering the sellout of Canada to the foreigner and in general being both inequitable and economically disastrous.

He goes on to say that he finds that these are a bunch of lies, that these are silly statements to make and throughout page after page he proceeds to do that. For instance:

In addition, the possession of wealth, it may be argued, provides advantages of opportunity, flexibility and security.

For example, in the face of income fluctuations over and above the income enjoyed from the employment of capital. It is therefore in itself an appropriate subject for differential taxation. The point may be illustrated by noting that at the extreme, and even with a comprehensive income tax base, such as proposed in the Carter report—

Which this government thoroughly emasculated. Carter is anathema! If you could cast down the tablets and break them, the government did it. Carter—what a dread name!

Well they put him under 15 feet of sod. Poor Carter is buried so deep that nobody, including me, has even got the temerity to mention his name anymore.

For 10 years it was bruited abroad in the land: Carter, the equitable man, who wanted all moneys that people made, from whatever source, brought into a central pool and taxed; instead of all the exemptions, exclusions and various forms of petty thievery that go on under the blessings of the Income Tax Act.

An hon. member: They would do anything to get tax money when he was alive.

Mr. Lawlor: A man of property could live and live well without any taxable income at all, simply by saying it was consuming his capital.

An hon. member: Tell me what is wrong with the system!

Mr. Lawlor: To continue again:

Economic life is not a track meet. Not everyone has the same interest and ability in winning and gaining riches. The financially successful on the whole are those who had the drive to get rich on the one hand, and the luck to have their efforts pay off in a big way on the other.

How many times, as a lawyer, have I seen that? How do you divide this thing up? People come in; they have a little capital; they are going to go into some business venture. Some succeed; some don't.

An hon. member: Poor lawyers!

Mr. Lawlor: And all the capitalistic mentalities in the world—

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): Including the member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: I had nothing to do with it; it was a stroke of luck!

In most cases people who are wealthy—except those who inherit wealth, and that is the bulk of the people who are already wealthy—are so not through any particular gifts of brain or brawn but through being lucky. That is true in this life.

Mr. J. McNie (Hamilton West): How do you know when you are wealthy?

Mr. Lawlor: Why should the government enfranchise it and reward, even beyond the dreams of avarice, the wealthy within the contours of this little piece of legislation, which is what they are doing?

I have so much money I don't know what to do with it all!

"Not everyone has the same interest and ability in winning and gaining riches."

Well, I have said that—

Mr. McIlveen: Yes, the member did.

Mr. Lawlor: —that it is luck as much as ability that makes for wealth.

What does a poor devil like the member for Oshawa know about it anyhow?

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: The member for Oshawa hasn't enough bloody bucks to rub one against another.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order! Back to Bill 39.

Mr. Lawlor: I shall look out the other way. I can begin to spread that particular doctrine around the House too, one by one; but I will leave the minister out of it.

Even if everyone started equal, we would thus end up with considerable inequality in an economic system which rewards the talented and the lucky to the extent that ours does. This inherited inequality is accentuated, however, by the fact that in reality not everyone starts at the same point because of differences in initial wealth.

The unlimited right to pass along accumulated wealth to subsequent generations fundamentally violates the principle of equality of opportunity alleged to be upheld in our society, more in the breach than the observance. That is the fundamental flaw, the thing that makes a blatant hypocrisy out of the whole works—the fact that equality of opportunity is observed in the breach.

As long as they permit large accretions of wealth to descend from generation to generation, they have a fundamental inequality worked into the veins of and at the heart of society. To the extent that they do that, forget all the blathering, forget all the talk at the hustings and otherwise. They may hoodwink a vast number of the population because there are various things working in that groin, and one of them is that they themselves wish to be in the position of the mighty. That is part of the social ethos and part of the ignoble breed of contemporary civilization.

But what he has to say about this business of starting unequally is the truest thing in the world:

> Too many individuals stand not on their own, but on their fathers. The existing distribution of assets among individuals at any point in time is to a large extent the outcome of a historical accident as condoned by the state and fossilized in law.

Mr. Foulds: Shame.

Mr. Lawlor: And here, in a fresh new vibrating piece of legislation, this government is perpetuating another fossilization. Most of its tax legislation is a form of fossildom. It is simply re-embalming the bones and turning them over.

This is a perfect example of it as it's done in Canada:

> The historic development of extractive and manufacturing industry, with the accompanying inequalities of rewards to labour and capital, lies at the root of many large fortunes today.

I ask the minister to glance at the article some day when we meet out in Queen's Park while perusing the flowers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I surrender – I will.

Mr. Lawlor: He could possibly tell me whether he has done so, and I could save him much pain tonight in this particular regard.

There are just one or two other pages:

> So far I have suggested that there are strong reasons of social policy and justice that urge heavier, not lighter, death taxes in Canada and gift taxes. I shall subsequently demonstrate that the economic arguments, while weaker, appear to me in balance to offer no hindrance to this policy. Yet in all this I am talking more about death taxes as they would be than as they too often are.
>
> McCulloch once truly said, "A perfect tax ne'er was and ne'er will be." He might well have been talking about gift and death taxes as we know them. The fact is that this potentially most equitable of taxes gives rise to very considerable inequities as it is presently structured and administered. The rampant injustices of the present system are clear and may be one reason why many practitioners are so ready to condemn the tax out of hand.

Then he goes on to say that even if they did, the beggars would move into another area of tax fees and be able to undermine and traduce the law and dream up ways of getting around it just as seriously as the present one does.

There are numerous sections in the gift tax legislation before us—for instance, in section 4 – where you have to devise a lot of stratagems in terms of debt, what is a debt and what is not a debt. It has been used traditionally by tax lawyers and estate planners as a way of creating a false debt and pretending that a debt is a situation of indebtedness that existed between a giver and a receiver which was never subsequently paid and which nevertheless, by way of giving the money, saying they were going to pay it back and never receiving it back – simply forgetting that it exists – effectively acted as a gift. The federal Estate Tax Act which is the only gift Act in existence before this one as far as we are concerned, had to close those loopholes time after time throughout that legislation.

He happens to mention on page 18:

> On balance, to quote one of the strongest attacks on death taxes ever made in Canada, out of the Ontario Economic Council, the prospect of death taxes being imposed upon the wealth that one has been

> fortunate enough to accumulate despite inflation and taxation affects entrepreneurial drive very little.

I will just say it was the wretched Economic Council of Ontario that did call it, that got onto this prating talk about double taxation which we have heard and now which the government would abandon itself; which the Treasurer of Ontario has pulled back on.

He's playing it soft these days. He's cool about this talk of double taxation because he knows that there are large accumulations of wealth which are not in the nature of capital gains at all but simply accumulations. They will not attract capital gains at death nor at any point in time and at the same time would not in any way involve the concept of double taxation. The recognition that there is a whole field here does give the government pause and must give it pause about withdrawing, as it has stated over and over again it intends to do, from the death and gift taxation fields.

There is section after section in this article which breaks down most of the nonsense. The business, for instance, again, that the Ontario Economic Council talked about.

The claim in that document was that family businesses had been forced to sell for liquidity purposes in face of succession duties. It is thoroughly questioned in this article which says it is not the most overriding reason There have been other economic studies, as the minister probably knows, which go against that but it was the Economic Council which so influenced and penetrated the thinking of the government on taxation policy—it was the only source that did apparently penetrate it—having to do with wealth taxes. It caused the minister and still causes him to hesitate and previously even to withdraw; to diminish its role; to play it down; to pretend that it was a bad tax; that it didn't have any great validity.

I hope that his thinking has changed. My feeling is that it is beginning to change partially, I trust, because of what we in the opposition have said hour after hour, time after time, in this House. We've been trying to penetrate, to get through, that he must not abandon these fields. On the contrary, these are the fields which he must utilize to the utmost because they are the most equitable. In this particular area, I want to transfer for a moment, a grain of wisdom. I want to point out to the minister what the hon. Saul Cherniack, Minister of Finance for the government of Manitoba, had to say about this kind of tax.

Mr. Breithaupt: An unimpeachable source!

Mr. Lawlor: He says the gift tax and succession duties which come flowing from it are not a tax on wealth in the real sense of the word. They are a tax on the transfer of wealth, and he thinks the reliance on the word "transfer" is terribly important. This is what he told the House a very short time ago when they introduced their measures before that assembly:

> Why is the distinction between wealth and wealth transfer so important? Again, the answer is easily given.
>
> In the first instance, the assumption is generally made, rightly or wrongly, that a person with wealth has earned it, that throughout his life he has paid some tax on it, though probably less than an equitable portion relative to many at lower income levels, and, in effect, is entitled to enjoy the benefits of that wealth throughout his life. But when that person dies, and through his will transfers his accumulated wealth to others, it becomes the responsibility of the government to ensure that this transfer, which really constitutes income for the recipients, does not place them in an unreasonably advantageous position relative to those members of society—and they are in the vast majority—who must work hard to earn a living and who must meet standard tax requirements to support the services which they receive from their government.
>
> This does not mean, and I want to make it very clear, every dollar of an estate should necessarily be treated as ordinary income and taxed at standard rates in the hands of the recipients. As long as the income tax system is this country is designed to favour those with high incomes at the expense of the low- and middle-income ranges, an equitable system of taxation on the transfer at death must recognize this in an exemption and rate structure which provides satisfactory protection from further regressive tax pressure.

That is the basic weight of the Manitoba legislation. I don't know whether we intend to take this matter into committee or not; we will consider on the basis of the minister's answer. But if we don't decide to, I would like the minister, if he will, to give me some good reason why there is unlimited granting of gifts as between spouses. That is one area in which I think the legislation is deficient.

Ought not there to be some limits?

Does not the minister recognize that this may mean simply an asportation of wealth out of this province which was made in this province under social conditions, under the beneficent life, and the flowering fruit of a Tory government which made everything so burgeoning and fine that they were able to become grossly wealthy?

Does the minister not think that maybe he should receive back, in sheer gratitude for the fine things he has done for these people who have become so wealthy, just a smidgen of the vast benefits visited upon them—just a smidgen?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Well now, that's a switch! That is a switch!

Mr. Lawlor: Rather than to let them escape through the open doors to the Caribbean and other places in the world, does the minister not think he has some responsibility in this particular regard? I would like the minister to address himself to that particular proposition.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): He is very enlightened on this.

Mr. E. R. Good (Waterloo North): Is the hon. member going to support the bill?

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I'm getting ready to support it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: As a matter of fact, standing here at this moment, I am not quite sure what the position is going to be.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Isn't that funny, that is exactly how the hon. member sounds.

Mr. J. Lane (Algoma-Manitoulin): I think the hon. member is enamoured of the sound of his own voice tonight.

Mr. Lawlor: I think it will depend upon the psychology of the minister. No, I think we will support the legislation, on the whole.

To have a gift tax is crucial. To have an inadequate and perfunctory gift tax is better than to have none whatsoever. It is deficient in a number of particulars, which I have outlined.

The schedule 1 of the rate structure is interesting. I suppose it has to be uniform because, however derelict the federal government may be in this regard, under the impact of the provincial ministers they had agreed latterly to collect the stuff—gift and wealth taxes and succession duty—for a period of three years, beginning on Jan. 1. And in order to get them to do that in some kind of uniform fashion—

By the way, I want to make a departure here in abbreviation. I want to stand in this House and strongly condemn the government of Alberta, for whatever it may mean. Whatever I happen to condemn, it wouldn't matter very much, but the fact is I think we have some responsibility to say these things. And if it would echo back into those lunatic ears, I would be very pleased. Because they have broken the trust. Alberta, in the matter of succession duties, has done more — an act that is more devisive to the good intent and the overall prosperity and the economic fulfilment of this country than Quebec ever hoped to do.

When she returned the 75 per cent of the federal duty back into the hands of the beneficiaries and wouldn't impose a tax upon it, it was with a deliberate intent to undermine what is crucially and necessarily a uniform factor in the economic life of this country.

Mr. Speaker: Meanwhile, back to our Bill 39.

Mr. Lawlor: Subsequent to that, Saskatchewan followed suit under Thatcher.

Hon. Mr. Winkler: I think it was an oily business.

Mr. Lawlor: The ministers in this province should try to bring all degrees of persuasion to bear upon the relatively new government of the province of Alberta—

Mr. Singer: Who are they talking to down there?

Mr. Lawlor: —to reconsider its position in that regard. My feeling is that there hasn't been any particularly great flight of widows from Ontario to Alberta to escape the impact of succession duties and gift tax. But, as I understand it standing here at this moment, the Alberta government has no intention of bringing into being such gift tax legislation as we have here tonight into Alberta, much less a Succession Duty Act. That cannot but have a disruptive, to say the least, and even possibly a devastating effect, upon the goodwill and amity and the understandings on economic policies that must prevail if this country is to be a unitive whole. We must have some accords in these matters. There must be some alliances with respect to the various tax structures and this is an important embroidery

and ingredient in the total picture of taxes. For them to abnegate it is to place us all in an invidious position.

That makes me feel much better now. I've got that Alberta situation off my mind. It's been a long time.

An. hon. member: Maybe now the member can sit down.

Mr. Stokes: Sock it to him.

Mr. Lawlor: You know what the rate structure says. The government stops at 50 per cent—that to all—50 per cent of $200,000. It's all hung up on the ceilings. This is a Trudeau thing, for heaven's sake. Trudeau's a wealthy man and his is inherited wealth largely, having nothing very much to do with anything he did. I mean he was a fairly dedicated kind of man who was prepared to work for very little to get his ideas across in various journals and in the law schools of the Province of Quebec. But he got this business about they ought to take no more than $1 out of $2 out of a man's pocket. I don't know why that should be. I don't think so. This kind of ceiling is kind of a white elephant or some kind of sacramental ghost that the government imposes. If a man has $100 million there's no reason why he should keep $1 in $2. If he made it from the surrounding territory and fed off us all in the process of doing so, then why not return a little to the heritage of the future?

This is precisely what they don't want to do and precisely what the government aids and abets them in not doing; because it's in their hands in this legislation, it protects inherited wealth. It is the weirdest mentality in the world.

I've spoken at too great a length in this House on previous occasions about this, that the government, as free enterprisers, ought not to adopt this position at all. If they're self-made men, then their children must be made self-made too. By handing down great quantities – you need a certain amount, fine, but I'm talking about considerable concentrations of wealth – the government coddles them. It makes fools out of our children; if they have no endurance, if they don't have to forfend in life, if they don't have to build their own. To that extent I sound like a free enterpriser, for heaven's sake. I'm going to sit down.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill, if not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I—

Mr. Stokes: Top that if you can.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quite frankly, I don't intend to try.

An hon. member: He didn't say anything.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): He said more in 20 minutes than the minister can say in a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know why the Treasurer shouldn't be here to suffer through this.

Mr. Lawlor: That is all right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member, of course, wants to debate socialism versus free enterprise, essentially.

Mr. Martel: This is not free enterprise.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Actually, if I were prepared to discuss the basic principle of a model Act and the need for it, I think I might even have agreed with some of the points he has made.

Mr. Deans: If you had understood them.

Mr. Lawlor: I thought all the government's Acts were model Acts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I won't tell them which points I might agree with. The fact remains he's not consistent either, with great respect, Mr. Speaker. He thinks you should take a bigger, much bigger chunk, from a wealthy person upon his death; and yet he's at great pains to compliment Manitoba and the Minister of Finance there because they put a maximum of $15,000 per year on gifts, whereas we give complete exemption for spouses. To be consistent, why does the hon. member defend that?

Mr. Lawlor: They are victimized by people like the minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why shouldn't it be $5,000, or why should there be an exemption at all?

Mr. Lawlor: A poor province like that! A big shouldered fellow like the minister just grinds them down.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, he is supposed to be talking, really, about the principle of the bill. If we are going to have a model Act we must approve the principle of the bill. If he is talking about one matter that remains within the

provincial policy jurisdiction – the amount that should be committed for interspousal gifts – that is another ball game altogether. That is a matter of value judgement, whether it should be $15,000 or $5,000 or nothing at all.

He either believes we should participate in a model Act or he doesn't and this is precisely what we are doing tonight. We are going along with what I think everyone will agree is the importance of having, as far as is humanly possible across this country, a model Act. Certainly Ontario is most anxious to participate in that sort of legislation, and I would suggest to the hon. members that they come along and vote for this bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Lawlor: It had better go to committee.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole?

Agreed.

SUCCESSION DUTY ACT

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves second reading of Bill 44, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: I undertake, in my remarks on this bill, to take only half the time I took on the other one with hopes that others may follow suit.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a companion piece of legislation to the model bill.

Mr. Foulds: Unfortunately, in the member's case brevity is not the soul of wit.

Mr. Breithaupt: No, but it may help of course, it may help.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I will at least choose to say in somewhat fewer words than others might that we will support the bill. I would call upon the members of the House to support it.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other member wish to speak to this bill?

The member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Yes, I shall continue my tirade.

There is a clause or two still left in Bird's article, particularly on succession duties, which have some value:

> One may regard this concentration of wealth in relatively few hands as socially undesirable for a number of reasons. Great inequality may be considered unlovely per se or it may be thought to represent an actual or potential danger to the economic or political system; for example, through the ability of a few rich families to export capital in economic crises or to extend massive financial support to political candidates sympathetic to their views. While the existence and power of corporations have perhaps weakened the potential evils of highly concentrated personal wealth, it has by no means eliminated these problems as matters of social concern.
>
> The fact that spreading out the wealth of the few among the many would not have any visible impact on their well-being, while true given the relative numbers of the two groups, is irrelevant from the social point of view, since the end aim is to make the rich less powerful and not the poor rich.

Within the terms of this particular bill, Bill 44, which is basically designed to fit the succession duty into the gift tax, or vice versa, the same thoughts apply as to whether the money is being siphoned off in advance of death or turned over when death occurs.

The bill is interesting from a couple of points of view. It covers the business of credits quite well with other jurisdictions. Just how wide ranging that is I can't tell from the surface of the bill – in other words which American jurisdictions have reciprocal relations with Ontario in recognizing credits going back and forth. I would take it—perhaps the minister could tell me—that we do not recognize credits for anything analogous to succession duties paid in any other jurisdiction if that jurisdiction does not in turn recognize our taxation rights on either an individual living there and possessing property here, or an individual living here and possessing either real or personal property there. That is one thing I would have liked to have had clear under the Act. Apart from that, I think, we certainly are not going to object to the legislation as it stands.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: There are a couple of points I'd like to discuss briefly with the minister and I wish the provincial Treasurer was here.

Many people are concerned, especially people with medium sized assets that would be transferred, such as farmers and small businesses, in that now that the federal government has vacated the succession duty, the estate tax field, and the provincial government is picking it up, we have no definite commitment, in writing that is, as to what action will be taken by the provincial government as it receives benefits under the federal capital gains tax.

I don't know what deal has been made between the province and the federal government as yet as to what portion of capital gains tax as it is generated by the federal government will be returned to the province. But farmers and small business people are concerned in that there could be a double taxation, as the capital gains are taxed on the federal level and a portion returned to the province, that they are then going to be caught in a provincial succession duty as well.

It should be one or the other. The provincial succession duty is now designed to replace the revenue lost by the federal government vacating it and returning it to the province. But if the province is to share in the capital gains tax, I should think there must be an adjustment in the future.

The other point I would like to make is to direct the minister's attention to the article in the Globe and Mail this morning by I. H. Asper, that renowned lawyer, tax expert and politician in the Province of Manitoba –

Mr. R. F. Nixon: A great political leader!

Mr. Ferrier: He hasn't even got a seat.

An hon. member: Snob politician! He's like an iceberg.

Mr. Good. He has stated that the tremendous scramble being made by the provincial governments now to get into the succession duty field has resulted due to the fact, mentioned by the member for Lakeshore, that Alberta is a tax haven –

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Foulds: Correction, please; frontbencher!

Mr. Good: Pardon me, the member for Lakeshore. It has resulted in the fact that –

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Backbencher sitting at the front!

Mr. Good: – it is now a comparatively simple matter for people with sophisticated estates, who have sufficient money to hire the proper tax experts and legal counsels, to set up a very simple arrangement to escape all succession duties even though they be residents in the Province of Ontario and their wealth be right here in the province. He states it very simply, in a few words, in that he says, for instance, that real estate located in the Province of Ontario, of course, is taxable here in the Province of Ontario; but shares in companies which are owned, we will say in the Province of Alberta, cannot be taxed by the Province of Ontario as succession duties.

So it is simply a matter, the courts have evidently decided already, that the shares are located where they can be transferred and where transfer registers exist for that particular share. So a person would simply have to set up a company in the Province of Alberta which would own all of his Ontario assets, and the company being of Alberta registry would then have its share transfer registry in Alberta, and in fact that estate could not be taxed by the provincial government in Ontario.

If he wanted to leave the assets of that company to his son, who resided in the Province of Ontario, he could get around that quite easily too by leaving the assets of his estate to another Alberta company whose shares were all owned by his son.

I think the minister would do well to look into this, not only on a provincial basis but on a federal basis, and see that there is more continuity, more regularity and more equity, so that all provinces in the country of Canada could work together to prevent this happening.

I don't know for what reason Alberta is doing this, other than probably to bring more wealth to that province at the expense of the rest of Canada. This is not the true spirit of Confederation, and I don't think it should be allowed at the present time.

It is evidently, according to the article of Mr. Asper, a very simple matter. I would ask the minister to have his people look at this article in this morning's Globe and Mail.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other members wish to enter the debate? If not, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. members say, this is a companion bill to the Gift Tax Act. There isn't really much to discuss on this; it would only be a repetition of the previous discussion.

However, in reply to the hon. member

for Waterloo North, I might tell him that if he refers to page 37 of the budget he will see that, if he doesn't recall, the provincial Treasurer had made the statement that a special committee to study the Succession Duty Act is being set up. I hope to be able to report on the makeup of that committee in a couple of weeks. It will study many aspects of the Succession Duty Act, particularly the problem which the hon. member has mentioned. Of course, it concerns us and we hope that they will come up with some viable recommendations.

I don't think there is anything else I could add to this which would help the debate at all, but that question was raised and that's the answer to it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is for second reading of Bill 44. Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: I believe this, then, completes the group of taxation bills, in which case we must deal with those bills, which are Bills 40, 41, 43, 46 and 48, upon which agreement was reached that they were to be stacked. All that remains, then, is to call in the members.

I would inform the House that there are five bills on which it was agreed that the vote would be stacked. I will deal with Bill 40 first. bill.

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 40, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Auld	Bounsall
Bales	Breithaupt
Belanger	Burr
Bennett	Davison
Bernier	Deacon
Birch (Mrs.)	Deans
Brunelle	Edighoffer
Carton	Ferrier
Clement	Foulds
Drea	Gaunt
Eaton	Germa
Gilbertson	Gisborn
Grossman	Good
Guindon	Haggerty
Hamilton	Laughren
Handleman	Lawlor
Havrot	Martel
Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton)	Nixon (Brant)
Hodgson (York-North)	Paterson
Irvine	Reid
Jessiman	Ruston
Kennedy	Singer
Kerr	Smith (Nipissing)
Lane	Spence
Lawrence (Carleton East)	Stokes
Lawrence (St. George)	Worton
Leluk	Young—27
MacBeth	
MacNaughton	
Maeck	
McIlveen	
McNeil	
McNie	
Meen	
Morrow	
Nixon (Dovercourt)	
Nuttall	
Parrott	
Potter	
Reilly	
Rhodes	
Rollins	
Rowe	
Scrivener (Mrs.)	
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	
Snow	
Stewart	
Walker	
Wardle	
White	
Winkler	
Wiseman	
Yakabuski	
Yaremko—54	

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 54, the "nays" are 27.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Would it be agreeable if the same vote be taken on the remaining four bills on which the vote was stacked?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would like Bill 41 to be referred to committee.

Mr. Speaker: We will deal with Bill 41 then in the same vote. Acceptable?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Committee of the whole House or standing committee?

Committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: That leaves Bill 43, Bill 46 and Bill 48 on which the votes were stacked. Is it agreeable the same vote be taken on each of those three bills?

Agreed.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bills.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bills be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order, House in committee of the whole; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> That every donor shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario the taxes imposed by the Gift Tax Act, 1972

as provided in Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> That every purchaser of gasoline shall pay to the Minister of Revenue for use of the right of the Crown in right of Ontario a charge or tax at the rate of 19 cents per imperial gallon on all gasoline purchased or delivery of which is received by him

as provided in Bill 40, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this resolution be concurred in?

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that we, in fact, do not concur in the resolution.

Mr. Chairman: Those in concurrence with the motion will please say aye".

Those opposed will please say "nay".

In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Resolution concurred in.

Clerk of the House: The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> That every purchaser shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics a tax at the rate of 25 cents per imperial gallon on all fuel received or used in Ontario by him to generate power in a motor vehicle, and that every holder of a registration certificate under the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario and Minister of Economics a tax at the rate of 25 cents per imperial gallon on all fuel used by him to generate power in a motor vehicle,

as provided in Bill 41, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> That every person who tenders for registration a conveyance, deed, transfer or other instrument or writing whereby any land is granted, assigned, conveyed or otherwise transferred shall pay a tax before the conveyance, deed, transfer, instrument or writing is registered, computed at a rate of three-tenths of one per cent upon the value of the consideration for the grant, assignment, conveyance, or other transfer, up to and including $35,000 and six-tenths of one per cent upon the remainder,

as provided in Bill 42, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

> That every consumer shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Ontario a tax computed as follows:
>
> (a) 2.3 cents on every five cigarettes purchased by him, and where the number of cigarettes purchased is not five or a multiple thereof, the tax shall be pro rated accordingly.
>
> (b) 2.5 cents for every one-half of one ounce or part thereof on any tobacco other than cigarettes or cigars purchased by him.
>
> (c) One cent on every cigar purchased by him for a price at retail of not more than seven cents.
>
> (d) Two cents on every cigar purchased by him for a price at retail of more than seven cents but not more than 10 cents.

(e) Three cents on every cigar purchased by him for a price at retail of more than 10 cents but not more than 15 cents.

(f) Four cents on every cigar purchased by him for a price at retail of more than 15 cents but not more than 20 cents, and thereafter an additional one cent for each additional five cents that the price at retail exceeds 20 cents,

as provided in Bill 43, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

That every successor to whom a refund is due under the Succession Duty Act shall be paid by the Minister of Revenue,

as provided in Bill 44, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Resolution concurred in.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor recommends the following:

That every purchaser shall pay to Her Majesty in right of Ontario, the taxes imposed by the Retail Sales Tax Act,

as amended by the provisions of Bill 48, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Chairman, before concurrence in this Act, I believe it's within this Act that the changes to the liquor prices come in ; is this correct? It's under this Act that the changes will occur?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): It is not debatable.

Mr. Deans: No? I thought it was. Sorry.

Resolution concurred in.

Mr. P. D. Lawlor (Lakeshore): Mr. Chairman, where does it come? It must come by order in council. It must come by regulation under the Liquor Control Act. It must come somewhere. We know there is nothing—

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is not a tax. It is just an increase in the sales price.

Mr. Lawlor: How do they do it? By order in council?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): It is just a markup. It is a merchandising operation.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It's a small monopoly they run over there.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): It's like a licence to steal, that is what it is.

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): They are just becoming like a bunch of dictators.

GIFT TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax. Are there any questions, comments or amendments in any of the first seven sections? If so, which one?

Mr. Lawlor: Which bill are we on?

Mr. Chairman: We are on Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

An hon. member: The minister's got one.

Mr. Chairman: If not, the hon. minister has that honour, an amendment for section 8.

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that subsection 1 of section 8 be amended by inserting after "where" in the first line, "a donor who is".

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question on it? Under that section, or any other section, is this gift tax cumulative? That is, under the federal Act, gifts given from year to year were all totalled except for the rates charged for gifts given in a particular year which were determined by the totality of gifts given in previous years. Is that still under your legislation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I couldn't hear you.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member repeat his question.

Mr. Lawlor: The simple question is, is your gift tax cumulative?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can't hear the member. There is too much noise.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. It is difficult to hear the question. Would the member care to place it again?

Mr. Lawlor: It is even more difficult to hear the answer.

Mr. Stokes: If you would stop talking over there among yourselves you would be able to hear the question.

Mr. Lawlor: I told him that the federal gift tax, as it was up until Jan. 1, was a cumulative tax where the amount of gifts given in any one year cumulatively over a lifetime were assessed and that the rate therefore for a gift given in any one year would be based upon the totality of gifts given in previous years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It's not cumulative, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lawlor: It's not cumulative? But you realize of course that it ought to be, don't you? Would you care to debate the issue?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will study it. No, I am not going to debate the issue.

Mr. Chairman: Will this section as amended then stand as part of the bill?

Agreed.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments on any of the next 10 sections? If not, the hon. minister has an amendment for section 18. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman moves that subsection 1 of section 18 be struck out and the following substituted therefore:

> (1) Every donor who makes a gift in any year other than (a) a gift exempt from tax under section 10, or (b) a gift made to an individual having a value of $2,000 or less, that the aggregate value of gifts made to individuals by the donor in the year does not exceed $10,000, shall, without any demand therefor, file with the minister on or before April 30 in the next succeeding year, a return in the prescribed form.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this section as amended then stand as part of the bill?

Agreed.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments on any other section up to and including section 38? If not the hon. minister has an amendment for section 39.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I move that section 39 be amended by striking out the words "not less than" in the third line, and "not more than 50 per cent" in the fourth line.

Mr. Chairman: Is this motion carried?

Carried.

Shall this section as amended stand as part of the bill?

Carried.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments in any section up to and including section 51? If not the hon. minister, I believe, has an amendment for section 52.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, can I move that clause c of subsection 3 of section 52 be amended by striking out "duty" in the last line and inserting in lieu therefor "tax".

Mr. Chairman: Shall this motion carry?

Agreed.

Shall this section as amended stand as part of the bill?

Carried.

Are there any other comments, questions or amendments to any other section of this bill? If not shall this bill, as amended be reported?

Bill No. 43, as amended, reported.

MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill 41, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman: Bill 41, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Are there any comments, questions or amendments on any section of this bill; and if so which section?

Mr. Lawlor: Well section 2.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Lakeshore on section 2.

Mr. Lawlor: Section 2, I suppose Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything before section 2.

All right, the hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Just a single question to the minister on the base of the increase of the tax. He seemed to dispute the proposition that there was some correlation between the tax and the expenditure made on highways.

My question has to do with the fact that traditionally and as an intrinsic part of your department from its very inception, this has been a primal consideration, which you dismissed cavalierly as though it did not exist.

This is the trouble with these new ministers. They do not know what the heartbeat of a department is.

Smith says, at 94:

> Using the methods, the Department of Transport has estimated the user responsibility for road costs at 68 per cent. This is the weighted average of all classes of rural and urban roads. [And then as far as the rationale of the tie-in is concerned]. Because the beneficiaries of road services can be more easily identified and charged for these services than can the beneficiaries of a great many other government outlays, and because motor vehicle charges are not a good instrument for redistributing income, we believe that the appropriateness of the revenue raised by these charges should be judged according to the portion of road costs that they cover.

And I say to you that has been the basic position at certain times in the history of this province long before I came here. You misrepresented, I understand, on some occasions, exactly what those road charges are. There were secret reports inside this government, kept in close scrutiny. When the figure hit the 101 per cent—

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This matter really should have been debated on the principle of the bill.

Mr. Lawlor: It was debated and you didn't answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well I did, and I did not cavalierly dismiss it.

Mr. Lawlor: What did you say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said I didn't necessarily agree with the member, that's all. That's hardly a cavalier dismissal!

Mr. Stokes: You just said you didn't know what you were talking about.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When I left this afternoon, it is interesting Mr. Chairman, the member was on exactly the same point. One can stay away for six hours and come back and have the feeling you have missed nothing.

Mr. Deans: It shows how obtuse that government is.

Mr. Lawlor: Young fellow, I can tell you there is one hell of a lot you could have learned in the meantime. You didn't see fit to come here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: After six hours, seven hours – seven hours less five minutes!

Mr. Lawlor: You show up at 10 o'clock at night!

Mr. Ferrier: Why didn't you stay away longer!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In seven hours one has missed nothing. But I would simply say this to my friend, coming in as I am at this tense moment to give my colleague from St. Andrew-St. Patrick some help, I would simply say this; that if—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: The Treasurer is embarrassed tonight.

Mr. Ferrier: What did you say?

Mr. Lawlor: Can't hear you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —if the member for Lakeshore would get off the esoteric realm where he normally dwells and in the fall of the year—

An hon. member: Spell it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —come down to a little group of 2,000 people called the Ontario Good Roads Convention, he would find out how wrong he is because—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: That explains it. Now we know what his trouble is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —they spell out the amount that is raised—

An hon. member: Maybe we will want details.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —from all the taxes which go into transportation and they spell out how much money is being spent on transportation. You would find a revenue gap of somewhere, as I recall—and when I left this afternoon it was my great intention to go and look these figures up—

Mr. Lawlor: Right.

Mr. Stokes: It is obvious you didn't do that.

An hon. member: It just came to the minister automatically?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —but off the top of my head, I would guess—

An hon. member: You do not.

Mr. Stokes: You weren't looking at those types of figures.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —that that gap is

somewhere in the neighbourhood of $250 million—

An hon. member: Too much.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the Smith report says, too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and the small measures which are being taken by the Minister of Revenue tonight—

Mr. Lawlor: There is a credibility gap over there.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —in this House go some small way in the interests of equity and fairness to restore that balance. Having said that, I will leave the matter to my friend.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): That is it for today.

Mr. Stokes: Bailed out again.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I'll say that man is really—

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman, in the spirit of dalliance and again with the waves of the hand and the little bows.—Tell me, did you see Charlie Chaplin the other night in "Modern Times"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What section is this in?

Mr. Lawlor: He reminded me of him. Did you see him on roller skates? How he skates around and, you know, pirouettes a little and does a fandango? Well—

Mr. Stokes: With the balloons, you know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think you did it, Pat, the way you dance—

Mr. Lawlor: Does the minister—either one of those self-feeding crocodiles over there—does either one of them agree—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Lawlor: —that there ought to be some ratio between what people using the highway pay? Ought they to pay 100 per cent under gasoline tax for the maintenance and development of roads, or should they pay more like 65 to 75 per cent because other people get the other 25 per cent of the benefit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Out of order, Mr. Chairman. That is the principle of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. This goes back to the principle of the bill which was carried earlier today.

Mr. Lawlor: That is the specific point.

An hon. member: What are you talking about?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Shall this section stand as part of the bill? Any other comments, questions or amendments of any other section of the bill? If not, shall the bill be reported?

Bill 41 reported.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Solicitor General): Charlie Chaplin didn't have roller skates on.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: You did a great job Al, in spite of the assistance.

Mr. Deans: Go to third readings and get them over with?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Let's do third readings.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report certain resolutions concurred in, one bill with amendment, and one bill without amendment, and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 17, An Act to amend the Edible Oil Products Act.

Bill 18, An Act to amend the Dog Tax and Live Stock and Poultry Protection Act.

Bill 39, An Act to impose a Gift Tax.

Bill 40, An Act to amend the Gasoline Tax Act.

Bill 41, An Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act.

Mr. I. Deans (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries I would like to ask

the provincial Treasurer how the province intends to go about collecting this tax on fuel that is used by truckers travelling through the province but is not necessarily purchased in the province. How exactly is he going to do it? I really didn't understand the explanation earlier.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): The explanation is that there is a reporting of mileage, and on the basis of the mileage it will be calculated what fuel was used, and there is presently a reporting of the mileage in respect of many of these trucks.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Whether it was purchased here or not.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): States as well as provinces? States?

Mr. Deans: Both states and provinces?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the third reading of the bill, I just want to say I agree completely with my colleague.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Deans: One final question: How much money does the minister intend, or hope to raise from this tax?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I don't know, but it is a considerable amount of money.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Order please. The bill has been debated in principle, and clause by clause in second reading, and so on.

THIRD READINGS
(*continued*)

Bill 42, An Act to amend the Land Transfer Tax Act.

Bill 43, An Act to amend the Tobacco Tax Act.

Bill 44, An Act to amend the Succession Duty Act.

Bill 45, An Act to amend the Security Transfer Tax Act.

Bill 46, An Act to repeal the Logging Tax Act.

Bill 47, An Act to amend the Race Tracks Tax Act.

Bill 48, An Act to amend the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Clerk of the House: The 26th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1402, item 3, crop insurance.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. I was wanting to talk on item 2. I presume that you've already passed that.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, we carried that the other day. Next year?

Mr. Gaunt: Next year. Thanks. Anyway Mr. Chairman, I'm sure there's another vote under which I can get to it. It relates to the farm tax reduction programme. We're on item 3, crop insurance? Perhaps I couldn't get it in on that one, but I'll certainly try in the next one, extension.

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Chairman, briefly on the crop insurance. Does crop insurance cover seed onions now? Can the minister tell me that? What's the status on that? Is it coming on any other type of onions?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): Yes. The 1972 crop year plans will cover cooking onions both from sets and seed. I'm not sure whether that's seed onions or not. I gather it is. It's covering cooking onions that are planted from, I suppose, Dutch sets, as well as from seeds. So I would say yes to my hon. friend. I hope I'm not wrong in this.

Mr. Ruston: The information I got from the member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson), who had to leave, was that seed onions were covered and that the set onions were not covered at this time. But you think now that you are covering set onions for food?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: For this year. They weren't last year, but for this year.

Mr. Ruston: I see.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3. Carried?

Item 4, extension.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex-Kent.

Mr. Ruston: I am still on the crop insurance.

Mr. Chairman: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were finished.

Mr. Ruston: I don't think there is too much more. I just wanted to ask the minister if he feels that the crop insurance has increased, has added a lot of coverage in the last year to different crops. Probably we still haven't increased the coverage on some of the grain crops. I look at the amount of people that have contracts, for instance, for winter wheat; I think there were 850 contracts in the 1969-70 crop year.

I was just reading, in the paper today that there are roughly, 20,000 wheat growers in Ontario. So we haven't really got into the bulk of the wheat growers, but probably—and maybe the minister would agree with me—if we have a new price for wheat with the new two-price system, that with a higher income it could be that crop insurance wouldn't be as attractive. So there'll probably be some problems there in increasing that acreage.

As for cost of operations, I was looking over for the two years, but I do see that it hasn't increased too much and we have increased a lot of contracts. I think I complained a year ago or two years ago about the high cost of administration. I do notice now that, in accordance with the new contracts we added, the cost of administration has gone down some compared to the number of contracts, so I don't have that objection this year. I don't think I have any more on that right now.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 then is now carried?

Mr. Gaunt: No, Mr. Chairman. I was wondering, in view of the fact that the government is now matching the federal contribution, what difference this has made with respect to numbers of farmers coming in on the plan. Has it made a substantial difference now the premiums are lower because of the contribution the government is making in that direction?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, the contributions as far as wheat is concerned—and that was the first crop to which the increased premiums applied, in the fall of 1971—the number of participants in the plan increased from 550 to 1,050; so there was almost a 100 per cent increase last fall.

Mr. Gaunt: That was just on wheat?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That was just on wheat. That was the first time the 25 per cent premium applied. It didn't apply on the 1971 spring crop but it did on the fall crop. I beg your pardon?

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Leader of the Opposition): It is nice that it came along for last fall, but I won't raise that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I am sure you won't. But we thought it was a move in the right direction and the farmers appreciated it. We have over 1,000 farmers already in the wheat plan; so that was an increase of 100 per cent.

Item 3 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4, extension.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, there was a matter related to the farm tax reduction programme, in that the extension branch does carry out a good deal of studies and so on—

Mr. Chairman: That really comes under item 1.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: This was an extension study.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, this does relate to extension as well, Mr. Chairman. The extension branch does carry out a good many studies, and I am sure one of the things they studied is the farm tax reduction programme. I notice that under the—

Mr. Chairman: The minister might answer this, but really we did discuss this in all its phases on item 1.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, let me put it this way then, Mr. Chairman: Has the extension branch done any studies with respect to the tax credit system and the fact that it will replace the farm tax reduction programme? And what impact will it have on farmers and on the actual amount of money they will get under this programme? Has the branch done any studies?

For instance, I notice that a farmer with seven dependants and $2,643 taxable income will actually get a reduction of $219.41, and a farmer with nine dependants with no taxable income will have a reduction of $34.22. On the other hand an urban dweller with

five dependants and a taxable income of $11,000 will actually get an increase of $8.50.

I am wondering if the minister and the extension branch of his department has actually done any studies in relation to this and from the standpoint of what impact it will have on the farm community when the government moves over to the tax credit system?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, Mr. Chairman, we haven't done any actual study of that one at the moment. I am not sure where the hon. member got those figures from—

Mr. Gaunt: The federation brief.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, but I think there is some doubt as to the validity of those figures. Without casting any reflections on the Federation of Agriculture, I believe that at the time the federation presented its brief to cabinet the provincial Treasurer had some things to say about that and I believe, found some difference of opinion as to the application of those figures. I am not sure that they are quite valid.

We as a government have taken the position that when the tax base is reviewed after full assessment is completed, the farm people, we hope, will find as much or even better tax relief than they have today.

Mr. Gaunt: Am I to assume that the tax credit system is definitely going to replace the farm tax reduction programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I don't think there is any definite feeling about it yet. Certainly it will continue until we have the programme worked out and see what its application is. I don't think we are in any position to say "yes" or "no" in a positive way on this.

I am talking about another minister's department, but in discussions I have had with him on this particular item we believe that we had better find out what the assessment is and what the application of any formula that might be worked out on a provincial basis would reveal before we take any firm positions one way or the other. Frankly, we all feel very keenly that the present method of return of tax rebate to farmers is providing a degree of relief that we don't want to see inhibited in any way.

Mr. Gaunt: I was wondering what areas of difference were there between the Treasurer and the figures outlined in the federation brief?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I can't answer that, Mr. Chairman; I don't recall.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4, extension. The member for Kent.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent): Can we talk on veterinarians under this extension vote, or does it come under another part?

Mr. Chairman: It comes under a different section.

Mr. Spence: All right.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4, extension.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I notice that we are asked to vote just over $200,000 for the special extension work in agricultural development in northern Ontario. The minister, I am sure, recalls some special programmes in the past involving ARDA funds, not just for community pastures but, for example, in the establishment of cow-calf herds in the north. Has there ever been a report on that?

I know that the minister is aware that some of the farmers involved in those programmes are somewhat less than satisfied with the way it has finally petered out after two or three years. Is this money to be used for a continuation of cow-calf herd research on the clay belt areas of northern Ontario? If not, can he report to the House why this developmental programme on cow-calf operation is not continuing, since certainly he spoke about it in most glowing terms in previous years.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: First of all, Mr. Chairman, the $212,000, I believe is for northern Ontario services. I think that—

Mr. R. F. Nixon: It is $209,000.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, agriculture, $209,278. That is for northern Ontario grants that are provided to the agricultural committees throughout northern districts. The agricultural representatives in the respective districts are the secretaries to those local committees. The money is given to them to dispense how they wish. The experimental work and the research work that we did as far as the beef cow-calf operations in northern Ontario are concerned never did come out of this vote. It was completely apart from that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Was that all ARDA money?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, that was ARDA money. This didn't come out of that grant at all.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: I would like to ask about that on the other vote or here, since this

refers to agricultural development in the north. The minister might like to comment more fully or I would be prepared to wait if it would be more convenient for him.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think it is really under ARDA.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: All right. That is agreeable.

Mr. Chairman: On item 4.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to ask the minister if a request came through from one operation. It is a dairy operation that they expect to expand to a cow-calf operation and they had made application to the Department of Lands and Forests for rezoning so that they could expand it to make it a viable operation.

To what programme would a person apply? Would it be through these agricultural development committees in northern Ontario or would he have to deal through ARDA for that particular purpose, if he wanted to get a subsidy for establishing that kind of an operation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: There is no subsidy, Mr. Chairman, for the establishment of a beef-cow herd in northern Ontario, other than the normal grants that are paid for livestock assistance in northern Ontario. This is transportation assistance and assistance on purebred bulls, this kind of thing. That is the only assistance. As far as expansion of the land is concerned, I don't follow the member. If it was a parcel of land that was to be bought by ARDA and leased to this operator to expand his land holdings that would be—

Mr. Stokes: It is Crown land now.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That would have to be made to the Department of Lands and Forests. We wouldn't have anything to do with it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 carried?

Item 5, home economics, carried?

Item 6, livestock services.

Mr. Gaunt: The cow-calf proposal which was put forward by the government and subsequently turned down by the Ontario Beef Improvement Association is still up for discussion. I am just wondering is the minister in a position to be able to tell us whether, in fact, he is going ahead with some plan in this direction?

Beef production, I believe, is increasing something in the neighbourhood of one per cent and our consumption is increasing at the rate of four per cent. Add to that the fact that we have had a great deal of difficulty this past fall in bringing feeder cattle down from western Canada via the railway, I think all of these things go together to make for some type of incentive. I'm wondering if the minister and his department plan to go ahead with this in some form.

I understand the real controversy actually centred around the forgivable loan part and, without getting into the merits of that, there were strong feelings on either side and the executive of the Ontario Beef Improvement Association, in their wisdom, said, "No we don't agree with that feature of the plan." But I think they had their knuckles rapped at the annual meeting and they reversed their stand and said, "Look, we feel the programme is important at this time."

So I'm wondering if the minister is in a position to indicate—I'm not suggesting to him that he has to lay the entire plan out before us, but I've had a good many inquiries from beef farmers who are actually interested and are prepared to expand their herds, but they're sitting back waiting to see what the minister is going to do in this area. I'm wondering if he can tell us about any plan he has to move this matter forward.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the Ontario Beef Improvement Association did reject the offer that had been made of a 20 per cent forgivable loan. Just for the record's sake, we offered a government-guaranteed loan—that is, the government would guarantee the banks—for a farmer to purchase beef cows, or beef-breeding females. It was a maximum loan of $15,000, with a minimum loan of $3,000, with interest payable for the first two years at prime rate plus one per cent, for the next four years the interest plus 20 per cent of the principal and the government paying the final seventh-year's 20 per cent.

The Beef Improvement Association executive did receive a good deal of criticism for rejecting that offer. But I think we should be fair and say that they rejected the offer because they believed there would be an unnecessary and unwarranted escalation in the price of females. They felt that the 20 per cent would simply be added on to the price of cows. They felt as well that any farmer that wanted to get rid of cull cows would simply offer them for sale knowing full well that somebody was going to get a 20 per cent forgivable loan on those cows and could esca-

late the price and get more than the cows were worth. They felt as well it would be an encouragement to bring cull cows out of western Canada because the loan would apply on such purchases.

I don't think they were really as opposed to expanding the cow herd in Ontario as they were to the application of the 20 per cent forgivable clause for the reasons I have mentioned because it might escalate the price of breeding females out of all proportion and would really not be of much benefit to the people it was designed to help. Now that was their reason. Obviously there were many people who did not agree with their decision.

When the annual meeting of the Ontario Beef Improvement Association was held, the executive dealt with the matter and there were many resolutions presented. A resolution from Rainy River, which asked for the reinstatement of the forgivable portion of the offer, or the proposal we had made earlier last summer, carried by a vote of 70 people in favour, with 36 opposed and 76 of the registered delegates not voting. So it was a pretty inconclusive vote when one compares the figures.

Obviously there was great confusion as to what they were really voting for, and I think it is fair to say that some of them voted without really knowing what it was they were voting for. I am not blaming anybody for that. It was just one of those kind of things. The executive of the Beef Improvement Association, that is the new executive, brought the resolution forward to me and presented it to me about two weeks ago, advising me that they were directed by the annual meeting to make this presentation. I asked them if they themselves had really changed their minds any and I think in fairness to them, they hadn't. They had not changed their minds from the original position. They held that they had taken the proper position earlier and that they had not really abandoned that position, but they were duty bound to do what the annual meeting had voted them to do.

Mr. R. F. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am having a little trouble hearing the minister, and even though it is almost 10:30 maybe the caucus could break up over there for a minute.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: So, we listened to the petition. Since then I have had meetings with several good beef people throughout the province. I met with many beef farmers, cow-calf operators, and I must confess that I am persuaded that the arguments they had raised concerning the difficulties that might pertain if the forgivable part were made applicable, have a great deal of validity. We are considering making an offer to the OBIA, based on a government guarantee, but applicable only on heifers—that is open heifers or heifers carrying their first calf—without the forgivable clause.

I think that our main objective as my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce has suggested, is that our cattle population, certainly in Ontario, is not expanding anything like as fast as we think it should to keep up with consumer demand in Ontario. We think that we should expand the beef cow herds in this province. When one recognizes the fact that the Province of Alberta has already exceeded the Province of Ontario in the last two years in total beef produced, slaughtered and processed in that province. It brings us up short in recognizing that 40 per cent of all the beef produced in Canada is used in the Province of Ontario, and of that 40 per cent only 30 per cent is produced in Ontario. It does seem to me that we have an obligation to our industry, not only of beef production, to use the available resources we have at our disposal, but also to assure that the packing industry continues to find a source of beef to process in this province without bringing cattle in from outside.

Mr. Stokes: Is the minister saying we only produce 30 per cent of our requirements?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thirty per cent of the requirements here in Ontario. That is right. The rest all comes in from outside Ontario. We have been bringing in from western Canada some 250,000 to 400,000 feeder calves each fall plus yearlings and feeders through the year. Up until recently, we were able to get those cattle without too much difficulty, but because of the encouragement that has been given to western feed-lot operators to buy feeder cattle in western Canada and to finish them there, we find ourselves in increasing competition with the western farmer. There is also encouragement being given in the three western provinces to expand the cow herd out there as well.

In the last 20 months we imported into Ontario 120,000 head of finished beef steers from the United States. They were slaughtered here in Ontario to meet the demand. I think when we bear all these things in mind, our objective then must be to use heifers to expand the cow herd and this is why I believe

we must expand our beef-cow herd in Ontario. I respect the opinion of the Beef Improvement Association. These are cattlemen knowledgeable about what they are saying and they say if you want to expand the beef herd use heifers. If cows are traded between farmers, we don't really add to the cow herd. And I think they have got a good point.

Now, we would like to do this. I think this is a reasonable approach and perhaps will accomplish the objective that we would like to achieve. Frankly, I am not in a position to say we are going to do it right now, but this is what I have in mind and I think it has a lot of merit quite frankly.

Mr. Chairman: Will there be any further discussion on this item?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that tomorrow we will continue with the committee of supply on the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. If we are successful in completing that item, we will proceed to the consideration of Bill 24, the Nursing Homes Act, in committee of the whole House. If not, we will follow that order on Monday. I am just not prepared to say at this moment what we will do on Tuesday, but I think that is sufficient for tonight.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, April 13, 1972

Tobacco Tax Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1193

Gift Tax Act, bill to impose, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1195

Succession Duty Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading 1204

Gift Tax Act, bill to impose, reported 1208

Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Act, bill to amend, reported 1209

Third readings 1211

Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued 1212

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to 1217

No. 32

ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Second Session of the Twenty-Ninth Legislature

Friday, April 14, 1972

Speaker: Honourable Allan Edward Reuter
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER AND PUBLISHER
TORONTO
1972

10

Price per session, $10.00. Address, Clerk of the House, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto

CONTENTS

(Daily index of proceedings appears at back of this issue.)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, APRIL 14, 1972

The House met today at 10 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have visitors this morning: In the east gallery students from Zion Heights Junior High School, Willowdale, and from St. Andrews Junior High School of Willowdale; in the west gallery students from Branksome Hall School of Toronto.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

METRO CENTRE PLAN

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer.

Could the Treasurer explain to us the contents of the memos referred to in a lead story in one of the morning papers this morning; and advise us whether or not these memoranda are going to be made available in full detail to the Ontario Municipal Board and whether or not the personnel who prepared them are going to be made available as witnesses so that they can be cross-examined in relation to them?

Hon. W. D. McKeough (Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs): Mr. Speaker, these memoranda are internal and I will come back to that. I would not at this moment think they would be particularly relevant to the board.

As to whether the particular people who wrote the memoranda will in fact be asked to come before the board by the parties represented at the board will be determined, I suppose, in due course. They have not to my knowledge been requested to come as yet; nor have I, nor have officials of the department. If, as and when we are, we will take that matter under consideration and so advise the parties concerned.

I suppose I might say something more, Mr. Speaker, about this matter. I think it might be appropriate if I read parts, or nearly all, of a memorandum which the director of the regional development branch sent to the deputy minister this morning.

The following information may prove useful as background to the article in the Globe and Mail this morning.

Late last year, knowing that the Metro Centre proposal would be referred to the government by the city of Toronto, it was decided that the regional development branch would examine the proposal to determine its impact on the Toronto-centred region plan. To undertake this examination a task force was established in the TCR team. The memorandum of Dec. 22 is part of the terms of reference for this task force. One of the major techniques used in the evaluation was to list the major arguments, pro and con, and then relate these to the TCR. This enabled us to examine the Metro Centre proposal from all viewpoints, and produced a spirited debate within the regional development branch.

During the course of this examination, the task force prepared memoranda for internal discussion purposes. The memorandum of Jan. 26 which was read into the record by the leader of the New Democratic Party is one of these. These memoranda were not designed or intended to present a branch position and so were circulated for discussion only within the branch. For obvious reasons they were not submitted to either the minister or yourself.

In February, following this internal evaluation, I decided that the Metro Centre proposal did conform with, and indeed reinforced, the objectives of the Toronto-centred plan. There were minor technical points needing clarification, particularly on the transportation side, but these were of local and not regional concern. This conclusion was transmitted verbally by me to the minister, and is reflected in the letter sent by the minister to the Ontario Municipal Board.

I think I might, departing from reading this memorandum for a minute, say at this point that during this period the same sort of evaluation was going on in a number of departments, particularly the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I suppose the Bugslag memorandum would be indicative of the kind of discussion which might have been taking place in the Department of Municipal Affairs at that point. The concerns or recommendations, particularly of the community planning branch, undoubtedly were, I am told, conveyed to the then Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Bales), and a recommendation was made to him that the proposed statement was in order. I assume that at the same time discussions were taking place, and had indeed taken place in each of these ministries, for something like three or four years, as I said to the House the other day. Undoubtedly the same sort of examination was going on in the Department of Transportation and Communications.

Those recommendations, and I can only speak at this moment of the particular recommendation to me from Mr. Claskey, came to the several deputies and/or to the ministers involved. There was a government discussion at the cabinet level which resulted in my letter to the chairman of the board under date of February 23, 1972; and that is part of the decision-making process.

Going back to Mr. Clasky's memorandum to Mr. Macdonald, he says:

> In March, following the tabling of the minister's letter, a memorandum from our Metro Centre task force was submitted to me. This memo restated some of the concerns which had been expressed in our earlier internal discussions and asked whether these should be pursued. This is the memo of March 14.
>
> I directed that the task force be disbanded because: (a) the concerns had already been examined in our earlier evaluation and had been rejected; (b) the minister had stated in his letter the policy of the provincial government and this agreed with our branch's conclusions. The task force was then dissolved.
>
> In summary the following points should be noted:
>
> (a) Metro Centre was studied within the regional development branch and our conclusion was that it was compatible with the Toronto-Centred Region. I take sole responsibility for making this recommendation to the minister;
>
> (b) The three memoranda, December 22, January 26 and March 14, quoted in the Globe and Mail are authentic; but they were purely internal notes for discussion purposes only, bear no official status and were not submitted to the minister.
>
> (c) There has been a leak of information from the branch. I do not know at this time who was responsible.

I would just add this: One of the memorandum, and I suppose this perhaps sums it up, summing up in part what was said about the so-called Bugslag memorandum of the other day—I refer to one of the three memoranda quoted in the Globe and Mail this morning, that of March 14, 1972, from the task force convenor to the project manager—ends as such:

> Although the minister's statement does not cover completely our previously stated areas of concern—December, 1971, memo to A.R.S.—it does appear to be a final statement of government position. Accordingly, we presume we should not proceed further on this matter unless otherwise directed.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that sums the situation up very well. The point is that within this government, within the bureaucracy at large, there is discussion, there is dissent, there are conclusions reached, there are suggestions made. Ultimately, they come to the cabinet and the cabinet makes its decision. That was what was conveyed to the municipal board in the letter of February 23, 1972.

From time to time we hear from members opposite that the bureaucracy runs this government. I think this is a clear manifestation that bureaucracy does not run this government. We take full responsibility for the decisions which we make.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minister takes full responsibility for his decisions, why do he and his colleagues continue to go through the charade of having apparently, or so-called, independent determinations by such boards as the OMB?

If the OMB is going to carry on the role that the minister's predecessors said it did as being independent, how can the minister justify at all the fact that his decision, or the cabinet decision, replaces all of the collective knowledge, information and opinion of the experts in the field?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Obviously the member for Downsview has a little bit different view of government than I hold. The position of the elected member and the position of this ministry, obviously in my view, is somewhat in conflict with the views held by the member for Downsview.

I say, simply, that we look at a great deal of information. We get recommendations from a great number of sources. Then

this government makes up its mind and so acts. We are not going to go back over all the ground which may lead into the final decision-making process.

In reply to the member's particular question, I would suggest that he goes back to the letter to the board dated February 23, signed by myself, after the government decision had been reached. He will find that letter states that we approve Metro Centre in principle and that the board should be looking at particular aspects of the plan. I think that is the answer to the member's question.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of further supplementary, is the minister in fact saying that no matter what kind of decision the OMB comes to in principle, the government decision will prevail and the OMB might just as well forget about any principle of planning in this particular development?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a purely hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in order that all of the apparent difficulties envisioned by the staff of the department could become known to the members of the public, would the minister undertake to make available to the OMB and to those persons interested, all of the memoranda that have been prepared, as well as the names of those people who have prepared them, so that those people could, if necessary, be called as witnesses and crossexamined at the OMB hearing?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): By way of supplementary, if I may Mr. Speaker: Surely the minister recognizes that it is in a sense unprecedented that a person like Mr. Bugslag should convey that kind of reservation by way of memoranda, that within the regional development branch of his own department these documents should emerge. Does it not convey to him the enormous anxiety and reservations—that was the word I used earlier this week – that his staff and the community planning branch staff have about this entire Metro Centre development? And should not the minister, in the light of that, perhaps re-evaluate or reassess what he has already said to the OMB?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the Metro Centre development and the Toronto-centred region are of enormous consequence to the people of this province. There is no question that there are strongly held views both within and without the government on the impact on the concepts and the details of both Metro Centre and the Toronto-centred region.

It does not surprise me at all that there is disagreement within the staff from time to time. Surely that's part of the decision-making process of government. I'm delighted that there is that kind of discussion, that kind of violence of views or anxiety which the leader of the New Democratic Party has referred to. But at some point or another there has to be some finality; and in terms of the government's decision we made our view known to the board on Feb. 23.

Mr. Lewis: One further supplementary: Having now seen the memoranda, I think particularly the Feb. 23 memorandum, or the Dec. 22 memorandum which the minister had not apparently seen before, raising all the questions about traffic flows, transportation lines, commercial development, the possible incompatibility with the entire Toronto-centred region plan, does not the minister think that in terms of his planners and the community development branch planners the government should retreat from the position it has taken before the OMB now that it has had its hand seriously compromised by the views of its own planners?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I don't subscribe to that view at all, Mr. Speaker.

There are memoranda, there are documents —stacks of them—which would come to a great variety of views. Those views are put together; within the several departments decisions were reached by branch directors, decisions were reached by deputy ministers, decisions were ultimately reached by the ministers and presented to the government and certain conclusions drawn. The fact is that there may still be, and obviously there is, someone somewhere who is still disgruntled with the decision that the government came to. Obviously they are; they leaked the documents.

Mr. Singer: Only the planners!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Only a planner!

Mr. Singer: The minister's planners—branch opinion is against it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Only a planner!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With great respect, if the member for Downsview had listened, we are talking about a planner. And we can roll out 10 who disagree with that planner.

Mr. Singer: The minister's branch advisers disagree.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is completely incorrect.

Mr. Singer: That is what the minister said earlier this morning.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is completely incorrect.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Downsview have further questions on behalf of the Liberal Party?

PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. Singer: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Premier.

Could the Premier indicate to us the extent to which the decision-making process has moved on in relation to the purchase of what appears to be now a $2-million jet?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I think I indicated some two and a half weeks ago to the member for Downsview, who has taken an interest in this subject, that there were two or three planes being considered; the decision-making process has not reached the point where a decision has been made.

USE OF GOVERNMENT CARS

Mr. Singer: On another question, Mr. Speaker; could the Premier indicate to us whether in fact the Province of Ontario provides automobiles and chauffeurs to deputy ministers such as the Deputy Provincial Secretary of Justice, Mr. Fleck; and to Mr. Reynolds and others?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there has been policy whereby deputy ministers and those in that equivalent position who are not necessarily called deputy ministers have had automobiles available to them. On the question of drivers for the automobiles, I think this is varied; I will endeavour to check that out for the hon. member. But they have the use of cars.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of supplementary, could the Premier undertake to advise us as quickly as may be possible about the extent to which government cars are made available to senior civil servants, as well as the availability of chauffeurs?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

DE HAVILLAND LABOUR DISPUTE

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Labour in relation to the continuing strike at de Havilland. In view of the apparent immediacy of the letting of a contract for the purchase and sale of STOL aircraft to de Havilland, and in view of the continuing and most unfortunate strike, have the minister and/or his officials been able to do anything in recent days to get management and labour together, and can he give us any reasonable news about the possibility of settlement of this strike?

Hon. F. Guindon (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member from Downsview, I wish to inform him, and the members of the House, that we had a meeting yesterday with both parties and we are planning another one early next week.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, does the minister believe any progress is being made? If this talked-about contract does in fact come about it would be a shame if the plant continues in its present condition.

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker I agree with the hon. member.

It is a very difficult situation here. The problem has been compounded because of the untimely death of one of the union officials, and another reason was that the company was not getting orders. But I do believe that the meeting has been fruitful and we are looking forward hopefully to some results next week.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary, would the minister not agree that the situation is critical enough that perhaps he himself should intervene in it?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, the minister is always at the service of the people.

Hon. J. White (Minister of Industry and Tourism): Very good!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

METRO CIVIC DISPUTE

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Labour: Can he indicate the extent of his department's involvement in the Metro civic dispute at this point?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring to the calling of a meeting between the parties involved, I should like to tell him that I expect to be in a position to make a statement later on today.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, will the statement be made in the House?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think I'll be in a position to do it before the closing of the House and recess.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I understand the minister, I take it he feels he will be in a position today to announce the resumption of negotiations?

Hon. Mr. Guindon: Yes Mr. Speaker.

REMOVAL OF SAND FROM DUNES IN PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Natural Resources: Can the Minister of Natural Resources explain to the House his recently-quoted statement to the Belleville Intelligencer? I will quote it:

> Natural Resources Minister Mr. Leo Bernier, yesterday told the delegation of Prince Edward County councillors in Toronto he would support the Lake Ontario Cement Company if a choice ever should be forced between the sandbanks and the plant.

Hon. L. Bernier (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, we had some very detailed discussions, not only with the council and the mayors and reeves of that particular area, but also with the labour aspect—the labour unions were represented. At that time I intimated to them that if there was a choice I would certainly give careful consideration, very careful consideration, to the jobs that were at stake, with which they were very concerned. It certainly is not the intention of this government to put anybody out of work.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, given the recent nature of this statement, are we to take it that the government is anticipating that such a choice in fact will have to be made?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, this is a little premature. I think we will have to await the report of Dr. Tovell, who is engaged in that very in-depth study at the moment. Once his report is in my hands, then I would be prepared of course to look at his recommendations very carefully; and until that time there is very little we can do.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is it not possible there might be retraining and relocating and alternative manpower opportunities provided, by way of task force or mobilization of government, for the workers involved, rather than allowing the sandbanks to be permanently destroyed? Is that not also an alternative?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I think it may be a little premature to be looking into this aspect of it. Until the report is handed down and the recommendations from Dr. Tovell are in my hands, certainly I am not going to advance any of those things until I have to make that decision.

Mr. E. W. Martel (Sudbury East): It was premature of the minister to say what he said then.

Hon. A. F. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Justice): There are many other alternatives.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is not the minister somewhat guilty of prematurity in already indicating publicly that in the choice between the natural resource and the company, he comes down in favour of the company? Does this not show the inherent contradiction in his department between the extraction of resources on the one hand and the preservation of resources on the other?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

CONVICTIONS UNDER ENVIRONMENTAL ACTS

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development: Is the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development aware that between Feb. 23, 1970, and April 7, 1972, there were 59 charges under the three major environmental Acts in Ontario, 41 convictions with an average fine levied of $465.24; and is he prepared to say that in the Province of Ontario over 25 months, average fines of $465 are in any sense likely to be a deterrent to environmental destruction?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence (Provincial Secretary for Resources Development): Mr. Speaker, the details of those charges are not with me, and they would, of course, be found

through the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Auld). So the only comment I would make on the point or approach of the question is that it is not essentially the dollar value of the fine that is significant, it's the application of the law itself.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since the application of the law involves fines as a deterrent, would the minister not concede at this point that average fines of $465 spread out well over two years under the major Acts of government are, in fact, an incentive to pollute rather than a deterrent?

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: My answer would be in the negative. Certainly the fines are significant, but much more significant than the dollar—

Mr Lewis: Significant?

Mr. Martel: Pin money.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: The ability to fine is important, it's a significant ingredient—

Mr. Lewis: But they are a joke.

Hon. A. B. R. Lawrence: —but it's not the most important. The important one is to clear up the problem; and whether it be $400 or $4,000, I don't think that's the most important aspect.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): What about Union Carbide?

Mr. Singer: I would like to hear the trial; but I don't know that we are going to be here that long.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Lewis: May I ask one more question of the provincial Treasurer?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for Downsview thinking of leaving?

Mr. Singer: We've got about four more elections to go before that will come to trial.

LOCATION OF NEW AIRPORT

Mr. Lewis: Is the provincial Treasurer satisfied in his own mind, through the documents he has seen, that the federal government has made an appropriate argument justifying a second airport? I am not asking about the site location, I am asking whether the provincial Treasurer is persuaded of the need for a second airport on the basis of the material he has seen.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think that I am technically competent to answer that question. As the Prime Minister has expressed, that hasn't been part of our particular role in the whole area of the airport. Let me put it this way: If you go back four years, we were not asked whether we thought the expansion of Malton was a good thing or not, nor did we express views at that time. Following the blowup of the Malton expansion, the government of Canada said: "We have decided that there needs to be a second airport site," and I think probably it is fair to say we accepted that at that point in time.

They then asked us if we would assist them in determining the location of that second site. The actual fact is that, for example of the 59 sites—and there came to be more than that, that were detailed in the report which was leaked by someone to the Globe and Mail I guess, or one of the papers—

Mr. Lewis: At least one more site than the 59?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes. I haven't checked this but the member will recall that at the time of the joint announcement but Mr. Jamieson referred to 78 sites—or 79, I have forgotten which—of which 59 were shown in the September, 1970, report.

We did not select any one of the 79 sites. Each of those sites, I think it's fair to say, was selected by the federal team and we commented on each one of those sites as to its desirability or otherwise from a whole range of criteria—the environment, the cost, the servicing cost and so forth. We made our input on each one of those sites as they were rolled out to us.

Coming back to the question which has been asked by the leader of the New Democratic Party, I don't think I'd want to express a view, particularly, on the need or otherwise. We started this whole exercise with the federal government saying there was need. I think the member will recall that at the time of the joint announcement, perhaps it was at the press conference—and we had seen these figures before—Mr. Jamieson indicated that there are about six million people using Malton now. By the year 1978 or 1979 it is expected that will go to 12 million passengers per year, and by the year 2000 it is expected that the total number of

passengers going through Malton or through the Toronto airport system will be something in the neighbourhood of 60 million passengers.

I would have to say, from my knowledge, at some point, whether that's 1978 or whether it's 1975 or whether it's 1988, a second site will be needed. But that is not a technical opinion. That is just from my observation of the figures.

Mr. Singer: The minister doesn't pay any attention to technical figures anyway.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The other terribly interesting thing about all this from a lay point of view, after hearing the discussions over the last three or four years and now seeing some of it starting to happen, is the enormous growth which is predicted in terms of air freight, not only in Canada but all over the world, which of course will put a further strain on airport facilities.

I don't think I could add much more to that. Those are personal observations rather than governmental observations because we as a government have not looked specifically at the need for a second airport.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): A supplementary!

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: That is interesting. I think the minister will find the figure is 32 million quoted by Mr. Jamieson for the year 2000 and 22 million quoted by Statistics Canada. Those figures aside, does the provincial Treasurer not find the government's position therefore almost a compromised one, a very difficult one to sustain, given the enormous economic, social and environmental impact of this airport development? The question, which is the root of it all, is should there be a second site? Does not the minister feel that he, and the Premier and his cabinet colleagues, should have been satisfied on the basis of materials from the federal government that there was demonstrable need for a second airport, rather than simply accepting their fiat, their assertion, that they were going to build a second airport? Doesn't the minister think that is Ontario's responsibility at that point.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No. I think the location of an airport, the need for airports, is very definitely the responsibility of the federal government under the constitution. I don't think it helps the governing of the country particularly if we meddle in what is clearly a federal government responsibility.

Mr. Reid: By way of a supplementary: Surely the minister has to agree that when it involves the expenditure of public money from the Ontario Treasury, it is the responsibility of the government sitting over there to ascertain the need for that airport before these moneys are spent from the Ontario Treasury?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose the same thing could be said about the expansion of the airports at Mount Hope and London and Windsor.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Answer the question!

Mr. R. D. Kennedy (Peel South): Or Owen Sound!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Or Owen Sound, yes!

Mr. Sargent: Fat chance!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Our job is to provide the services to the site, with the municipalities, and to make sure that the infrastructure is there. I don't think it is our job to meddle, if I can use that word, with what is clearly the responsibility of the government of Canada.

Mr. Reid: That attitude hasn't been apparent on the government of Ontario's part.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is abdicating on this one. He can't defend it.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): A further supplementary: Since the province does have definite responsibility for planning the transportation, certainly surface transportation of highways and other public transportation in this province and certainly is concerned about the preservation of agricultural land, at least according to its Toronto-centred region plan, why would the minister not be interested—in determining whether there are alternatives to building a second airport which would use up so much of the agricultural land and spoil the environment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If you are going to build an airport, if you are going to provide for air transportation in this country, I suppose you have to have an airport site. We start from that premise. The hon. member for York Centre probably thinks the alternative of the horse and buggy is there. We don't quite accept that on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I think there have been a sufficient and reasonable number of supplementaries now.

Does the hon. member for Scarborough West have further questions?

The hon. member for St. David is trying to get the floor.

NEW JAILS

Mrs. M. Scrivener (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services.

In view of the conditions of some of the existing Don Jail facilities, will the minister give consideration to the acceleration of the construction of two new jails to be built in the eastern and western areas of Toronto?

Hon. J. W. Snow (Minister of Government Services): Mr. Speaker, as I think I explained a few days ago in the House—

Mr. Singer: Several days ago; outside the House!

Hon. Mr. Snow: —my department did receive approval from Management Board in the current year's estimates to proceed with the architectural design for two replacement institutions for the Don Jail, one in east Toronto and one in west Toronto. My property branch is presently working with the Ministry of Correctional services, and I believe the municipalities, in selecting suitable sites. This is underway right now, and I understand is proceeding very well. I also stated that two architectural firms have been selected for the design of these two institutions.

Mr. Martel: The answer is no.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I anticipate the design will take most of the current fiscal year, before the sites are finalized and the design is finalized. Beyond that, it is not in my power to accelerate the project until next year's estimates are decided.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Consistently consistent!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York-Forest Hill.

SPADINA RAPID TRANSIT

Mr. P. G. Givens (York-Forest Hill): I would like to ask the Treasurer, in his capacity as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, whether he would care to make a statement within a day or two as to why the construction of the Spadina rapid transit in the area from Yorkdale to Eglinton, which is an area which everybody has agreed upon, is progressing at such a very slow pace?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think that would be a question which would more appropriately be put to the Minister of Transportation and Communications who is chairing a committee, provincial and Metro, which is concerned with transportation matters in Metropolitan Toronto, and who could answer that question more appropriately.

Mr. Givens: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since I have been unable to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications this question for a couple of days, would the Treasurer mind very much passing the request on to him so that we can have this answer as soon as possible?

Mr. Speaker: That certainly is no point of order. The hon. member for Thunder Bay.

PROGRAMMES FOR UNORGANIZED COMMUNITIES

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): I would like to direct a question to the Premier.

Will the Premier consult with his colleagues to see if some programmes can't be set up to provide assistance for unorganized communities, particularly in northern Ontario, that lack adequate hydro facilities and adequate water facilities? Will the Premier endeavour to see if agencies, such as Ontario Hydro and the Ontario Water Resources Commission, cannot come up with programmes to assist unorganized communities, which seems to be impossible at the present time?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure the committee concerned with natural resources is looking at this in detail yet, but if not, it will be. Certainly I would be delighted to consult with my colleagues, but I think the policy field committee will be dealing with this in detail very shortly.

Mr. Stokes: As a supplementary, could the Premier tell me the status of applications from unorganized communities? I think he's aware of them. They have made application for hydro services and apparently it's before cabinet at the present time. Could the Premier enlighten me on that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can't enlighten the hon. member on this occasion. I shall endeavour to do so as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Essex-Kent.

FUNDS FOR SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEMS

Mr. R. F. Ruston (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Does the minister feel that with the signing of the new agreement in Ottawa with the President of the United States he will now he able to speed up the construction of sewage disposal systems in Ontario, now that the federal government will be supplying more funds for these constructions?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of the Environment: Mr. Speaker, as far as the Canada-US agreement is concerned and the agreement that Ontario has with Canada, there are funds available having to do with removal of nutrient from the systems. The existing programme of CMHC financing, by which they provide two-thirds of the cost and one quarter of that is forgivable, will also continue. That, of course, has been a great help in the past.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane South.

DISTRIBUTION OF DRAUGHT BEER IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. W. Ferrier (Cochrane South): I have a question of the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Has the government received the report from Arthur Wishart relative to the distribution of draught beer in northern Ontario? If so when will there be a statement as to what the government's position will be on this issue?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes Mr. Speaker, we have received a report from Mr. Wishart related to that particular matter. I anticipate a statement will be made by the appropriate minister very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York Centre.

BONDING OF CHARTER FLIGHT OPERATORS

Mr. Deacon: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Is the minister planning to establish provincial standards for bonding of charter flights operating out of Ontario, in co-operation with and in support of those in the industry now who recognize this need and are taking steps to protect at least their own customers?

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, we have it under very active consideration. We believe that it is more properly effected from the federal level. We are co-operating with that authority and if they do not move, we will.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for High Park.

TENDERING PRACTICES OF TIMISKAMING SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. M. Shulman (High Park): I have a question of the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister explain why the Timiskaming School Board does not accept the lowest tender on items that it puts out for construction? Why has the minister not replied to correspondence sent to him on this particular matter?

Hon. T. L. Wells (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that if correspondence has come in we would have somebody in our department reply to it, or they will be in the process of replying to it. I'll be glad to look into the matter that the hon. member has raised and bring back an answer.

Mr. Shulman: A supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister explain why Mr. Norman Mealing, his administrative officer, has said that local people should get the work regardless of whether or not they give the lowest bid?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You know, that feeling is prevalent, I think, in some parts of this province. I'll be glad to look into this particular situation and report to the member.

Mr. Shulman: A final supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Winkler: What is the member selling?

Mr. Shulman: Is the minister not aware that if local people are always given the award, persons from outside the local area will not bid? As a result the costs will go up and the cost of education will go up in this province?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I am very much aware of that. As the hon. member knows, one can't reduce this down to a simple thing like that. There certainly is a prevalent feeling that if at all possible work should be kept locally, but in no way limiting the scope of tendering. I'll be glad to report on this situation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

PURCHASE OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: I would like to ask him about the $2 million toy he is contemplating buying. Would the Prime Minister agree that he's kind of milking things a bit? He's got a $1 million budget for his office and now he's buying a $2 million plane, when a $400,000 plane would keep him within 20 minutes of his whole market here.

In view of the fact that he can save himself about $1.5 million on this project, would he please advise if the log will be open for inspection—not like he promised last year—and the plane will be available for government business only? None of this hanky panky of taking parties to the Caribbean.

Mr. W. Newman (Ontario South): What does the member want him to do? Buy his plane?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I guess the member for Grey-Bruce hasn't been here for a few days. This matter has been discussed often enough—

Interjections by hon members.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I recognize his own plane is a matter of great financial benefit to him in the conduct of the affairs of the public and his own personal business—

Mr. Sargent: The taxpayers didn't pay for that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Quite right, but I would think perhaps there would be, from him at least, a greater recognition that sometimes air service can expedite the carrying on of business, even in the public interest. This has been demonstrated by a senior jurisdiction in Canada and several other provincial jurisdictions; there is no question about this, Mr. Speaker.

As it relates to the possible acquisition, as I explained to the member for Downsview, the decision-making process has reached the point where no decision has as yet been made; so it is quite impossible to inform the hon. member beyond that. I can only assure the hon. member—and this has been stated many times in this House—that the use of government aircraft by ministers and senior public servants is in the public interest.

There was an instance, and I was disappointed the hon. member for Grey-Bruce didn't have an opportunity to involve himself in that discussion, as to the use of the Twin Otter by myself for something that might be construed as other than completely public business—I am quite prepared to acknowledge and accept that. And as our discussions go on in relation to the possible acquisition or updating of the air service in the province, I certainly would be delighted to inform the hon. member so that I can have the benefit of his assessment—probably after the decision has been made.

Mr. Sargent: A supplementary: In view of the fact that the Prime Minister admitted the Conservative Party had used the plane for political purposes, would it be available to the Liberal Party and to the New Democratic Party in the same way if we paid for it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we have never had a request from the Liberal Party to use a government plane for political purposes. I would have to give this very careful consideration. My initial reaction would be that it might possibly be a somewhat negative response—

Mr. Singer: If the decision-making process had reached the position where no decision had been made!

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is right—and on that particular question the decision-making process hasn't even started.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sandwich-Riverside.

HOMEBUILDER REGULATIONS

Mr. F. A. Burr (Sandwich-Riverside): Mr. Speaker, a question of the Treasurer: Is he considering any legislation that would enable municipalities to compel contractors to make good within a reasonable time any defects in homes they are constructing or have constructed?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't believe that any such legislation is under consideration within the department, and if such contemplation were being given it might be more appropriately contemplated and thought about within the—

Mr. Martel: Department of Labour!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Within the department headed by the House leader—

Mr. Martel: Uniform building codes in the Department of Labour?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and in the building standards branch of that department.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. Shulman moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Shulman: Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment sets up appropriate regulations and penalties for controlling persons moving back odometers.

Mr. Speaker: As has been the custom in this House for some time past, it has been deemed appropriate to put on the record the names of the pages who serve us so well in this Legislature. Today is the last day for the present group of pages to be on duty, and in keeping with the practice of the past I shall read into the record the names of those pages who have indeed served us very well for the past six or seven weeks:

Pamela Case of Stratford from the riding of Perth, Suzanne Cline of Pembroke from the riding of Renfrew North, Craig Currie of Ottawa from the riding of Carleton, Christine Czysch of Renfrew from the riding of Renfrew South, Maurice Doyle of Toronto from the riding of York South, Janet Farley of St. Thomas from the riding of Elgin, Dara Frame of Woodbridge from the riding of York Centre, Ned Harrington of Toronto from the riding of Eglinton, Karen Hoy of Agincourt from the riding of Scarborough North, Terry Kalyn of Willowdale from the riding of York Mills, Jill MacCulloch of Toronto from the riding of York East, Elizabeth Meen of Willowdale from the riding of York Mills, Tove Pedersen of Chapleau from the riding of Nickel Belt, Jeremy Pridham of Willowdale from the riding of York Mills, Scott Purves of Scarborough from the riding of Scarborough West, Bruce Raymer of Toronto from the riding of Riverdale, Ronald Saunders of Toronto from the riding of High Park, Colin Seed of Thunder Bay from the riding of Fort William, Owen Smyth of Oakville from the riding of Halton East, Gerry Vecchiola of Toronto from the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, and Dale Webb of Cottam from the riding of Essex South.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. R. D. Rowe in the chair.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD
(*continued*)

Mr. Chairman: Page 170, second vote.

On vote 1402.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): I gathered from what the minister said last night, Mr. Chairman, that the government hopes to come in with some type of programme to encourage beef production along the lines of a guaranteed bank loan. If I understood the minister's comments correctly, I think that is what he said. I am just wondering what the timing will be on this. Presumably this will be done before the end of the summer break. The minister will be in a position too—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture and Food): In reply to the member's inquiry, I'd hoped to be able to make that announcement within a matter of a few days. I think it's that close, because I think that between now and grass time, or shortly after grass time, is when some of these good heifers should be picked up. If they are going to be put into a cow herd they don't want to be finished in the feed lot.

Mr. Gaunt: That's exactly the point. I am pleased to hear that.

I want to turn to another aspect of this problem; it's related but not explicitly on this particular point. It relates to the shipping of cattle from west to east. Many of

the feeders and livestock men here in the province were very unhappy with the shipping arrangements which were made last fall, resulting in a great deal of loss. I think the classic example was a shipment of cattle which was destined to go to a farmer near Hensall and out of 118 cattle there were 32 dead in that particular shipment. That was the most extensive loss, I think, of any which I heard about. There were a number of other shipments that contained three or four dead calves, all of which added to the tremendous dissatisfaction with shipping, and the arrangements which are made with respect to the railways and with respect to loading, with respect to feeding and watering, and so on.

I notice that there have been a number of meetings. I think the Ontario Beef Improvement Association has met with the railways and with the Canadian Transportation Commission, and this has all been centred around the matters related to the shipment of calves down here from the west.

I'm not saying that the railways are all to blame. I think it's a situation that involves a number of problems. I think in some cases the western farmers have weaned the calves and then immediately loaded them onto the cars. They haven't been given a chance to settle down and to learn to feed in the normal way, and this has resulted in more shipping fever than should have happened. I think in some cases the cars are overloaded. In an effort to save money they put a few more head of cattle in than should be put in.

I think last fall this applied more so than perhaps it has in recent years, where eastern buyers held off until the last minute in the hope that prices would come down. They didn't come down, so there was a tremendous flood of purchases and all of a sudden the railways were overburdened with cattle coming down and they just simply couldn't handle the overload. I think there is a very definite case to be made for the railways' inefficiency and the fact that they do take longer than necessary, in many cases, to come down here. I think, particularly on weekends, cattle are not unloaded and properly fed when they should be. All of this adds up to a situation in this province that in my view is completely unacceptable from the feedlot operator's viewpoint.

I notice that the Federation of Agriculture has taken up this matter and in its brief it indicated to the minister and to the Ontario cabinet that it would like the Ontario government in some fashion to supervise all of the unloading that takes place. I'm not sure just exactly what that would do, but I'd be interested in the minister's response. I presume that what they have in mind is that if the Ontario government supervises all of the off-loading of livestock in transit from western Canada, that it will be able to screen the carloads of cattle coming down here, where there have been extra losses over and above the normal losses that one expects, and in that way they could pinpoint and perhaps investigate any circumstances surrounding those losses. Insurance is involved as well; I suppose it would make it easier to settle claims, and so on.

I feel that there are a number of things that could be done with respect to speeding up the service. I think if the railways were in competition with the truckers it would perhaps add a little competition in the marketplace and that in itself would improve the service. Every time the truckers get involved in the business the railways lower their prices to the point that the truckers cannot compete, then they go out and the railways have it all on their own. When they have that situation—a monopoly on the shipping—we run into all sorts of problems of delay and loss.

I would be interested in hearing the minister's comments, and if in fact the department has anything in mind with respect to improving the service for the shipment of cattle.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the matter of shipments of cattle from western Canada, we are very much concerned. Admittedly it is a real problem and not an easy problem to deal with, because the trend of cattle production in western Canada as a result of geography, climate and all the rest of it, is that calves are born in the spring of the year and weaned in the fall—that's when our cattle people have to get them down here.

There were certainly problems last year. I think it is perhaps a question of the personnel who are operating the railways, looking after these cars coming down here, not really being knowledgeable about cattle. Cattle are different from hard freight. You can set a car of machinery on the siding for a few days and nobody worries too much about it, other than the fellow who is supposed to be getting delivery on it; it isn't going to deteriorate. But you can't do that with livestock. I am afraid there isn't enough appreciation among the people who handle these cars on the

rail lines of the fact that they are handling live cargo—and it does make a great difference.

Certainly our staff has been working with the transportation committee of the Ontario Beef Improvement Association in discussions that are continuing with the two rail lines to try to resolve these problems, but there is a great influx of these cattle coming in each fall. I think last year we brought down about 175,000 head in a matter of a few weeks. While we would like to see more cattle brought in by truck, I think we have to recognize the limitations on these cattle coming down by truck because there just aren't enough trucks.

One of the most encouraging developments I have seen take place over this last winter since these discussions have been held is the CPR providing a trial run of a doubledeck car with the provision of feed and water in the car. That, to me, is the most promising thing I have seen happen.

Mr. Gaunt: As long as the cars are not overloaded.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: That's true, but we have to see that they are not overloaded, and certainly the person who is shipping the cattle and the person who is receiving the cattle have to look after that aspect of it.

On the trial runs that have come down, the cattle have come in in very good shape.

It seems to me that by cutting off a couple of days en route, as I believe has been the case with these two trial runs, the cattle are coming off in much better shape. I hope that experiment will become a reality with more cars and that we can look forward to future development of that means of transportation.

The Ontario Federation of Agriculture, as my friend suggested, requested supervision of unloading of these cattle cars coming into the Province of Ontario at all unloading points at the expense of the Province of Ontario. Frankly, I have some reservations about the validity and wisdom of that request.

I suppose it would be a good thing to do, but after all we have no control over the railways—they are chartered by the federal government—and I would suggest that if there is an organization that wants to have that kind of supervision provided, then I suppose the OBIA, which has a substantial source of funds at its disposal through the checkoff, could provide the supervision. I am not sure what it would accomplish, quite frankly.

I would a lot sooner see the speeding up of the movement of those cattle from the western source right through to the Ontario destination rather than to have them sitting around yards, sometimes not getting ample opportunity to get feed or water before they are reloaded again, and of course the stress and strain of unloading and all the rest of it is quite severe.

It is not an easy problem to resolve. We are hopeful that improvements can be made by next year, and I would think as well that one of the contributing factors to the problems that did arise last fall with regard to the shipment of cattle from western Canada, was associated with the kind of weather we had. Perhaps there has never been a fall, in my memory at least, when we have had such warm weather as we had in Ontario last fall. The experience that I have had in shipping cattle—the first load of cattle I brought out of the west was in 1937, and we have been doing it ever since—is that they come down in better shape when the weather is cool and crisp and frosty; not damp, muggy weather but crisp, cool weather. Last year it was very warm, and I think it helped to contribute to some of our problems.

There were cattle that came out of Nova Scotia as well. I think the railways are to be criticized for not having provided sufficient cattle cars in Nova Scotia to bring those cattle west. The Maritime freight rates do apply. But it does seem to me that when there is as sizable a number of cattle assembled as was assembled in Nova Scotia—something like 2,300 to 2,500 head of cattle being sold in that auction—they should have had sufficient cattle cars there to move them, instead of putting them in boxcars and shipping them west, particular in weather that was as warm as we had last fall. It was inevitable that we were going to run into some real problems and we did.

Some of those matters have been settled, I think, by the people who were responsible for loading them in the east. We have let it be known in no uncertain terms that we didn't think much of that idea and we don't want to see it happen again.

I think all of us in Ontario are interested in the sources of feeder cattle, in finding additional or alternate sources of feeder cattle to western Canada. Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick to some degree, provide that source of reasonably good-quality cattle, but we have to have a better means of getting them here than was obvious last fall.

I have been disappointed that we were unable to get the feeder cattle out of the eastern United States, because undoubtedly there is a source of feeder cattle there that is just second to none, in my opinion, in the North American continent; all kinds of beef cows producing very good calves, well graded, well put up, packaged in the kind of lots that any feedlot operator would like to have. But the problem is the federal government has, quite rightly, I think imposed the anaplasmosis test, which requires a blood test on the cattle that takes about 12 days to read. That effectively has blocked the movement of cattle out of the eastern United States to Ontario feedlots. Those cattle could be loaded in the Virginias, in Kentucky, and to some degree in the Carolinas, and moved into Ontario without any trouble at all in a matter of hours. But to take that test just spoils the whole thing.

I think we have to recognize that our exports of dairy cattle out of this country are phenomenal, and one of the reasons is because we have such a high standard of health, through the federal health of animals regulations. So these are matters that are of concern, and I think probably this is one of the reasons that generated the interest that we have in seeing the beef cow herd in Ontario expanded.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, just on that point, I would hate to see the health of animals branch in Ottawa lower their standards; I wouldn't want to see that. And while the minister's point is quite valid—those cattle could move up from the south in a very short time—at the same time I think we have to maintain the standards which we have here. I think in 1970-1971 didn't we export something in the neighbourhood of $20 million worth of grade and purebred Holstein cattle? And it's all because of the health standards which we maintain. We have the highest—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: And the quality of our cattle!

Mr. Gaunt: —and the quality of our cattle. We have one of the highest standards of any country in the world with respect to health of animals, and, as the minister points out, add to that the excellent quality of our cattle, and we have a tremendous export trade in purebred and grade cattle. So I would hate to see us lose even a part of that.

I am wondering, in the minister's mind, what percentage of the feeder cattle should we be aiming to produce in this province? Would the minister bring forward his plan, as I hope he does, within the next few days? What is the overall objective of the department? Does he feel that we should be raising, say, 30, 40, 50 per cent of our feeder cattle in this province, our replacement stock? What is the objective behind the policy? I think the minister said last night, in total, there was something in the neighbourhood of 400,000 cattle moved into the province to go into feedlots this past year. Does he have a certain percentage? Is there an objective to the policy which he is going to bring in? If so, I would like to hear it.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think it is a very difficult question to answer. I don't think we can set any target. I think we have to recognize that there are certain limitations of resources. I just don't know how one determines how many more beef cows could be kept in the Province of Ontario. As I travel about this province, I see areas where, I think, resources are not being used to the full.

I am wondering if it is because we have had a tradition in Ontario of providing more care for our beef cows than we really need to provide. I see, in the past, barns that have been put up, stables that have been put up to winter beef cows. In my humble thinking, there is no place for beef cows being kept in the stable in the Province of Ontario if we can get them outside. I travel through parts of the province, as I have recently, and see beautiful groves, where those cattle could stay in and never have any wind bother them. Sure, there is snow there and it is cold, but cattle can stand that. There is no problem at all, and they are far healthier. I just think that we have missed some opportunities.

I think we have been restricting ourselves to how many cattle a man can put in a barn and look after through the winter. Sure, we have to put up feed. We have to get that feed out to them, but I have seen big cow herds that have been carried outside through the winter and hay drawn out to them and spread on the frozen ground. They would come through the winter in beautiful shape and produce really top quality beef calves the next year.

I think we have got to recognize that this is the kind of beef cow operation that we have to look forward to in the Province of Ontario. I don't think that we can have a beef cow industry developed in Ontario, based on too much capital investment in the facilities that the cow is going to be kept or housed in. I think it is an operation that has to perform on the salvage of some crops. When I drive home between Toronto and our place, I drive through an area where, on

both sides of the road, I see virtually hundreds of acres of corn stalks lying there, and which have lain there all this winter. Save at the time of the ice storm a few weeks ago, there was really nothing to hinder cows living on those corn stalks all winter.

Some farmers in that general area, west of here, between here and London, are using those corn stalks to carry beef cows through the winter. I tell the House I think that is what has to be done. Where is the grass going to be provided? There is rough land. Perhaps we are going to have to use more of the research work that has been done by the University of Guelph, through the research provided by our department, in pasture renovation—the use of birdsfoot trefoil, or crown vetch, these various types of legumes that can be used and can be introduced to rundown pastures. I think we have to look at getting some of these thorn trees and old maple trees out of the way and putting some of this land back into productive pasture.

Now, how many cows can we have? As I said last night, I believe, last fall we brought down 175,000 calves from western Canada. We should have brought down 250,000 to 300,000 calves. We had the facilities; we could have used them. If we were to increase our cow herd in Ontario by 50,000 it would be a start. My guess is we couldn't possibly increase it in a year's time by that amount. I think it will take time to work it up. But if we even increased it by 100,000, say in three years, that would be 100,000 more feeder calves here than we now have.

And even with the improvements that I hope will take place in the transportation facilities provided by the rail lines—and there are more truckers now interested in moving cattle from the west in these large multi-layer trucks—we may be able to bring those calves down a little easier than we did before.

I feel we have got to do everything we can to use these resources, and frankly, Mr. Chairman, I can't give an answer as to what the objectives should really be. I think we have to do the best we can to explore every avenue to expand the cow herd—and that is our objective right now.

Mr. Gaunt: If we succeed in producing an extra 100,000 replacement cattle down here, that would constitute roughly 33 per cent—a third? You say that 300,000 are required and if we produced an extra 100,000, that would be roughly a third.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes.

Mr. Gaunt: I am glad the minister has indicated that, because at least in my view it is a good start—and we can move forward from that point. I'll leave that matter; I don't want to pursue it any further.

There is another matter that I want to mention; it relates to beef testing. Almost every year I make a speech about beef testing, and I am going to make my annual pitch, so to speak.

I just want to say that as far as I am concerned the objectives of the beef testing programme are very much worthwhile, very laudatory. I don't think there is any question about that. But I think we get into the situation where the programme is stratified, it is stereotyped, and it applies right across the board to every animal, to every breed. But our breeds are different; they have different characteristics.

If I understand the programme correctly—and I am working strictly from memory—I think an animal goes on test around six months of age.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member is talking about bulls, isn't he?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, right. They go on about six months of age; they are required to gain something in the neighbourhood of 2½ lb a day in order to meet the requirements. It has even been pointed out to me that in the future, in order to be registered as purebred, an animal will have to comply with the testing requirements. Not only will he have to meet the blood line requirements but he will have to meet the testing requirements as well.

I think the point I would like to make at this juncture is that if an animal goes on test at six months of age and has to make the required 2½-lb daily gain, it is going to require some force-feeding; that animal is going to have to be shoved to a certain extent. There are individual characteristics pertaining to each of the breeds, and it is my view that some of the animals perhaps can accommodate that, but other breeds cannot.

I think it is wise for any breeder—and I say this, having consulted a number of them, not only my father, but a number of other purebred breeds, who feel that the best animals are the ones which are allowed to have a period of growth where they're not forced too much to mature to a certain extent before they got on to full feed and are pushed from that point forward.

I know that in the shorthorn breed I think we have some excellent breeders. One of the best feeders and herdsmen, perhaps, that we have in the province with respect to shorthorn cattle resides up near Peterborough. I happen to know him quite well. He has indicated to me on a number of occasions that, as far as he's concerned, these animals should be grown for a period and should not, in his view, go on test until they're nine or 10 months of age—no sooner—because, apparently, the feeling is that you get a far better animal if it's done that way. If those animals are put on at six months of age, then, obviously, the animal doesn't have a chance to grow and develop and mature to the same extent that it would otherwise.

I wonder if the breed associations are ever consulted on these requirements. Are they ever asked what their views are with respect to these matters, because Aberdeen Angus mature very quickly? The Hereford, I think it's fair to say, perhaps matures quicker than the shorthorn. At least they grow very quickly at an early age and I think they tend to mature more rapidly.

Can the minister indicate to me if there are consultations with the various breed associations? I'm not thinking of the old three, so to speak, the Charolais people, the Limousin and—

Mr. D. J. Wiseman (Lanark): Charolais, Aberdeen Angus, Hereford.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes. My good friend over here from Lanark was telling me the other night at the Speaker's dinner that he has Charolais. I'm sure maybe he would want to comment on this matter, because I think it's important. I think that it's the same old business, when you make a rule and apply it to everyone. It doesn't matter whether you're doing it to cattle or whether you're doing it to people, you always hurt somebody in the process. We can't be fitted into the little slots and neatly packaged and sent off. It just doesn't work that way.

Mr. Wiseman: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. The member for Lanark.

Mr. Wiseman: On behalf of what, or going along with what the speaker from Huron-Bruce has said, I'm a Charolais breeder and I don't believe what he says at all. I believe if a bull on test doesn't come up to the qualifications, or can't prove himself, then I think we're wasting the Minister of Agriculture's time in a good cow-calf operation.

Mr. Gaunt: The member missed my point.

Mr. Wiseman: If any of these other breeds can't come up to it, for instance, in ours, if he doesn't weigh 1,050 lb then we don't allow him to be registered. I think if we're going to breed cows and get more weight into those calves, then we have to select our bulls. In this testing that's going on, if we don't go along the way it is now, then we're not ever going to get more weight into our calves. For instance, we don't keep a calf in our herd that, after a couple of tests, doesn't come up to well over 1,050 lb at a year. I'd just like to say I'm in favour of the way it is now. It's working out well in our herd and I think we should leave it that way. If the other breeds just don't come up to it, scrap them.

Mr. Gaunt: This is promotion?

Hon E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I can appreciate what my friend from Lanark says, that it might be very well for the Charolais people. I am not quarrelling for a moment with the fact that we should try to increase the weight and feed conversion of our cattle. I am not talking about that at all.

All I am saying is that there are variations in the different breeds. If you want to set a standard of 1,050 lb at, say, a year for all breeds, well and good, that is fine. All I am saying is I think it is wrong to say an animal has to go on test at a specific period and has to come off test at a specific period and has to meet certain requirements at a given age. I think all we need to do is to maintain in our regulations the objective that these animals have to gain more quickly, have to convert better and so on. It really doesn't matter a hoot when they go on as long as they achieve the desired end. That is what I am complaining about.

I am saying that each breed is different; that your Charolais may go on test at six months and come off at a year and weigh 1,050 lb or 1,150 lb. That is fine, but there may be some other breeds which really don't fit into those classifications and, in the end, maybe will perform just as well as your Charolais animals. Do you see what I mean? That is the point I am making and I still think it is valid notwithstanding what my friend has said.

I come back to my question to the minister. Do you consult with breed associations in establishing these standards?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes to that question. We do consult; my stock commissioner tells me there are constant discussions going on with the various beef breeders.

For the interest of the members I might mention that last year there were 2,072 bulls tested. The minimum requirement for a premium is 2.5 of daily gain. The average daily gain of all the breeds tested last year was 2.8 which is well above the premium requirement of gainability. All of the various breeds, including Aberdeen Angus, averaged higher than the minimum requirement. We even had some Santa Gertrudis in there with a pretty substantial gain. There was one brown Swiss bull and there were several crossbred bulls as well. The average daily gain was 2.8.

I think the member for Huron-Bruce, with respect, has a point. I think we all like to see these bulls grown a bit more than just finished with too much fat. I think this is what he is saying—let the bull grow rather than get too much fat on it. But my friend, the livestock commissioner, Mr. McGill, has just handed me a note and he tells us that the bulls tested at Guelph with the ultrasonic measurement equipment used now to measure back fat thickness at the start of the test had 0.3 in. The average fat thickness at the end of the test was 0.5. Now that isn't a very substantial difference after a bull has come off test so I think those figures indicate that bulls are not becoming excessively fat on the test basis.

Mr. Gaunt: Is that for all breeds?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, for all breeds. This is the average for all bulls on test at the Guelph station.

Mr. Gaunt: Do you have it broken down breed by breed?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I haven't here; I don't know whether or not the livestock commissioner has. But I point out—did you catch the note I made about the 2,072 bulls that were on test? I think you were reading a note when I read that.

The premium requirement, as you mentioned, is 2.5 lb of average daily gain. The average daily gain on the 2,072 bulls was 2.8, in the province last year. The Aberdeen Angus was right up there; those bulls were over the minimum requirement. So I think, generally speaking, when the livestock commissioner has discussed these matters with the various breed associations they have all wanted the same standard of test for their various cattle.

After all a good beef breeder recognizes that we are still selling beef by the pound and he wants to be able to provide a bull that will show that inheritable characteristic of gainability. I think we have to recognize these are important things.

There is one thing I do think we should recognize in this bull-testing programme, and it is that we perhaps should be exploring ways and means whereby we could increase that number of 2,072 bulls. We need presently in Ontario well over 4,000 beef bulls just to maintain the number of bulls for replacement purposes in this province. We are testing about half of them, and if we can increase the beef cow herd we are going to need more. So it would seem to me that we should be exploring ways and means whereby, rather than having, say, 1,800 bulls on home test, we could find a feedlot with a good manager, a good operator and the right kind of feed and put all those bulls in there together and leave them under the same environment, the same management, the same feed.

Then if we gave them a test, it seems to me we would know a lot more about the performance of those bulls on feed under the same conditions than we would by letting some really top-quality herdsman and manager look after that bull on his own farm in comparison with another farmer who might not have the same environment or the same native ability to be a good livestock man, because I often think it's inherited rather than developed to a great extent.

We are taking a look at that proposal. I think it has a great deal of promise. We would like to see if we could expand that idea during the coming year at least on a trial basis and get the show on the road.

Mr. Gaunt: I was just going to make one or two comments on this point. I would agree with the minister that putting a group of bulls under one manager and under one feeder is a good idea, because there are just as big differences in feeders as there are in bulls. Some are good and others aren't. The quality and the capability of the bull may be there, but if he isn't under proper management and proper care one can't get the best out of him. I think that's a very valid point, and I would like to see the department pursue that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister has thought about the need for a compensation fund for loss due to predators, especially in view of the pronouncement in the budget about doing away with certain management controls on predators that we have in the province. It seems we have compensation for hunter damage, rabies and other forms but we do not have it for loss due to predators. I wonder if the minister has considered this or if he would consider such a compensation fund.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the member for Victoria-Haliburton has raised a very valid point. We are concerned by the losses that have been caused by predators, where the farmer has not been able to collect from the municipality because his livestock or poultry was destroyed by wild animals. Under the Dog Tax and Livestock and Poultry Protection Act, no compensation is paid by the municipality where this is proved to be the case.

Oh, my friend the livestock commissioner tells me, Mr. Chairman, that the municipality can pass a bylaw permitting it to pay for domestic animals that are destroyed by wild animals within that municipality. This is something I was not aware of, because it does not apply under our Act. There are obviously some municipalities that haven't done that because there have been some substantial losses sustained by some in the province, particularly sheep men, because they couldn't collect damage. So I appreciate the point raised by my hon. friend; we are certainly looking at this, but I am not sure what the final outcome will be.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey-Bruce): Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister is very well aware of the fact that Grey and Bruce are the best two counties in all Canada as far as the production of beef is concerned—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I wasn't aware of that.

Mr. Sargent: Well, you told us that at the last big beef dinner we had up there, maybe you were kidding the troops then, but you told us that you thought it was the finest in Canada.

An hon. member: That was a lot of bull, Ed.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Did you say the Prime Minister of Canada said that?

Mr. Sargent: No, the minister said that—you yourself.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will have to be more careful.

Mr. Sargent: The minister I think has been at our beef barbecues and I think we are the finest area in all Canada for the production of beef, but I am concerned—

An hon. member: We have some good barbecues in our area.

Mr. Sargent: —on behalf of my people as it is our major industry. This current issue of Life magazine tells America about the consumers' plight insofar as the cost of meat is concerned and I think, Mr. Minister, somewhere in this $3.4 million that you want for this vote 6, that there must be some way to find the answer. With all the technology that you have at your hands and this budget of $3.4 million, there must be some way to protect the people who are producing this great commodity which we must have.

The information that I have before me is concerned about the consumer being gobbled up by meat prices. Consider that in the last 12 years, Mr. Minister—I'm saying this on behalf of the farmer—the average consumer's income has increased by 82 per cent. Meanwhile the farmers are getting the same price for the cattle they fed as they did 12, even 20 years ago. You know that's a fact.

On Jan. 9, 1952, prime cattle were $39; most choice to prime were $35 to $38. On Feb. 16, 1972, 20 years later, the prime cattle price was $38; most choice to prime, $34 to $37.

The consumer was paying 85 cents for swiss steak in 1952; now he is paying $1.69. For hamburger, 49 cents in 1952; now 98 cents to $1.19 a pound. Rib steak, 79 cents 20 years ago; now $1.59. Beef stew, 79 cents 20 years ago; now it is 98 cents. Round steak, 98 cents 20 years ago; and now it's $1.38. Beef roast, 65 cents 20 years ago; now it's $1.19. Prime rib, 69 cents 20 years ago; now it's $1.29.

So in effect the increase in cost then is not from the farmer's selling price. It's due to the high labour costs and the increased cost of packaging and transportation. And besides paying the same price for everything that everyone else does, it costs the farmer, as

you know, over 50 per cent more to produce a superior meat product for the ungrateful consumer. The farmers had to tighten their belts, cut out extras and continue to produce quality products.

If public opinion, the public media we're hearing so much about—I mentioned Life magazine here, and all the consumer groups are talking about this—continue on the same path that they are going, this country could see the day when the meat counters are empty and then all hell will break loose. Because the farmer has the most powerful weapon in the world, hunger, to make people come into line, if he wants to go on strike.

I know that you are in accord with this, but let's put the blame where the blame belongs and not on the hard-working farmer, because this is not his responsibility.

We have $3.4 million in this department on this vote; you must have some way to protect the farmer. Although our friends—our farmer friends in the NDP here who have large holdings of agriculture in Hamilton and so on, who talk authoritatively on this subject—know all the answers for agricultural problems, we don't. The United States doesn't know the answer. But when you're spending $3.4 million there must be some way to protect the farmer, because he's the prime producer.

At the risk of being laughed at, I will suggest to the minister that there should be some way—we talked about crop insurance on the previous vote—I think to have a beef crop insurance programme. I know the minister will laugh at that, but somewhere along the line there has to be something to protect the farmer. I would like to have the minister's thought on some way to bring this into proper perspective. It would be the most important thing he could do if one year he would say, "Do not make that $3 million, make it $10 million." But find the answer, if the minister can, because it isn't the farmer's fault.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will take that matter under consideration, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: That just isn't good enough. I am not going to speak for five or 10 minutes on something that is logical and right and have the minister say he will take that under consideration. I want to know the answer.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am telling the member I can't say I am going to spend $10 million next year after a budget of $3,346,000 here. I can't say I am going to increase that $6.5 million. There are—

Mr. Sargent: It is not working.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: —several other people who have got to talk about it as well. All I will do is say to the member that I undertake to give consideration to the points that he has raised, and I think there is some validity in it.

Mr. Sargent: But it is not working.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: But what the minister is doing now is not working.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, now I don't think that that is quite the case. I haven't run into very many beef men, even in those great beef counties of Bruce and Grey, who are not pretty happy with the price of beef cattle today. I haven't met them. The member refers to the fact that 20 years ago the price of beef was indeed comparable to what it is this winter. That is a fact. There was a scarcity of beef developed in those years. That was in 1951.

I recall very well the fall of 1951, when beef calf prices were not as high as they were last fall by any means, but they were quite a bit stronger than they had been previously. The price of finished beef worked up in the fall of 1951 to hit the record prices that he mentioned a few moments ago and they are quite correct. But the market broke on February 8, 1952, when the news broke that foot-and-mouth disease had broken out in Saskatchewan. Immediately that word was out, the United States closed its border.

The price of beef dropped eight cents a pound relatively overnight, within a matter of two weeks it dropped. There was no more beef going to the States. There was no more pork going to the States. Quite frankly, had the federal government not stepped in at that time and introduced a canned meat programme to take that meat off the market, I don't know what the price would have ended up finally, but it did do that and I give them credit for it.

In my opinion, the price of beef never recovered in those ensuing years until about two to three years ago when we had a price escalation of up to the $35 to $36 level. Then there was a great concern expressed by some consumer organizations with the high price of beef. The advice was given by the president of one of the chain stores here in Toronto to boycott the beef counter. The

federal Minister of Consumer Affairs, Mr. Basford, at that time said, "Boycott the beef counter. Go on strike, you don't have to buy beef. Go somewhere else."

I think those two men did the greatest disservice that has ever been done to the beef industry in the history of Canada by those two statements. Certainly, the consumer, because of all the public furore that was developed, did back away from the beef counter. They increased the purchase of other commodities, pork and chicken particularly.

Let me say that the chain store operator in that particular case laughed all the way to the bank, because what he wasn't selling in beef, he was selling twice as much in chicken and pork.

I think that we have had a situation develop in North America—because of the growing population and the growing affluence of our people generally speaking—to escalate the per capita consumption of beef to the place where, because of the biological factor in the production of beef, which is limited to one cow producing one calf a year, we have run into what can be described as—I don't think I would want to call it a shortage of beef, but certainly not as much beef available to go on the market as has been the case in the past. This to me has brought the price of beef up to what I think is a much more acceptable level to the producer than it has been for many years in the past.

We are importing into Canada, and into United States, enormous quantities of beef from Australia and New Zealand. This is beef that is going in most cases into the process trade, hamburg and cooked meats, but it does fill a need that we simply do not have the beef to fill in this country or in United States. I am not that concerned about those imports of beef. Quite frankly, I think that they have helped to keep synthetic beef off the market.

I am really concerned with any future problems that may develop over the foreseeable years in a further shortage of beef to meet domestic requirements in United States and Canada, which could generate the introduction of synthetic meat on the market. I think that if we don't have enough beef to fulfil consumer demand for normal beef, we can find ourselves in that predicament. And I don't think any of us, as beef producers or meat producers, want to see that happen.

I think we have to recognize as well that the consumer is entitled to buy meat products at a price that she can afford to pay. By the same token, I want to see our producers get a price that they can afford to live on and enjoy the standard of living that I am sure my hon. friend from Grey-Bruce wants them to enjoy.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Your department is Ministry of Agriculture and Food and that's a big ball of wax insofar as about 8,000,000 taxpayers in this province are concerned. It's a big job you have, and it's very important. The price of steak was 80 to 85 cents 20 years ago, and now it's double, $1.69. We know that the chain store is not making it because they work on a profit of one per cent of volume. So somewhere along the line the increased cost of meat is due to high labour costs and increased costs of packaging and transportation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Right.

Mr. Sargent: It boils down to those three areas. I don't know, and the minister states he doesn't know—no one seems to know—the answer to this thing. You are basically in partnership with the farmers of this province in their industry, and I don't know if there are any good on suggestions or not, but there should be awareness by the consumer that it isn't the farmers' fault; maybe a one-shot PR campaign or full-page ads or on radio or television, telling the people that this is not the area they should be laying the blame on. I just leave that with the minister.

But I do think that we will have to solve the disappearance of our family farms. In our area they are closing up in hundreds every year, as you know. We have to find some way of keeping them together, because the integration vertically is now in full flight. I am very concerned about this and I know you are too. I would like to see that you have a bigger budget than $3.4 million in this area, because it is one of the biggest industries that we have.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for York Centre.

Mr. D. M. Deacon (York Centre): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the minister what progress has been made in the question that I raised last year on the Japanese demand for our beef, particularly our breeding animals? I know the federal government was giving some consideration to this, and I was wondering if you were working with them at all? The Americans have been doing a very good job on this by having a

man over there who is respected by the beef producers, who was actually working on these Japanese beef farms showing them how to improve their standards. The Japanese beef herds are a long way behind us in their standard of quality of animals as well as in their operating techniques. They have come right up in their dairy operations.

With the tremendous increase in demand per capita for beef in the last three or four years—it's really moving up very fast now with the increase in the standard of living—it's possible demand could be developed for synthetic beef. It may be a place where the Japanese might move in if we don't help them supply that demand by our development of that beef supply. Have you anything to report on this?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes. Certainly, there have been exploratory trips and, as a matter of fact, Japan was Canada's second best customer for exports of pork last year. Over 20 million lb were sent to Japan and that is a sizable figure in a new market. I don't know whether we can continue to ship there at the present price of pork. That was on a very poor market, as you will recall, as far as our producers were concerned. Whether or not we can ship there at this price I don't know. I think that we may be able to.

For instance, I understand that a company has made arrangements to build a packing plant in the Province of Alberta to supply Pacific rim countries with a minimum of 640,000 hog carcasses a year. They would be buying on today's market and it is encouraging to think that can happen. I think this is a real breakthrough and I hope that that plant goes ahead. The last word I had, as of last week, was that it was going to go ahead.

There have been some trial shipments of beef to Japan. I haven't heard the results of those shipments as yet. I understand that one of the promoters of the programme is over there in Japan right now but what the results are, I just don't know.

I was talking to a livestock exporter this morning before I came to the Legislature and he told me that he has two Japanese delegations coming to his farm here in Ontario next week. He is vitally interested in exporting dairy cattle to Japan. These are matters that we would like to see followed up and I hope successfully. We are interested. We are trying to do the job.

Mr. Deacon: Mr. Chairman, the way that the Americans have been having considerable success in this programme is by having a man who is a practical farmer reside over there working with their farmers. He's a man who knows the language. He knows, from his own experience, how to help them set up. He is actually going out on their farms, the beef breeders' farms and helping them, right there, improve the situation.

They are so pathetically behind us and yet I don't think we will ever be able really to look for a finished beef market of great proportions in Japan, to the extent that we can look for an export market for breeding animals. This is the area about which I am concerned more than the shipping of carcasses.

It seems to me that in a country like that where they do have the potential for building up feeder lots, there could be a great demand for our breeding cattle and we could earn a reputation for our beef breeds that is certainly comparable to our purebred dairy breeds. That is the area in which I was hoping the minister might have had something to report during the past year.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, reverting to the discussion that the member for Grey-Bruce had with the minister on the question of prices: Would the minister have any information as to the extent to which the price to the producer and the price to the consumer have kept in balance? Or is the amount taken by the middleman, the wholesaler, the retailer, the processor, an escalating amount of the differential? More directly, does the minister have any indication that the middleman operation, important and essential as it is in getting it from the producer to the consumer, is taking an increasing share of this spread, or bears any responsibility for it? If he does bear a responsibility for it, is it being discharged in terms of the quality of the processing that is taking place in producing the commodity that ends up on the consumer's table?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, the studies that have been done didn't indicate that the distributors were taking any larger markup today than they had been some time ago. As a matter of fact, their percentage markup in some cases indicated that it was less on a per carcass of beef than it had been previously. Volume of course is something to be considered.

But I think one of the reasons for the increase that is taking place at the consumer level, in comparison with what it may have been at an earlier day when cattle were at a similar live-weight price level, can be associated with the extra costs of breaking the carcass, defatting, deboning and shipping it out in cryovac packages. All of this costs money.

Of course there has been a very substantial increase in the wage rates that have been paid to the various unions that are involved in the meat trade and in the retail grocery trade as well. There are a great many people who handle the carcass of beef from the time it leaves the farmer's gate until it arrives on the foodstore counter available to the consumer.

So I think all of these things have entered into it very definitely, but I would have to say to my hon. friend that there doesn't appear to have been any exhorbitant advantage taken by the distributors in this particular case.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell me what the best available source of information is for this kind of inquiry, or study, currently available? Is there any up-to-date information currently available?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I believe the Ambler pricing service is one of the services that is available to do comparative checking of costs.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried?

On item 7, soils and crops.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that exports do constitute a large part of the farmer's income with respect to the soil crops, I am wondering if the minister would perhaps enlighten me with respect to the impact that Britain's entry into the European Common Market will have.

For instance, I think in 1971 we exported in the neighbourhood of 60 per cent of our turnip crop grown in the province. About 20 per cent of carrot production was exported. I think a lot of it to the United States, but certainly, I believe, some of it went over to Great Britain. Twenty-five per cent of Ontario's onion production is exported each year. About 10 per cent of Ontario's grape production is exported. Exports of white beans have increased to the point where we export about 60 per cent of our total production. Coupled with that, of course, is the tremendous exports we have in the livestock area.

We are talking, I believe in 1971, about $2 billion that was put into the farmers' pockets through the export trade; taken right across the country. I am taking about Canada now. That is a lot of money. I think it amounts to around $4,800 and some odd dollars per farmer. So we are talking about a lot of dollars and we are talking about a tremendous impact if, in fact, this export market should be curtailed in any fashion.

Now, as far as the entry into the Common Market is concerned, I really don't know what impact it is going to have. I don't think any of us really know. My friend, the member for Middlesex South, indicated he felt this really wouldn't have very much impact.

Mr. R. G. Eaton (Middlesex South): I didn't say that.

Mr. Gaunt: Oh, well I am sorry. Maybe I am putting words in my friend's mouth. But I had understood that he had suggested that it would not be all that great. I think that, according to my information at least, it will affect about 90 per cent of our exports to the United Kingdom; as I said, time will tell how seriously.

I believe that the common agricultural policy will not be implemented overnight. I think it extends over a five-year period commencing Jan. 1, 1973, then it will be phased in over the course of that five-year transitional period. In that way, I suppose it's fairly logical to assume that the disruption will be minimal. However, in the three major exports to Britain—wheat, tobacco and barley—I think it could be fairly serious.

I don't know whether the department has made any particular studies or conducted any negotiations with Britain, but I'd be interested in knowing the effects. I believe about nine per cent of our exports to that country will not be affected at all. The other 91 per cent, it appears at this point in time, will be affected—whether slightly or to quite an extent, no one knows. But I think it's important for the farmers in Ontario and for the farmers in Canada generally, and I wonder if the minister has any comments. I think he's reading the same speech I was reading.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No. I'm not reading a speech at all.

Mr. Eaton: I wouldn't mind making some comments in view of the fact that the member for Huron-Bruce indicated that I said it wouldn't have any effect at all. I certainly didn't feel that. I stated that I felt we should not take pessimistic views of it, but look on it as an opportunity to use the United Kingdom for a doorway into the Common

Market and go after that market aggressively. I think that if we take this attitude there's an opportunity we may even be able to expand some of those markets for our products in there.

Mr. R. Haggerty (Welland South): You'll never sneak in the back door that way, that's for sure.

Mr. Eaton: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Haggerty: You'll never sneak in the back door that way—not the European Common Market.

Mr. Eaton: Well, it's certainly worth a try to take an opportunity to go after those markets.

Mr. Haggerty: It is just wishful thinking.

Mr. Eaton: I had indicated that in the one product I do know something about, where we're now exporting 70 per cent to the United Kingdom—

Mr. Gaunt: Seventy instead of 60?

Mr. Eaton: That's right.

Mr. Gaunt: You'll find it much lower later.

Mr. Eaton: The canners there are processing our product and the market is opening up in the United Kingdom for more of that product, and these canners, being in a position to do it and now becoming part of the Common Market, may be able to sell a lot of our product throughout the Common Market. I think it is certainly worth a try to take this approach and do the best we can to expand those markets. Don't be pessimistic. Let's go after them.

Mr. Gaunt: I would agree with what my friend says. The optimism he exhibits with respect to opening up the European Common Market to our exports is one I would share, but I really don't know whether it's going to work as effectively as we would hope. Perhaps it will. Maybe there's no way to determine that either until we actually get involved—

Mr. Eaton: Give it a try.

Mr. Gaunt: —and start promoting and start getting involved in the toe-to-toe negotiations with Britain and the European Common Market generally. But I think the situation in Britain may improve. For instance, if the economy improves generally, they'll be in a position to buy more agricultural products from us. If they've got more disposable income, they're going to be spending more money on some of these foodstuffs; that will certainly help the picture from the point of view of our exports to that country.

As far as the European Common Market itself is concerned, and using Britain as a go-between and as a funnel to the European Common Market, quite frankly I would be interested in pursuing that. My first reaction is that they are much more adept at keeping out products from the European Common Market than to let us funnel through Great Britain all of the agricultural products we would wish to export to the ECM. I don't think they will let us do it.

Mr. Eaton: I am not suggesting using it as a funnel, but as a contact to get into that market—to make our contacts and try and sell there.

Mr. Gaunt: I hope that that point works out and that we able to do that, because we don't have the export trade in western European countries that we should have—indeed, could have. I would hope that that will improve in the near future.

Perhaps the entry of Britain into the European Common Market will be one avenue through which we can improve that situation. Has the minister any comments with respect to my earlier remarks?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, while I share the enthusiastic optimism of my friend from Middlesex South I also share the concern expressed by the member for Huron-Bruce. Because there will be some problems, there is no question about it, that are going to develop in the traditional trading patterns come Jan. 1, 1973.

But one of the things that I do like and that, I think, exemplifies what the member for Middlesex South has just said, is illustrated by the recent white bean mission, for instance, which has gone over there. The chairman, the vice-chairman, and the secretary-manager of the white bean producers marketing board have gone to the UK to explore the possibilities and they have gone further into the western European countries. They have visited Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, West Germany and France to explore the possibilties of getting Canadian white beans into that market.

With Britain's entry into the Common Market we will lose our Commonwealth preference on Canadian white beans exported to the UK. These beans will become subject to the common external tariff of 4.5 per cent,

so by then we will be competing on an equal basis with the United States.

Just how significant this will be I don't know, but you see, just for instance, this last year in the recent negotiations on farm prices in the European Common Market countries they have agreed to an average increase of 6.3 per cent for 1972-1973 farm prices. There was great dissatisfaction among the farmers of the European Common Market countries because they were asking for a much more substantial increase than that.

Mr. Gaunt: How much was the increase?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The increase granted was 6.3 per cent; they asked for 13 per cent, and the European Parliament and the Brussels commission had recommended an eight per cent increase, but they settled on 6.3. That's a substantial price hike, so we gain that advantage. Now while we have lost 45 per cent of preferential tariff, we have gained that kind of an advantage for our commodities that are going over there.

Just what the reaction will be insofar as sale of these commodities—beans, for instance—in the United Kingdom I don't think any of us know. I think we are hopeful that we will be able to maintain our strong position there and get into the European markets through these means as well.

I am concerned about tobacco exports. I think here again there can be some real problems develop because of the fact that our price structure, albeit a quality crop, will lose some of the preferential tariff agreements that we have had in the past. We will come more on the open market as far as our tobacco is concerned.

Then there is always the possibility that the differences between Rhodesia and the United Kingdom will be settled and, because of the other countries wishing to get into the United Kingdom market—that is the European Common Market countries wishing to get into the UK market—we are going to face increasing competition for our tobacco. This is why, as I mentioned a few days ago, we are interested to see what type of a system can be developed by our people here—that is developed by our flue-cured board—with the tobacco industry in Ontario, that will help to offset the impact of those lesser exports to the UK that can possibly develop say, in the years 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977 and from there on.

I think we must bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that the escalating price factor of agricultural food commodities in those markets will be an advantage to us. This is the optimistic note that I think we should pursue and should expand on at every opportunity.

Mr. Gaunt: It will be an advantage to us, but it will also be an advantage to the United States, will it not? They'll be in the exact same position as we will be. So what appears to be an advantage to us will certainly be an advantage to them. We will be in competition with the United States; there is no question about it. I think that in some of these areas, in the matter of tobacco and wheat, we could be in rather serious difficulty when we have to compete with countries that are bankrolled to the extent that the United States is, where they support their farmers by way of subsidy and government programmes of one nature or another. To that extent it is going to make it very difficult for our people here in the province to compete with them in that market.

Mr. Chairman: Item 7 carried. The hon. member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if we are at the end of the consideration of the particular items under vote 1402, before we pass the vote as a whole, I would like to ask the minister about an area which is of interest to me, that is, this whole question of phasing out one programme and introducing a new or more needed programme.

In the area of the agricultural production programme, is the minister subjected, first of all, to pressures for the institution of other areas under this agricultural production programme that are not now covered by the particular separate parts of this programme?

Does he consider, apart from any pressure, that this is the extent of the programme that this government should be undertaking, or are there other fields which, because of shortage of government funds, should be part and parcel of this programme? Specifically, are there any of these which the minister believes would be best phased out and other programmes substituted for them?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I am afraid I find it difficult to reply. I hope I am not being unduly obtuse, but I am not sure what my hon. friend is coming at here. Can he give me some specific illustrations of phasing out of programmes?

Mr. Renwick: I don't have—well, for example let's use an obvious one—

Mr. Gaunt: Sugar beet!

Mr. Renwick: —even though it may be ludicrous from my lack of knowledge. Let's assume for the moment that the government operation in the crop insurance field could by appropriate means be transferred to the private sector. That would be a phasing out of the crop insurance programme and the government might then be in a position to use the funds which are available in that programme, not only for a reinforcement of the remaining elements of this programme but for the introduction of a new item under this vote, of a new programme, of a new departure which would assist the overall objective of the government to increase, stabilize and rationalize the agricultural production programme of the province.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The programmes are constantly under review, Mr. Chairman. There are some that have been phased out or reduced, which we have gone through in these estimates. I am afraid the illustration used as far as crop insurance is concerned was not perhaps the best one, because here this is a fairly heavily subsidized programme. The Province of Ontario and the government of Canada each carries 50 per cent of the cost of administration and each pays 25 per cent of the cost of the premium. So, if we were to turn that one over to the private sector there would have to be substantial increases in premium and administration costs or the programme, I'm afraid, wouldn't be very well accepted.

We have in some areas, however, changed our subsidies and I point to one here with specific reference. That is the subsidy for the transportation of agricultural limestone which has been reduced from over $100,000 to $35,000 and this is in the vote we're on right now. The reason that was reduced is that we have done away with the subsidy for the transportation of agricultural limestone in southern Ontario. It does apply in northern Ontario, and that's the approximate breakdown. We were spending something over $60,000 for transportation of limestone in southern Ontario and roughly $35,000 in the north. It was about a $100,000 programme in round figures.

We have felt that because of the introduction of certain crops in southern Ontario, corn and barley for instance—such crops that do not require the degree of limestone in their growth—we could abandon that programme without very seriously affecting the agricultural industry. In the north, however, because of the climate they can't grow corn; they have to grow legumes and it is necessary to use lime to grow legumes, if the acidity of the soil is such that it requires the introduction of limestone. We felt it was essential to carry it there for those reasons. Now, that's just one illustration.

We have withdrawn the subsidization to the warble fly inspector programme we have throughout the province; it amounted to $44,000. This is simply another illustration of what we are trying to do. I think at the same time we have to look at the fact that we have vastly expanded our services in the development of export markets for food. We have expanded that service. We have certainly increased the capital grant programme, as I mentioned last night, to a very substantial figure. We are constantly required, as all other departments are, to review our programmes and to try to keep them as current in necessity as possible.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 7 carry?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure where I should raise this matter of imports with respect to fruit and vegetables. I don't know whether—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The food council.

Mr. Gaunt: The food council. I think that would be the appropriate place.

Mr. Chairman: Is item 7 carried then?

Vote 1402 agreed to.

On vote 1403:

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, the federal government announced a $150 million small farms development programme, I believe it was back in December. I'm quite unclear as to how this programme is going to fit in with the ARDA programme already in operation here in the province.

If I understood the announcement and new reports which flowed from that announcement at that time, I was of the impression that the programme was basically designed to follow more or less the programme which was already operating in Ontario. I listened rather carefully to the interview that was conducted with the federal minister at that time. I understood him to say that in some provinces certain programmes were applicable and in other provinces the emphasis was in some other direction.

Generally speaking, hearing him outline the programme which they had undertaken I felt that programme matched very closely the programme that is already operating in this

province. I'm wondering exactly how the federal programme as announced at that time is going to dovetail with the programme that is already operating here at the moment. Is there going to be duplication? Is the federal government going to undertake some of the programmes, particularly in the farm consolidation end, that were previously administered by the Ontario branch of ARDA; or just exactly how is this going to work?

I think that $150 million was spread out over seven years. It was a seven-year programme and involved a number of programmes—farm consolidation, moving farmers off the land and bringing industry in to create work opportunities, and so on. Now, those things are being done here. So I am wondering, does this programme apply in the province or doesn't it? Now, what's the situation?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, Mr. Chairman, I share the concern expressed by my hon. friend. When the programme was first discussed by the federal minister, we expressed alarm that it would be a complete duplication of the programme already in operation in Ontario, with some modifications.

We have, we think, an extremely satisfactory and useful programme in Ontario that is carried out through the ARDA counsellors, the field men, working under the ARDA directorate of Ontario and the various counties and districts.

We can provide counselling service to the people who are interested in changing their particular status, whether it be to sell out, or whether it be to enlarge the farms they already have in order to expand their operations.

We felt that it would be a superimposition of another structure of—as I described it the other night, "bureaucracy"—over what we already have today at federal level. And I think it will be.

We tried to persuade the federal minister and his officials to grant whatever amount of money he felt should be determined for the Province of Ontario to the ARDA directorate, which really is composed of provincial authority—officials in our province—but which works closely with the ARDA directorate; the federal ARDA co-ordinator in the province.

If you'll notice, all the announcements that go out on ARDA programmes and projects in Ontario, bear the name of the federal minister and my name as the minister in Ontario. We give them full marks for every participation, every bit of participation that they have with us in the ARDA programme. I was more than willing to do that with the federal Minister of Agriculture. I wasn't trying to get the programme away from him into the province with use of federal money. I felt that it was a programme that should be provided jointly, because to me we will have a federal small farms' development programme working at this end, and we will have our provincial-federal ARDA programme working at the other area in the same province. To me that just doesn't make sense when they are both really trying to do the same thing. We met with no success whatever in that debate.

We have never abandoned that position and we still believe that the proper thing to do is to have done it as I suggested. There are other provinces in Canada that share our thinking in this regard.

However, we have been given to understand that the federal department intends to go ahead with the proposal. They are perhaps ready to discuss certain elements of co-ordination, but not at all on the basis that we felt it should be decided. So we are frankly disappointed that this could not have been accomplished.

I think that the programme, as proposed by the federal minister, has a good deal of merit. I think it has application. Perhaps in some parts of Ontario there will be limits as far as the amount of money that they can spend for the acquisition of farms is concerned. I do believe that it will resolve some problems, but I am not so sure that it will resolve any problems that we can't resolve under the present ARDA programme that we have in Ontario.

Mr. Gaunt: I am wondering, Mr. Chairman—The other provinces in Canada, and without trying to lead the minister in any way, I understand that Ontario has the best ARDA programme of any of the 10 provinces.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We have, no question about it.

Mr. Gaunt: Yes, well, I didn't want to lead you into saying that—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I just wanted to confirm the opinion.

Mr. T. P. Reid (Rainy River): I believe you, but your modesty is overwhelming.

Mr. Gaunt: —I wanted to say it myself.

Mr. Chairman: Would the hon. member please resume his seat before speaking.

Mr. Gaunt: Who me?

Mr. Chairman: No, the other member.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, he wasn't speaking, he was just interjecting.

Mr. Gaunt: I am wondering in view of that, Mr. Chairman, if the programme undertaken by the federal government is really completely unnecessary in the Province of Ontario. Is there no provision by which the Province of Ontario can be exempted? I presume that the hangup arises over the $150 million. You want your share of the money without involving the superstructure of the federal government bureaucracy.

I gather from what you say that that's where the hiatus comes; they don't want to do that, they want to do it themselves. Is this a matter which has been finalized? Is that the final stance of the federal government with respect to this, or is there any new development? Are you undertaking continuing negotiations to try to sort this out? Are you and your deputy going to take the Otter and go up to see the federal minister and see if you can't sort this out?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, we wouldn't hesitate at all to take the Otter if we thought that it would be to the advantage of the farmers of Ontario. But we have had continuing negotiations on this matter, and I must confess that I am disappointed in the results. I believe the federal minister and his staff are determined to go ahead in spite of the objections, I believe, of almost all of the provinces in Canada, to the implementation of the programme.

We presented the plan to the federal minister as a group of 10 ministers of agriculture last November. That was hammered out with great detail and was I think a pretty useful type of an agricultural programme for Canada. It would include the points that he has presented in the small farm development programme, but would go much further in that it would assist in providing a working capital, expanded credit facilities, various things that we felt were in the interests of Canadian farmers; such as an export development fund, which we think was essential to the expansion of the development of Canadian exports into a market that is becoming more competitive on a world basis almost every day.

Frankly, I cannot understand why he didn't seize on that opportunity. Here he had 10 provinces, representing four different political stripes, all agreeing on a programme that we would work on with him and the federal government in implementing in our various provinces. To me it was quite an historic occasion to bring together those people and agree on something that we were willing to work out with the federal government. But we got no encouragement whatever on the implementation of those programmes, and I am frankly quite disappointed. I think we had an opportunity to really do something for Canadian agriculture.

There have been discussions continuing on the programme. Our assistant deputy minister, Mr. Lantz, and two of our officials from the department here—and Mr. Crown—have been working with the federal departmental officials to try to come up with a workable solution. They want to administer the programme through the farm credit corporation in all of the 10 provinces in Canada. They feel that they have the machinery to do it on a uniform basis across Canada. But along with that, they have in many provinces decided to put in counsellors or advisers for the programme so that the farmer will be the contact at the local level. We have that structure now. I have been hopeful that these gentlemen—and I am not sure what progress they have made to date; I am rather doubtful if they have made very much—can provide that service through the ARDA counsellors and through the extension people that we have in the counties where we do not have specific ARDA staff.

For the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why we have to employ another group of civil servants when we already have a group here, quite capable, ready and able to do the job and give the full marks to the federal government for the programme which they would be implementing on their behalf. That just makes sound common sense and good logic to me as a taxpayer in this country. I make no apologies for having taken a pretty strong stand in this regard. I am hopeful that with the continuing negotiations that we may be able to arrive at what, I think, is a much more workable and rational decision than has already been indicated.

Mr. Chairman: Does vote 1403 carry?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, with the situation as it now is, with the federal government then going to move into this area, I would suggest to the minister that within six months they are going to find themselves unemployed because they won't be able to find anything to do. The programmes are

already undertaken by the provincial ARDA. I don't know what more any government could do or seek out in that particular field. I think every single area that the federal minister has mentioned with respect to this development programme is presently being looked after by the province and, unless they are going out together in the same car, I don't know what these federal people will be doing.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, I have a proposition to make. How would it be if my hon. friend and I joined together, and whether we take the Otter or not, if we were to go to Ottawa maybe we could resolve this.

Mr. Gaunt: In the Otter?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I'm not sure whether we need that or not.

Mr. Gaunt: I want to go in the Otter. If we go in the Otter I'll take the minister up on that.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The member wants to fly in that Otter?

Mr. Gaunt: I'll take him up.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We'll have to take that under advisement.

Vote 1403 agreed to.

On vote 1404:

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1404. Carried?

Mr. Gaunt: No, no, Mr. Chairman, just relax for a moment here. I have a matter related to the egg producers' disaster loan fund. The federation mentioned this in its brief and made quite a play on it, if I can just find it here. The federation mentioned that, as far as it was concerned, it felt that producers should have some immediate help. In that regard it felt that it should have a disaster loan programme instituted immediately. This was because of the fact, of course, that since 1971 the price of eggs have been 21.6 cents per dozen, which is almost four cents less than the Canadian average, which underscores the fact that Ontario has really been harder hit than some of the other provinces in regard to egg prices and the results which flowed from the egg war.

I think they suggested that a provincial government-guaranteed loan to egg producers of $2 per bird to a maximum of 20,000 birds per producer be implemented. They had a suggestion with respect to the interest-free clauses on that loan, that it be interest-free for the first two years, that repayment of principal and interest at five per cent would commence in the third year and be fully repaid in six years. They also suggested that the loan be given to genuine egg producers and to no one else. I certainly would concur with that suggestion.

I am just wondering, has the minister given any consideration to this matter? He said on Tuesday night, I believe, that as far as the Ross report was concerned, that it was going to take some time to study the various proposals and their impact, which means that we'll not likely have an egg marketing plan in this province for a few months anyway. In the meantime, I think the federation suggestion has some merit.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister want to comment?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I think that gentleman back there—do you want to speak, Ray?

Mr. Haggerty: No, after.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the loan that was requested by the Federation of Agriculture to be made to egg producers, I must confess I have many reservations about the wisdom of doing that. I just don't think it would really resolve anything.

It wouldn't have lessened the number of eggs produced in Ontario one iota. I doubt very much if it would have saved anybody from any more serious financial position than they are in already, other than it would have transferred the debt owing to the feed company to the government, and once we back a note we could very well find ourselves in the position of having to pay that note.

When we consider that there was approximately $40 million requested, that is a sizable chunk of money. I feel that it would ill behove the government to provide that kind of credit by way of guaranteed loan to one particular commodity group. I think others could have come in and demanded the same thing.

The position that we have adopted, as I mentioned the other night, of perhaps providing some type of guaranteed credit to egg producers to finance their future operations once a quota is established and they can see the stability of the future, to me holds a great deal more promise. I hope we may explore the possibilities of that through the

government. I am just talking as the Minister of Agriculture today.

I feel that that is the proper course to follow and I think that opinion is shared by some of my colleagues. But, of course, we have to go through the necessary steps, and I am not sure what reception that idea would have with the producers themselves. I think they would welcome it, quite frankly, because I feel very keenly that we should do everything we can to put the future of the egg industry, insofar as production is concerned, back in the hands of the primary producer of eggs. Today I don't think he has that control. I think it is vested in feed companies and perhaps, to some degree, those that supply other services, including facilities and hatchery people, and this kind of thing.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is not on marketing of eggs.

Mr. Chairman: Were the comments of the member of Riverdale on this?

Mr. Renwick: No, I was not going to speak on eggs this morning.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Prince Edward-Lennox.

Mr. J. A. Taylor (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, through you to the minister, the egg producers whom I have talked with in my riding wholly concur in the recommendations of Judge Ross, so I might say that we are enthusiastic that something be done immediately in regard to this overall situation. I was wondering whether the minister had any concept of the timing, insofar as the implementation of that report is concerned?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Chairman, I can readily understand the concern expressed by my friend from Prince Edward-Lennox. I share his concern, and I would like to get on with the job just as quickly as we can.

With this intent we have recommended that we engage some people to work with the Farm Products Marketing Board and with the egg producers of Ontario and those who are associated with the trade and the industry to try to work out the details of this plan, to get it into operation just as quickly as possible. As of Wednesday of this week we had our assistant deputy minister in charge of marketing, with the chairman and vice-chairman of the Farm Products Marketing Board, in Ottawa discussing with the federal officials and with the other provincial officials from across Canada the basic details of a national plan to establish quotas.

Mr. Taylor: I gather from the minister's remarks that the plan is proceeding then toward the implementation of the report, is that so? And that people are currently working to that end?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Welland South.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk on fruit marketing in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We carried the first section of that.

Mr. Chairman: Well, were we not doing the whole vote as a unit?

Mr. Gaunt: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Well, some of the votes lend themselves to item by item consideration and others don't.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We are in the marketing section.

Mr. Chairman: It seems to me we're discussing marketing in this last part.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We're into marketing, right.

Mr. Haggerty: May I continue, Mr. Chairman?

One of the most pleasing matters for many agricultural people in Ontario was the record year for Ontario grape growers—more grapes were growing on more acres than ever before. In 1971, sales of Ontario grapes reached a record dollar value in income with a record-setting yield of 82,000 tons producing more than $12 million at the vineyard level. All told 45 different types of grapes were grown in the Niagara region. The president, Mr. Ron Moyer, stated that peninsula grapes displaced apples as the leading dollar earner of any type of fruit crop in Ontario. Complementary to this surge was a 30 per cent gain for the wine industry. The success this year in production was due to the most favourable weather conditions and to the good farmers in the area.

Mr. J. E. Stokes (Thunder Bay): A vintage year.

Mr. Haggerty: The production of the grape farmers has extended to vineyards on top of the Niagara Escarpment, making it possible for the vineyards to be more profitable ventures for many farmers in the area and offering a promising outlook for future market expansion.

The wine industry is becoming a very profitable source of revenue, and the quality of Ontario wines is perhaps the best that can be found anywhere in Ontario or in Canada. One can readily see that this expanding industry in Ontario has a good potential export trade available; the resources are there, provided the government does not allow further erosion of the most valuable farmlands in Ontario.

I find it rather discouraging to see large acreages of Ontario's richest farmland being hacked up or slaughtered by highways. I take exception to the present highway construction along the Queen Elizabeth Way, where the department is now building service roads in that area; this will perhaps bring in further development in the area. I can see now, as I travel on the Queen Elizabeth Way, that from Stoney Creek east to St. Catharines the farm land is all marked up for sale. It's really discouraging to see this.

I believe the ministers in the government have done very little to preserve one of God's great creations. Its beauty is being destroyed day by day, year after year and the efforts of those responsible in government have been most disappointing to date. It has been suggested by many citizens, both urban and rural, and in many studies carried out by local universities, that this government must now move to implement land-use planning to preserve the valuable fruitland for posterity's sake. One becomes most sensitive on this issue. Highways and industries should be constructed on less choice and less valuable farmlands than are in the Niagara region.

The Liberal agricultural critic, the member for Huron-Bruce, has quite rightly said that Ontario's most basic industry is agriculture; yet many farmers conclude that they are not sharing equitably in Ontario's prosperity. Farm people's income, in many instances, is on the decrease. Ontario needs the best rural development programme to boost the income of the farm family. They are the economic and social base for a strong rural society.

Mr. Chairman, while speaking on this matter I can see, particularly in my area, there are a number of farmers leaving the farms and perhaps going into some other type of work or employment. Some of them are successful in getting employed in industry but it still doesn't solve the problem of the waste farmlands that lie idle in the region of Niagara. I hope that this government will do something to get this land back in development as it should be, as farmland.

I find that in many instances youngsters are leaving the farms and there are not jobs available in their urban centres. Mr. Olsen, I believe, has a programme coming out now by which he will provide loans to interested parties that want to expand farm operations. I believe he has available some $150 million. I don't know if this government is going to match this or not, but I was wondering if we shouldn't perhaps get back into it and encourage more of these youngsters to stay on the farms instead of creating further urban problems. I find that moving these people into urban areas is not solving the problems in these larger communities because there are other services which have to be provided for these persons. One is jobs, and jobs are not that readily available today.

I have a letter here, Mr. Chairman and I would like to read it into the record. It is from Mr. Thomas A. Whitelaw of Beamsville; I presume that he is a fruit farmer in the Niagara region. He lays out policy proposals concerning the fruit industry in the Niagara Peninsula. He has a list of about four or five of them here. He said:

> Import of foreign fruit into Canada is the major problem facing fruit farmers in the Niagara Peninsula and the federal government must bear the major responsibility in controlling these imports as they have the authority to impose tariffs and quotas. However, non-tariff barriers can be effective in controlling imports and here the Ontario government can play a role. The Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food, through its inspection service, can make sure that imported fresh fruit is up to Ontario standards and the service could also apply pressure on those stores that sell large quantities of foreign fruits. Recently the United States customs held carloads of Ontario produce—lettuce—five days for inspection. The Ontario government could consider similar action.
>
> 2. Strengthening marketing boards:
>
> Currently there are four marketing boards concerned with the selling of fruit produced in the Niagara Peninsula: Ontario Fresh Fruit Growers Marketing Board; the Ontario Fresh Grape Growers Marketing Board; the Ontario Tender Fruit Growers Marketing Board; Ontario Grape Growers Marketing Board. The Ontario Government

should encourage the amalgamation of the four marketing Boards subject to the approval of the boards and the farmers. In this way the boards should be better able to co-ordinate marketing policies.

(b) The marketing boards should maintain a full-time sales staff complete with market research personnel. The Ontario government should provide grants if necessary to ensure that this is possible. Alternatively the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food could lend department economists to the marketing boards to conduct marketing studies of the Niagara produced fruit.

The marketing boards need to maintain contact with the farmers so that a field liaison man should be part of the board staff. The government could provide the funds to make this possible.

The marketing boards should take over the fruit shipping companies in the peninsula with the aid of government loans and run them as co-operatives. At present the fruit shipping companies are under the control of Central Fruit Exchange run by the marketing boards and the companies operate as their agents. If the fruit shipping companies were to operate as co-operatives, this would give farmers more control over fruit distribution and should reduce distribution costs as co-operatives operate at cost. A single body could also rationalize shipping facilities, eliminating duplication, and thus reducing costs. Farm supplies could also be provided at cost for these co-operatives.

(3) Distribution of fruit:

(a) Food terminals.

At present there is only one major fruit terminal in Ontario where farmers and truckers can take Ontario fruit and sell it as wholesalers directly to the storekeeper—the Ontario Food Terminal in Toronto. Most fruit is shipped to Toronto and the market can be easily glutted while other areas cannot get any fruit. The Ontario government should build a series of food terminals in all of the major centres of Ontario. With food terminals all over the province, a wider distribution of fruit could be achieved and hence most fruit could be sold. Also, these fruit terminals could reduce the distribution costs of all food in Ontario.

And I think he raises a very important point here. I remember being on a government tour in northwestern Ontario. I walked into stores in Port Arthur and one other community there and found I was going to have to pay some 65 cents per pound of tomatoes; yet knowing you could have picked them up down in the Niagara region for about 45 or 40 cents a basket. You wonder and say, "Well, is there justice to the consumers in the Province of Ontario."

He goes on to say:

(b) Other facilities:

Industries often need specialized facilities in order to operate efficiently. In this area the fruit industry such facilities include central cold storage, farm cold storage and processing plants. The government should provide low-cost loans to improve and expand these facilities.

And I think he has hit upon another important point here. I know there is a problem of farm marketing of fruits, particularly in my riding and in Fonthill and Pelham town.

I remember meeting a group of growers last summer and this is one of the problems. There was an enormous crop of cherries last season, along with other fruits. And there was just no place to market it. One of the suggestions made by the growers in the area was that government, either this government or the federal government should perhaps build a large processing plant on a cost-sharing basis. I am talking about the fast-frozen type of plant where fruits can be frozen and stored there for a period of four to five or six months.

This would help the farmers in the area to absorb their produce. Not only that, but I think it would increase marketing in the province of Ontario and perhaps in other provinces in Canada.

We often find that one of the biggest competitors for frozen cherries is the State of Michigan. If I can recall—I do have some figures here—the domestic crop has perhaps been hampered by allowing imports to come in from the United States at this particular time in the harvesting season.

One finds that we allow the Maraschino cherries to come in from Italy, and there is a tariff of one cent. We bring in from the United States and there is I think a tariff of somewhere around about three cents.

I suppose it is a type of a trade protection but I believe in this particular instance Mr. Whitelaw has hit on a very important thing that something should be done in this particular instance. We should be looking for some measures to make sure that all the

fruits that grow in this particular area are being processed and the market is here in Ontario.

He goes on to say further:

(c) Transportation subsidies:

The Ontario government could provide transportation subsidies to open up markets in other areas of Canada. This would be especially important in large crop years, such as this year, when the traditional markets in Ontario and Montreal cannot absorb the full fruit production of the Niagara Peninsula.

(d) Winery stores.

Winery should be allowed to operate more company-owned stores as this would encourage the sales of Niagara wines.

4. Promotion of Canadian fruit:

(a) Advertising: An advertising campaign should be launched through the news media, television, radio, newspapers, to promote Ontario-grown farm produce. This could be accomplished either directly through the Ontario Department of Agriculture and Food and through government grants to the marketing boards.

Wouldn't it be nice to have the big campaign we had on here a year ago? Where would you rather be? Is there any other place you would rather be than in Ontario? Wouldn't it be nice to have some picture of the fruits that are grown here in the Province of Ontario advertised in this style? We see nothing now being advertised about how good and how prosperous Ontario is—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You complained too much about our programme.

Mr. Haggerty: But you have cut it off all of a sudden. Why don't you get into it now and start advertising?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: You objected so much to our advertising Ontario that we cut it out.

An hon. member: You people over there caused the unemployment in Ontario—

Mr. Gaunt: You advertise just before the election.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, just before the election. All of a sudden, there is nothing there now.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Revenue): You like us telling everybody what a great place Ontario is?

Mr. Haggerty: I was pleased at the Speaker's dinner at least to see the Speaker had wines from the Niagara Peninsula. That was just great. But I believe a year ago, it wasn't wines from the Niagara Peninsula.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, what a difference a Speaker makes.

Mr. Haggerty: What a difference! This is right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Five years ago, you fellows objected to us using wine at all.

Mr. Haggerty: To continue the quotation:

Government-controlled agencies can play a large role in promoting Ontario produce. An important example is the Liquor Control Board of Ontario which should promote Ontario wines. Also it was revealed that when the restaurants at Ontario Place first opened, they were not serving any Ontario wines. Situations like this must not be allowed to happen again. All government institutions and functions should promote Ontario produce.

I was rather disappointed. I think there was a new member appointed to the Liquor Control Board. He said that Ontario wines were the poorest in quality and he was looking to bring in further imports. In a sense, I could not care less about it, but I can tell you this much, Ontario wines are the best.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I'll take your word they are.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I wonder if the hon. member would find this a convenient place to make a break in his presentation?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will move the adjournment now.

Mr. Gaunt: Do we continue with these estimates on Monday? Is that what I understood the House leader to say?

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. E. A. Winkler (Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question that was put to me, on Monday I anticipated that we will pro-

ceed with the committee of the whole House on Bill 24, the Nursing Homes Act. The House should also be prepared to consider second reading of bills on the order paper, numbers—this is business numbers—four to eight, a bill standing in the name of the Attorney General (Mr. Bales) and then we will return to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture to be followed by the estimates of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. J. A. Renwick (Riverdale): Did the House leader say Industry and Tourism?

Hon. Mr. Winkler: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Winkler moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:00 o'clock, p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, April 14, 1972

Metro Centre plan, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Singer, Mr. Lewis ... 1221

Purchase of aircraft for government, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer ... 1224

Use of government cars, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Singer ... 1224

de Havilland labour dispute, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Singer ... 1224

Metro civic dispute, questions of Mr. Guindon: Mr. Lewis ... 1224

Removal of sand from dunes in Prince Edward County, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Lewis ... 1225

Convictions under environmental Acts, questions of Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Lewis 1225

Location of new airport, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Reid ... 1226

New jails, question of Mr. Snow: Mrs. Scrivener ... 1228

Spadina rapid transit, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Givens ... 1228

Programmes for unorganized communities, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Stokes ... 1228

Funds for sewage disposal systems, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Ruston ... 1229

Distribution of draught beer in northern Ontario, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Ferrier ... 1229

Bonding of charter flight operators, question of Mr. Winkler: Mr. Deacon ... 1229

Tendering practices of Timiskaming School Board, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Shulman 1229

Purchase of aircraft for government, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent ... 1230

Homebuilder regulations, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Burr ... 1230

Highway Traffic Act, bill to amend, Mr. Shulman, first reading ... 1231

Estimates, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. Stewart, continued ... 1231

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Winkler, agreed to ... 1253

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2